


GIFT OF
Mrs. Gladys Isaacson





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

**JUDAISM
CHRISTIANITY
AND THE
MODERN SOCIAL
IDEALS**

BY
G. GEORGE FOX
TEMPLE BETH EL

UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

1919
**MONITOR PUBLISHING COMPANY
FORT WORTH, TEXAS**

BM 72
56 F6

COPYRIGHT 1918
BY
THE MONITOR PRESS
FORT WORTH
TEXAS

Gift of Mrs. Gladys Jackson

DEDICATED
TO MY PARENTS WHOSE SACRIFICES, AND
TO MY WIFE WHOSE DEVOTION, EXEM-
PLIFY SOME OF THE IDEALS SET
FORTH IN THIS WORK

M18310

PREFACE

Within the last quarter of a century a large number of books has been written dealing with the life of Jesus, his ethics and their relation to our social ideals. Here in America, works of which the "Social Teachings of Jesus," and "Christianity and the Changing Order," by Prof. Shailer Mathews; "Christianity and the Social Crisis," by Prof. Rauschenbusch, and "Jesus Christ and the Moral Question," by Prof. Peabody, are the best types, have rightly shifted the emphasis of Christianity from the dogmatic to the social and ethical side. In his "Social Teachings," Prof. Mathews has sounded the proper note, for in these days, religion must be socialized to be vital.

But from a perusal of this literature, one is made to feel that Christianity alone is to be credited with the best of our social ideals. One cannot find fault with Christian scholars for their magnificent allegiance to what they believe to be the ideals of their Master. But one looks in vain for an adequate evaluation of the tremendous influence of Judaism upon both the ancient and the modern life. Surely the Jewishness of Jesus himself played some part in the growth and development of our present day social ideals!

The following pages have been written because the writer believes that Judaism has been overlooked in the consideration of those forces which influence and refine modern life. He believes that most of the teachings of Jesus are as Jewish as those of any well-known teacher of the post-biblical writings. He believes that our present day social ideals are Jewish, and that many would agree with him if the information to substantiate this were at hand.

No one can deny that there is need for an exposition of the Jewish teachings and their relation to those of Jesus. Men are desirous to learn and a spirit of fair-mindedness is abroad. Works of this sort abound in Europe, in America they are extremely scarce. The ideals of Jesus, however, have found exposition in many volumes; to compare the Jewish ideals with these, and to answer too, the question of the attitude of liberal Jews towards their ancient co-religionist—a question asked many times of the writer—is the task of this work.

That these pages may to some extent clear up the misunderstanding with regard to ancient Judaism and its influence on modern life, is the fervent hope of the writer.

I desire to express my thanks here to the late Prof. George Burman Foster of the University of Chicago, and to Dr. Louis Grossman of the Hebrew Union Teachers' College,

Cincinnati, for reading the manuscript of this work, and for the encouragement which they gave me; to my friend and colleague, Rabbi David Rosenbaum of the Austin Temple and the University of Texas, for his painstaking assistance and for his suggestions; and to Miss Ethel Fox for assistance in preparing the manuscript for the press.

G. G. F.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	7
Chapter I The New Testament Sources.....	13
Chapter II Post-Biblical Jewish Ideals.....	47
Chapter III Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Ideals	79
Chapter IV The Jewish Ideals and the New Testament	118
The Fatherhood of God.....	122
The Brotherhood of Man and Brotherly Love.....	138
Social Justice.....	157
Individual Righteousness....	179
Charity	204
Peace	211
Chapter V The Attitude of Liberal Jews To- wards Jesus.....	226
Abbreviations	265
Notes	267
Index	281

JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY
AND
THE MODERN SOCIAL IDEALS

CHAPTER I.

The New Testament Sources

The works mentioned in the introductory remarks, and their kind, are the results of the studies of some who believe that the present day social ideals have their source almost wholly in the New Testament, and in the teachings of the Man of Nazareth. These books deal in the main with the social teachings of this leader whom their authors regard as the greatest teacher of mankind. They see him as the ideal, divine man, and by projecting his life into our own times, they hold it up as a standard so perfect that if imitated by all, there could be no room for the social inequalities which spring up through human shortcomings and human wickedness. Their knowledge of the life and deeds of Jesus they obtain wholly from the New Testament writings or from sources even later. The gospels

in particular form the sources upon which the life of Jesus is constructed.

In the following chapters we shall not attempt to deny to Christianity any influence that rightly came from it. But we are not ready to admit that the modern social ideals are the fruits of the New Testament, and are the sole and original contributions of Jesus. Nor will we agree that the New Testament writings form an historical source reliable and authoritative enough to create either for Jesus or against Judaism certain assumptions which many non-Jewish scholars are in the habit of making. We believe that the modern social ideals are the fruitage of other and stronger forces of which Jesus was only a part, and we shall endeavor to show that the ethics of this teacher were part and parcel of Jewish thought and life previous to, contemporary with, and subsequent to, his days, because there was a continuity in Judaism after the early Biblical and post-Biblical contributions, which was not influenced at all by early Christianity. There was from the days of Israel's earliest teachers a continuous stream of ethical thought and teaching, and of this Jesus drank deep. He was a child of his day,¹ a Jew of his time,² and a preacher of a common type of Judaism of his time. To confirm this statement, we shall bring forth evidence not only from the Biblical sources, but from

the teachings and the traditions which were common before and after the advent of the daughter religion, and which now form that important literature known as the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Misnah, Midrash, and Talmud. And we shall in the closing chapter attempt to sum up the reasons why Jews, acquainted with their history, their literature and their religion, cannot accept Jesus either as Messiah, Redeemer and Savior, or as the Perfect and Sinless Man of history.

In citing the teachings of Jesus as historical and authoritative one ought to be careful not to overlook a very important factor. If, for instance, we want to know what Washington said in his farewell address, or what Lincoln said in his Gettysburg speech, we need not ask any one or put any faith in hearsay evidence. We need only to refer to an authentic edition of their works. These have been carefully and authoritatively edited and therefore are reliably historical sources of what these leaders said and did. The rules of conduct of George Washington have their value as a character-building agency at a certain period in a child's life. If men desire to verify these, reference to his written works will set them aright. The same is true of Abraham Lincoln. Many a legend has been spun by his former neighbors and fellow-citizens. Stories of what he believed and how he practiced Law,

have had their rounds. Some of the things heard about him seemed altogether true, until reference to his biography and writings proved them mythical. But the matter to consider here is that when a controversy arises as to what Lincoln did say and what he did do, a study of any of the excellent biographies will give us ample and certain data. This is true of other men who have left their impress upon the world. Not all they said and did is published. But the important contributions of their lives—those which influenced generations and times, can be found by those who look for them, and they are recorded in indisputable records. Sometimes partisan bitterness and sectional prejudices blind writers to the virtues and magnify the vices of those about whom they write. But time corrects such injustices and after the heat of partisan struggles cools down and dispassionate judgment obtains, the truth is seen and thus recorded. The great principles of America's early leaders are thus known because of authoritative transmission; but it is just the lack of authoritative transmission that makes the alleged productions of the world's early teachers historically questionable. Much that we have may have been the instruction of great teachers; but much that we have under their names, was given in their names. And this distinction is a very important one.

In considering the precepts and teachings of Jesus, we must not forget that he himself did not write one word or syllable of that which now we call the New Testament. We can go much further and say that there are many great Biblical scholars who deny that even the apostles wrote what is purported in the New Testament books and their contemporary writings to have come either from his mouth or theirs. The greatest of all of Jesus' followers, Paul, not only did not know him, but did not become a follower of the Jesus cult until after the death of Jesus. As it was then not the custom to write down the teachings and discourses, except in the cases of a few rabbinical teachers, Jesus himself never wrote down, nor did his immediate disciples write, what he said and taught. This was transmitted orally to his followers. The different ways in which his words could have been understood and in which they affected his hearers, men and women of various shades of thought and education, and from various surroundings, can be in a large measure judged from the varying opinions expressed by a crowd which hears a lecture or sermon and yet has a number of different interpretations. It has been the lot of many a preacher to have to refer to his written manuscript in order to correct a false impression upon an auditor. One who has his eyes open to the experience of everyday life

need not be told how oral statements are kneaded, molded and changed by individual experience, until they are hardly recognized by him who originally uttered them. The thoughts thrown out to us by others are affected by our personal experience in the same manner that white light seen through colored lenses is affected by the coloring of the glass. Just as the light colored by the lens is no longer the white light, but the colored, so someone else's idea heard by us may no longer be his, but our idea of his idea. "This process of change through transmission is a very important element in the evaluation of the teachings of Jesus, especially so since there are so many contradictions and inconsistencies in the records that we have of them. Indeed many have thought that the New Testament points to at least two personalities by that name.

One would have to give an exposition of the content of the New Testament in order to bring out fully what is said above. It is hardly the province of these pages to do that; yet a short sketch of the writings themselves giving briefly their content, authorship and date are necessary to bring out our contention. We believe that a very short summary will not be amiss.

It will not be out of place to repeat that neither Jesus⁷ nor any of the apostles⁸ ever wrote any of the works treasured by the

church. This is the verdict of the greatest New Testament scholars, and while it is known within the student circles, it is not known among the world at large, nor will it be so easily believed.

Jesus died in the year 30 of the present era, and the early New Testament records did not assume a canonical or privileged form until the second half of the second century. This ought not to be lost sight of. The writings now included in what is called the New Testament, a term by the way, which did not come into use until long after the writings had been collected, were the works of early Jewish-Christian teachers, and were certainly never intended to be unique in character or inspired. They were written for the purpose of instruction, encouragement, historical knowledge and help in the ecclesiastical controversies, and were gradually collected as the church grew in numbers and influence, and began to feel the need of a historical basis and an authoritative tradition. The influence of the Old Testament at that time must not be overlooked. As long as there were differences between the Jews and the Christians; as long as Judaism had an authoritative source to which to refer; as long as the question of the Messiahship was in dispute, and as long as the earlier Christians based the Messianic pretensions of Jesus upon the Old Testament prophecies, so long

was there necessity for a collection of authoritative writings; and when such a collection once was vested with authority, the church traditions continued and enhanced it, although the writers of these documents, just like the writers of some of the Old Testament books, never knew what the fate of their productions would be. And as the church developed, the collection grew in importance until at the time of the first church councils, it included a number of books, and was decisively stamped as the Revealed Word of God to the Church.

If one judged the New Testament by the attitude displayed towards it by the greater part of Christendom, one would expect to find a work of unity of purpose, unity of tradition, and agreement of historical incidents. We expect a revelation to be absolute; and we should have a right to expect that a work which has been held up as the Revealed Word, would not contain contradictions, antagonistic points of view, and unauthenticated superscriptions. The Christian world can easily believe that the authority of the Old Testament and its claim to Revelation were undermined when the higher criticism pointed out the utter lack of its unity, the impossibility of much of its alleged authorship, and its overwhelming diversity of thought, language, style and points of view. But when the higher criticism found exactly the same de-

fects in the New Testament by applying the same canons of criticism, the point of view with regard to it did not change materially, and in the minds of those who easily and satisfiedly accept the results of the Old Testament criticism, those of the New, find no lodgment.

¹⁰It will perhaps shock the average reader to know that there are seven different arrangements of the New Testament Canon known to criticism. There are even seven different arrangements of the gospels themselves. John is first in many versions. No one has yet succeeded in discovering just why the gospels are arranged in their present order, though many reasons have been advanced. Here a sentence may be quoted from the foremost English New Testament scholar: "The division and arrangement of the gospels thus appear to have been determined partly on chronological grounds, partly from considerations of internal value and even size, partly from ecclesiastical ideas of the author's rank and partly from arbitrary fancies, or, at any rate, from what seem arbitrary and unintelligible to a modern."¹¹ It is not a salutary commentary on some moderns who accept as divine and absolute that which to the best trained minds in that particular field appears "arbitrary and unintelligible."

The amazing credulity which character-

izes the modern preacher who walks up and down his pulpit and shouts in a fit of ecstatic devotion, "I believe this Holy Book from cover to cover," can be judged only by those who know something of the diversity of the sources and the accounts of the New Testament. That faith must indeed be deep which will put implicit trust into a work of some twenty-seven parts, not one of which is definitely known to be historical and authoritative. The very earliest fragments have not even come down whole, and there are represented in the writings of the New Testament something like twenty other works or sources. This is the verdict not of Jewish scholarship, but of Christian research.¹² Would the logic of the matter not demand that every source from which a sentence in the New Testament is taken should likewise be a revelation from the Most High? And would this not then be true also of the works like the Wisdom of Solomon, the Book of Ben Sirach, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Book of Enoch, or others which not only contain ideas and teachings no less beautiful and no less exalted than many of those of the New Testament, but which are among its very sources? Is it generally known that the writers of different parts of the newer canon knew and used expressions, thoughts and teachings not only from the books just mentioned, but also from the As-

cension of Isaiah, Book of Jubilees, Apocalypse of Baruch, Assumption of Moses, Book of Eldad and Medad, Testament of Job, Tobit, Judith, Second Maccabees, the supposed Apocalypse of Jeremiah, the Ahikar traditions, the works of Philo, Josephus, and another work that has been identified as the Flakes of Ecclesiasticus? The content of the New Testament does not lose in value because it is a collection of ideas, some of which are original and some of which had already found expression elsewhere; but the theory of their divine inspiration does, and the time has come when every thoughtful person ought to know and consider the Bible in the light of its historical and literary development. In these days, they who presume to lead ought not to be satisfied with knowing merely the contents of the Book; they ought to know the contents in their relation to their sources, growth, and contemporary literature. We ought to know something of the manner in which these writings were composed and evolved; we ought to know the circumstances under which they were written, and the objects which brought them forth. We ought to know that the early Christians and the Jews, too, had no hesitancy in altering Biblical texts, especially those from the Septuagint, to suit their purposes, and that often the Hebrew was peculiarly collocated and changed in order to fit the point in contro-

versy. There is abundant evidence that the copyists did not hesitate not only to add later details which they thought important for their purposes, but also to delete such matter as they deemed harmful to their cause. Traditions were reworked and re-edited and interpolations and expansions were common. ¹²Tracts and letters were written in the names of apostles to give them authority, and as early as the second half of the second century the authenticity of the then New Testament writings was so much in doubt that Marcion, a Christian of that day, was accused of falsifying the gospel. A number of copies of the gospels existed, but there was widespread diversity among them.

In view of this looseness and lack of uniformity, it would perhaps not be out of place to run hastily over the books of the New Testament and see what results their study have brought forth with regard to the time of their probable composition, their content, and their purpose. There is no unanimity of opinion among scholars, and there is little likelihood that there ever will be. The results that follow will be bitterly disappointing to those who have been accustomed to regard the canon as something of a finished product given by the Almighty to the founders and early expositors of the newer faith.

Although the letters of Paul are in reality the earlier and more authoritative of the

fragments of that literature which later became the New Testament, the gospels, or the writings based on the sayings and traditional doings of Jesus occupy the first place in the canon. The reason for this is, of course, the importance of Jesus. We will here take the books in their present canonical order and show briefly what modern research has to tell us about their development, time of composition, and their authenticity.

A few words of general character ought to be said about the Synoptic Gospels, or those which give a similar synopsis of the life of Jesus, that is, the first three gospels of the New Testament. These are all works compiled from other sources. Not one is an original document which records or transcribes the words or teachings of Jesus or the apostles. Matthew and Luke are believed to have had Mark as a basis, though this has not yet been accepted by all scholars. Some scholars say that there was an original oral gospel that became the basis for the later gospels, but this is opposed on the grounds of the variations in the gospels which cannot be accounted for.

There is a difference of opinion as to whether the first gospel was written in Hebrew or Aramaic. Some think that Mark wrote his gospel from an Aramaic source and that Luke then used both the source and

Mark. Matthew, they believe, was then later written, combining Luke and Mark as a gospel for the Jews, while the earlier ones circulated among the non-Jewish Christians. There are some who say that there was an original Hebrew Matthew even before Mark, and that the present gospel of that name was based upon the gospel of Mark, which had earlier been based upon this original Hebrew Matthew. The uncertainty of the succession of these traditions is due largely to the fact that the early Christian sources were dealt with in a careless manner by later writers,—careless from our historical point of view; there was not that reverence for authorship that we have, and tampering had become a literary habit. Says Dr. Moffat: “The earliest traditions extant upon the origin of the gospels, i. e., the fragmentary remarks of John the Presbyter quoted from Papias,” the Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, who lived in the first half of the second century, by Eusebius, the first great church historian, who was born about 260, “show that no stereotyped official gospel was known to the memory of the sub-apostolic age. The first shapes which loom out of the mist are two documents roughly corresponding to the gospels of Mark and Matthew.” Perhaps a quotation from Papias regarding the account of Mark, may be interesting: “Mark, who was Peter’s interpreter, wrote down accur-

ately, though not in order, all that he RECOLLECTED of what Christ had said or done. For he was not a hearer of his Lord nor a follower of his; he followed Peter, as I have said, at a later date and Peter adapted his instructions to practical needs without any attempt to give the Lord's words systematically. So that Mark was not wrong in writing down some things in this way from memory, for his one concern was neither to omit nor to falsify anything he had heard." About Matthew, Papias says: "So then Matthew composed the Logia in the Hebrew language, and every one interpreted them as he was able." It seems to us that it would be straining a good deal to ask people to believe in a document, the author of which we would be told was, say, Lincoln, but which was not written until thirty-five to fifty years after his death, and written by one who was not a follower of his, nor a hearer, but who heard what he wrote from another who followed Lincoln at an earlier date. Hard to believe as this would be of a recent work, how much more difficult is it to put faith in the authenticity of documents written nearly 1800 years ago, and based on hearsay. If the ancients did not use any historical sense, it was because they did not have it; but we have it; it hardly becomes us not to use it.

Modern criticism has reached the conclusion that the synoptic gospels are based upon

two probable original sources, the Ur-Marcus, or the source upon which the gospel of Mark is thought to have been based, and the ¹⁵Q, or the source which was the work of a Jewish Christian who based his record not only upon that of Mark but also upon what is known as the Matthean Logia. Luke, on the other hand, uses not only the Ur-Marcus and the Q, but also other sources which he thought were for his purpose as authoritative and as important as these two. Both Luke and Matthew omit material which Mark contains, and this leads many critics to believe that the Mark of the present canon is a smaller book than was the original after which the other gospels were planned. Is it not strange that after the conflicting testimony of the greatest biblical scholars and critics; after the dearth of literature which could throw some light and thus enable us to reach certain conclusions about these books; after the utter inability to prove with a moderate degree of historical evidence the authenticity of the various books of the canon, millions still believe, and other millions are asked to believe, in the absolute truth and historicity of the Book and the characters in it? Is it not just a bit presumptuous to ask men of the twentieth century to believe this, when contemporary acts and records or those within recent centuries are subject to the closest historical scrutiny?

¹⁶The Gospel of Matthew, the first in the present canon, is so called, not from the fact that the apostle by that name wrote it, for he did not; the book probably takes its name from the fact that it contains more of the original Mathean sayings. This gospel, in spite of its anti-Pharisaic outbursts, is more Jewish than any of the others and shows every evidence of having been written by a Jewish-Christian. Whether or not the present work is a translation from a Hebrew or an Aramaic document, is not known; but its tone is much more sympathetic and its attitude much more friendly than any of the other gospels. The earliest date for the composition of Matthew is given as about forty years after the death of Jesus; in its present form the date has been placed between 75 and 90, but many place it later, and some as late as 140. There is no agreement as to the date. Is it likely that the teachings of Jesus remained intact, and that they have not been changed, especially when we realize that the present gospel is the work of editors who rewrote the supposed original Mathean Logia several times after years of transmission by word of mouth?

It will perhaps be of interest to know that at least two layers of tradition, and probably three, can be found in this gospel, viz: The Jewish, the Jewish-Christian, and the anti-Jewish. The earliest passages, i. e., the Jew-

ish, are doubtless the ones which are nearest to the sentiments uttered by Jesus; the Jewish-Christian passages are those which formed the bulk of the Q source, while the distinctively anti-Jewish passages are the work of the later or latest editors, who, influenced against Jews and Judaism, gave vent to his or their feelings in the final edition which has come down to us; certainly Jesus himself has never given any evidence of antagonism to Jews; for the "lost sheep of the House of Israel" must have been dear to him; it was for them that he came to "fulfill the law, not to destroy it." It was only in the years of the strife between Judaism and growing Christianity that that bitterness crept in which is at the same time anti-Jewish and unlike Jesus. For while he might have shared the well-known rabbinical dislike for the several classes of hypocritical Pharisees, he could never have judged all the Pharisees or all the Jews by the actions of these. It must be a more than difficult problem for a diligent, thoughtful and sincere student of the Bible to be able to decide which elements are revelations of God, and which are fulminations of angry and unjust partisans.

The Gospel of Mark, which is the oldest of the synoptics, is thought by scholars to be based largely on the original Marcan or Ur-Marcus source. It is a worked-over document,

edited by an anti-Jewish Paulinist redactor. Mark says nothing of the ancestry, birth and childhood of Jesus. His interest seems to be fixed on the actual life and death of the teacher. The supernatural healing powers of Jesus are strongly depicted, and while Matthew knows Jesus primarily as a preacher and teacher, he is to Mark a preacher, teacher and the powerful exorciser of evil spirits; it is this last power which gives him a special claim to the Messiahship.

The present Mark is also based upon Mark's draft of the Peter reminiscences, though it represents now both a later edition of an earlier work or works, and traces of two or three different sources. It contains Pauline elements which it could not have contained had it been the product solely of Mark's version of the Petrine material. Some critics detect in this gospel an Aramaic original or originals, the former of which was later translated into Greek, and in which the supernatural powers of Jesus as Messiah are brought out. Then a later redactor brings this work down to its present canonical form, embodying in it certain dogmatic elements which had become characteristic of the growing church.

The date of Mark is as unsettled as that of the other synoptics. The best critics of the day place it at between 70 and 130 of the

present era. The most likely date seems to be between 70 and 90.

Here we are again moved to ask which of the strata or sources of this gospel are to bear the seal of divine revelation? Is it to be the Ur-Marcus; the Aramaic sources, the work of the Paulinist anti-Jewish Redactor, or the whole gospel as edited by a final editor at the end of the first century or in the beginning of the second, and containing at the very end an apocryphal quotation to give a literary ending to the book?

The Third Gospel, written in scholarly Greek, starts out as a compilation of several traditions and narratives concerning the life of Jesus. The author, Luke, says he was not an eye-witness of the events he is about to narrate; he seems to have prepared himself by consulting the narratives and oral traditions known in his day. He says nothing of revelation or divine guidance. He lays no claim to any supernatural influence. He simply writes to his friend, Theophilus, what he thinks is an historical account of the new sect and tries in this account to harmonize as well as he can the oft conflicting contents of the different traditions and sources at his command. The author uses Mark extensively, as also Matthew, and very probably other gospels now lost. Luke contains several events not mentioned in the other synoptic accounts. Among these are the an-

nouncement of the birth of John the Baptist, the prediction of the birth of Jesus, the visit of Mary to Elizabeth, and the boyhood of Jesus, which of course has no historically authenticated basis, and is similar to the story of Samuel and to that of many other mythical and historical religious founders.

In this non-Jewish gospel Jesus is represented more than in the others as a friend of the sinners, the poor, and the downfallen. Contrary to the other synoptics, Luke emphasizes Jerusalem as the center of the activity of Jesus and his disciples.

The date of this gospel, like that of the others, is a matter of dispute. It is probably the latest of the synoptic gospels, yet there is no definite date assigned to it, the date varying from 54 to 130 after Jesus. Conservative scholarship places it at about 100.

The Fourth Gospel, an attempt to harmonize the dogmas of growing Christianity with Alexandrian Jewish philosophy, was written for the purpose of showing the life of Jesus to have been "an episode in the external existence of the Logos." He was in fact the Logos. The gospel contains several definite strata of thought, viz: Old Testament, Paulinist, Philonic, Gnostic and Stoic. It differs from the other gospels decisively in so far as in it Jesus loses a great deal of that humanness which characterizes him in the synoptics. As the Logos, he is above human-

kind; in fact, according to St. John, Jesus becomes transcendental and his mysteriousness becomes marked. The author maintains a certain consistency in this work and in accordance with his conception of Jesus, this teacher is made to know his own life, his mission and his death. He is made to act independently of human relationships, and to the end he remains what he was at the beginning of the gospel, a superhuman creature—an incarnation of the author's philosophical abstraction—God incarnate.

The writer of this gospel loses no opportunity to impress the reader with the divine messiahship of Jesus and his relation to God as His son. This appears from the earliest acts of Jesus recorded here, and in this respect, John differs from the other gospels. He does not make Jesus feel himself growing; there is no development of the messianic consciousness within him; he comes as the Logos or the manifestation of the Logos, and demonstrates this by his marvelous acts. The author of the gospel uses the story of the raising of Lazarus to show the divine power of Jesus. Here the dead is raised four days after death, when he had already been committed to the grave. In the case of the restoration to life, viz., that of the widow's son at Nain,¹⁷ death must have occurred only a few hours before the procession was seen by Jesus and the disciples, as it was the cus-

tom among the early Jews to bury as soon as possible after dissolution. In the case of the daughter of Jairus also, the child was at the point of death, or, as according to Matthew, had just died. In both of these cases life had been restored almost immediately after death. But in the story of Lazarus, the supreme power of Jesus is brought out under the circumstances already stated. And this is in keeping with that gospel conception of Jesus.

The author of the Fourth Gospel probably knew the synoptics. That he was acquainted with the gospel of Mark is certain. For he follows this except where it suits his purpose to depart from it, or where he has a tradition which seems more adapted to his conception of Jesus. That there are contradictions between this gospel and the others, is accounted for by the fact that its author was acquainted with gospel traditions then known but now lost, which he incorporated into his text.

Who the author of this piece of ancient mysticism was, criticism has not yet been able to determine. John the Presbyter is not the only one to whom its authorship has been assigned; it is pretty well agreed that he has even less claim than the others who have been proposed. Whoever did edit it, used the name "John" for reasons already mentioned. The author was probably a Jewish

Christian who was neither an eye-witness of the events which he described nor an inhabitant of the places where the acts he speaks of took place. The discrepancies between this gospel and the others point to this conclusion. But whoever the writer was, he had come under the spiritualizing influence of Alexandrian Jewish philosophy, Gnosticism, and Pauline theology, and these he incorporated into Christian traditions so skillfully that modern criticism has been unable to unravel his work. Chapter XXI is a Galilean addition which was appended by some one long after the original had been completed and finally edited. The date of the gospel is placed somewhere between 110 and 130 and by some as late as 170, while the additional chapter is dated between 150 and 185.

We know little about the Acts of the Apostles that can be called authentic. Luke may have written them, but what their basis was we do not know. They seem to contain elements from documents which have been lost, and the authenticity of which can only be assumed. There are some who believe that Acts is based upon an original which was the sequel to the Ur-Marcus, while some maintain that the original source was a Jewish-Christian document. This, it is believed, was worked over by Luke, and into it were incorporated supernatural events and anecdotes which he drew from popular Christian

traditions. These he might have colored and exaggerated to some extent. Critics discern in this work parts of a larger one, but its identification has not yet been established. All that we can say is that Luke probably wrote Acts as we have it; and that the book is based upon lost sources which contained popular traditions and even Mid-rashic elements. The purpose of this document seems to have been the bringing about of a reconciliation between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians, who were being divided because of the rivalry between the followers of Peter and those of Paul. The date of the Acts is given as between 100 and 125 years after Jesus.

We have given a very short summary of the principal literature of the New Testament, and that which bears directly on the life and doings of Jesus. For the sake of completion, however, we deem it wise to cite in as short form as possible, the latest results of criticism with regard to the authorship and date of the other books of the New Testament. They too, are important for our purpose, as their unauthoritativeness and historical uncertainty will strengthen our contention with regard to the inherent weakness of the newer covenant.

The ¹correspondence of Paul is the most historical of all New Testament literature. The epistles which are supposedly genuinely

Pauline date from the latter part of the activity of Paul, but they have been worked over and re-edited, and their autographs had disappeared as early as the first quarter of the second century. The Epistles to the Corinthians are dated about 60. The letters to the Thessalonians, Galatians and Romans, are dated about the same time. Doubt centers about the first fifteen chapters of Romans, some maintaining that they were the original of Paul's letter. Concerning the editorial changes in this epistle, there is a question as to whether they were made by Paul himself or by a later Pauline writer. The first Thessalonians is by some regarded even as a pseudonymous epistle of a post-Pauline origin. It is mentioned by the church fathers who wrote during the early part of the second century, and this would indicate that this epistle did not originate much later than the first century. Second Thessalonians is believed to be a Paulinist's work based on the First Thessalonians, and is placed between 70 and 110. Others regard it as a second century product, but the work of a Paulinist who worked over a pre-Christian Jewish apocalypse.

The present Ephesians is believed to be a revised and re-edited form of an original letter of the apostle. But both this epistle and Colossians could have been written by the same hand, that of some later Paulinist who

used Paul's name just as did Luke in composing the Pauline speeches in Acts. The epistle seems to have been a tract pleading for union among dissenting Christians. Its date ranges from about 62 to 85 of the present era, but it has been placed by some scholars as late as the second century.

About the date of Colossians, too, there is uncertainty. The conservative scholars say Paul wrote the epistle in or about 62, while advanced critics assign it also to the second century.

Timothy I and II, and Titus are grouped together and are supposedly Pauline pamphlets or tracts to those who were skeptical of Paul's authority. If these contain Pauline sources they have been so worked over that it is difficult to find them. The writer of these wrote in Paul's name, as did so many others, and sank his individuality into that of Paul's. These epistles are dated between 90 and 120 of the present era.

Philemon is a letter written by Paul while he was a prisoner, at about 62. It contains nothing of originality and is a personal letter from the apostle to a Christian friend. This date is also disputed by the critics.

According to the latest research, ¹⁹Paul neither wrote nor had anything to do with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Nor was it written to the Hebrews at all; it was sent to gentile Christians and its authorship is un-

known. As early as the third century its authorship was disputed, some maintaining that Paul wrote it, others that Luke was the author. Scholars maintain that the former did not write it because of the religious contents and character of the document. Clement of Rome, and Barnabas were anciently proposed as authors, and not until the fourth century did it become known as Pauline. Modern critics are also divided as to authorship, this being claimed for Apollos, Silas or Silvanus—both companions of Paul, Peter, Philip of Caesarea, Aristion, who is the alleged author of a portion of Mark (16:9-20); and even others. The author cannot be identified definitely with any figure of tradition. The epistle was not directed to Jewish Christians alone, but to all Christians, and its title is erroneous and ²⁰“was probably added to the epistle during the earlier part of the second century, as a reflection of the impression made upon the mind of a generation which had lost all direct knowledge of the writing’s origin and standpoint.” The date of the epistle is placed at between 63 and 118 after Jesus.

James is probably based upon an address delivered in Jerusalem. It is somewhat contradictory to the theology of Paul, approaching very closely the rabbinical idea that deed rather than faith, is the more important element in religion. It is one of the latest of the

New Testament books to become canonical, this taking place near the end of the fourth century. The epistle was not written by James, the brother of Jesus and the head of the church in Jerusalem; it was written by a Jewish Christian who sought to impress upon the Christian brethren the importance of right living, a matter which must have fallen rather into the background after the thorough establishment of the Pauline idea of salvation by faith. No date has been agreed on, and its composition is placed at between 62 and 150, with an inclination on the part of a greater number of writers to place it at about 100.

The authorship of the first of the Epistles of Peter has not by any means been determined as that of Peter himself. It is argued that had Simon Peter written this, a great deal more about Jesus would have been given us than appears here now. Silvanus is thought to be the author, at least of the form in which we have it. Others maintain that an anonymous writer wrote this epistle using the name of Peter. The dates assigned to this letter are as varied as the alleged authorship, and 54-140 are given; the greater number of critics place it no later than 117.

The second Epistle of Peter is the work of a later anonymous writer who used the name of the apostle. It is unlike the first epistle of the same name, and shows marked Phil-

onic and Jewish midrashic influences. The author probably used the first Peter, but he did not write it. He desired authority for his document and he attached to it a name honored in the church. Authorities are agreed upon the lateness of this epistle, and its date is placed between 150 and 170.

The First John seems to be an anonymous homily bearing a close relationship to the fourth gospel. It was, of course, not written by John, the son of Zebedee, and its date is generally regarded as about the same as that of the gospel of the same name. The second and third John are the products of John the Presbyter—not John the apostle—or a disciple of John. The letters contain no illuminating truths, and are placed by those who ascribe them to John the Presbyter, at between 110 and 155.

Jude is a second century product of an author who attempted to correct certain moral evils. It was not written by Judas, the brother of Jesus. The date of this epistle is as hazy as that of the others, and the best critics now place the authorship of this letter in the first quarter of the second century.

The Apocalypse of John or the Revelation of John is according to some, a re-written document based upon Jewish sources, and written about 70. Others maintain that it is an original apocalypse by John Mark based on Christian sources, while still others main-

tain that it is the work of John the Presbyter, who also based it on Jewish apocalyptic originals. The first three verses of the first chapter were added by a late writer. The work has the form of an Old Testament apocalypse, and some believe it is even modeled after Ezekiel and Zechariah. The book was used in the early church and a great many glosses have crept in, among which are the last few verses, 22:18-21. At an early date a sentiment against the canonicity of this book developed on account of its use by the Gnostics. The work is a fanatic exposition of dogmatic growths, written in the form of a revelation, and designed to encourage and strengthen the Christians in their repulsion of the Roman heresies of the Emperor Domitian, just as the Jews when Daniel was written, had repelled those of Antiochus Epiphanes under the valiant Maccabees. The rites of the Caesar-cultus were to be the last death-throb of the Roman empire, after the destruction of which the reign of the present order would cease, and the messiah would re-appear. The date ranges from 65-100, with preference for about 90.

Our purpose in giving this cursory review of the New Testament writings, is not merely to gather the results of the modern scientific investigators. We started out by saying that under the conditions of modern training, we should expect authenticated

documents to be the sources of what we are asked to believe historical characters said or did. We have learned that hearsay is not authority, and we have learned too, that the farther we are removed from a historical personage in time, the less authentic are the hearsay reports concerning him. This is eminently true of an age in which one's sayings and acts were not recorded either with exactness or with faithfulness to fact.

If there are those who would have us believe that Jesus said or did certain things, we have a right to ask for more historical records than those we have. It is hardly fair to expect men to believe that Jesus said that or did this in the face of the unhistorical character of the gospels, and the difference of opinion among the scholars concerning them. It is nothing less than remarkable that there is so little agreement concerning the date and the authorship of the New Testament writings among Christian scholars; and it is no mean indication of their weakness so far as their historicity is concerned. There is plenty of room for skepticism when one realizes that almost half a century passed, and in many cases a longer time, before the records of the chief character of the New Testament were committed to writing, and that this was done neither by himself nor by those who worked immediately with him. What a marvelous assumption do they make,

who tell us in the face of all this indefiniteness, that Jesus would do this or that under this set of circumstances or that set. And how deep must be the faith of those who can believe everything they so haphazardly read in the biblical records! After a study of the books of the newer canon; after a thorough realization that neither Paul, the apostles, nor the later writers ever expected their products to be vested with holiness or inspiration, one feels that the structure of early Christianity has been built upon a sandy foundation, and that the ancient church dignitaries were the real master-builders of the faith rather than Jesus and his apostles. And this feeling is borne out by history, for the life of the church thus far has consisted not of the vitalization of the ethics of Jesus the Jew, but of the ethics of the church fathers, who in most cases were the sons of Roman and Greek heathens. Who can deny that the best in the writings of the New Testament is that which is closely related to the mother-faith, while that which has discolored the pages of secular history, is the pernicious outgrowth of the admixture of the non-Jesus and heathen elements? However, our purpose is not to castigate the church. It would come with indifferent grace from one who realizes that early Judaism too, had its weaknesses. It is rather to show how utterly unreliable the ancient records are; how they

had been tampered with for one purpose or another and how it is really impossible to credit to Jesus with certainty those fundamental ethical principles to which the modern Christian sociologists point as the salvation of mankind, that this is written. Even the brightest gem in the whole collection—the Sermon on the Mount—does not stand out as ²¹original in the clear light of research. It is only by a sort of Christian gratuity that this is assigned to the Teacher himself! It is a great pity that he did not leave a written record of his sayings and teachings, for had he done so, Jewish literature might have been enriched by many jewels from one who breathed a Jewish atmosphere, lived and died a Jew, and as far as tradition can be believed, was turned against his people only after his death, when he was transformed into a god by those who understood neither him, his teachings, nor his people.

CHAPTER II.

Post-Biblical Jewish Ideals.

It is on this New Testament evidence that the whole structure of the contributions of Jesus is built. There is more than a grain of truth in the viewpoint of those who maintain that most of the New Testament contributions are only historical probabilities, whose weaknesses are by no means hidden. Books on the order of the "Life of Jesus," by Strauss, and the works of Drews and W. B. Smith are not to be despised; they are at least more logical than such works as the life of Jesus by Renan, who evolves a Jesus out of his own mind and then makes it fit the New Testament writings. Yet Renan is not by any means the only one guilty of such romanticism; the words of Ecclesiastes can well apply here, "of making many books there is no end."

There is a pronounced tendency to accept as historical much of the alleged material of Jesus. Indeed it has too strong a hold on the western world to be dismissed as unimportant, and this even they must admit, who find in his purported contributions only a minimum of historicity. But there is a middle ground between either accepting or reject-

ing what is ascribed to Jesus. And this middle ground is obtained by placing his alleged contributions on an equal historical footing with those of the apocryphal, apocalyptic, and rabbinical sources of that early Christian period. We can judge the New Testament writings on the same historical basis as that of the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Patriarchs or the stories of Hillel; and this too gives us a common basis for a comparison. And indeed there is much to compare.

When one reads the modern books on the life of Jesus, one is apt to conclude that whatever is held up as the best in the gospels is the absolute, new, and distinct contribution of the man from Gallilee. How often for instance have we been regaled with his "new" enunciation of love! What Christian minister has tired of hurling at Jews as the contribution of Jesus, that inimitable word which spells the tenderest sentiments of the holiest relations on earth. How often have we been left in breathless astonishment by the insistence that the New Testament law of "love" is a new law, different and distinct from that of ¹Leviticus: "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Or that other equally well known verse: ²"But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be as one born among

you, and thou shalt love him as thyself for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." This context will hardly permit us to say that the word "neighbor" means fellow-Jew. There have been those who have tried to construe this, and we are in error if we do not admit that the references in Matthew, Mark, Luke, Romans, Galatians and James, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," all are a re-statement of the Levitical commandments which have become part of the stock of Judaism; and it seems very possible too, from the wording of the last two, that the sayings of Akiba, who lived before the final redaction of these documents, was not unknown to their authors: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," he said, "this is the greatest principle in the Torah." It is hardly possible that Akiba, who was born about 50 after Jesus, and had studied and taught all of his life—he was martyred in 132—took his cue from Galatians or Romans or the Gospels. To those who would quote Matthew, "ye have heard that it hath been said thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy, but I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for those that spitefully use you and persecute you," we would suggest that the words "hate thine enemies" is not in the Old Testament; while the last part of the following verse reads like an excellent com-

mentary and an improvement on the verses in Proverbs: "Say not I will do so to him who hath done so to me; but if thine enemy be hungry give him bread to eat; if he be thirsty, give him water to drink for thou shalt be heaping coals of fire upon his head, and God will requite thee." And if the words of the gospels occasionally improve upon a thought of the Old Testament, one may rejoice to see one Jewish teacher improve upon another. The Jewish sages very often commented upon and even restated teachings of the Bible. Jesus but did the same. But Akiba could hardly have known the New Testament writings.

We have been accustomed to hear so much of the Scribes and the Pharisees—the good they did is never mentioned—their great virtues never spoken of—that they have come to be associated in many minds with bigotry, hypocrisy, and religious narrowness. It is the unspeakable misfortune of Judaism that its sources of knowledge and evidence are not generally tapped by non-Jews, for if they were, non-Jews would soon find out that not all Scribes were bad; that there were many very excellent Pharisees, and that there were sages and teachers who spoke with an authority and an originality no less inspired and subjective than that of Jesus. When Hillel said, "love peace and pursue it, love your fellow-creatures and bring them near

to God's law," he said something which in this particular form had never before been expressed; just as when Jesus said, "the Sabbath, it was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," he expressed a well known thought of the rabbis in slightly different form. Their way of saying it was: "You were not delivered unto the Sabbath, but the Sabbath was delivered to you." The fact that the rabbis tried to give in their serious legal disputations precedents for their decisions just as our courts do today, never deterred an individual sage or teacher from giving expression to his own opinion or inspiration, and this is the noticeable feature that the editors found in the teaching of Jesus and expressed in °Mark and Luke. The giving of a decision on one's authority might have astonished those who did not know the freedom allowed teachers in Israel at all times, or it might have appeared unusual to those who were not acquainted with Jewish methods and Jewish wisdom; but Jesus never seemed to be excited about it; nor did the apostles express any astonishment. That the statements were inserted to impress those who did not know Jewish life, cannot be doubted seriously. One might be led to believe that in the days of Jesus, a Jewish teacher dared not to utter a sentiment, unless he could trace it to or derive it from some "authority." This indeed was generally true

so far as the legal decisions were concerned—true for that day, and true for our day; but how many jewels are there in the rabbinical crown of thought which are subjective, spontaneous, self-authoritated and inspired? One ought to read over, even if only hastily, that unsurpassable treatise known as the ¹⁰“Ethics of the Fathers” put into critical form by ¹¹Prof. Taylor, so as to understand the shallowness of the statements referred to in Mark and Luke. Can anyone really think that a people like the Jews, throbbing and pulsating with life, could have had all of their vast knowledge and all of their thought contained only in the scrolls, laws and decisions of the teachers? Is it possible to imagine that in that growing and thriving city of Jerusalem, or in the life-preserving schools of Sura, Jamnia or Pumbaditha, or in the other academies, the men who taught were scribblers or imitators of their fathers; that they spent their time in “rehashing” old decisions, and put on the index anything that was new, clever or brilliant because it may not have been handed down in the name of somebody or other? And is just this not the impression one gets of these ancient sages, when one reads the many manuals treating of the teachings of Jesus?

Another false impression that the world has, and which may here be corrected, is that Judaism practically ceased with the close of

the Old Testament or very soon after it. It seems to forget that this great work is the budding of the religious development of the Jew, while the next centuries brought forth the flowering. We must not forget that the real life of the Jew, though it may have its sources in Biblical prescriptions, takes its thought, not alone from the Bible. There are as magnificent religious lessons outside of the Bible as within it; there are some masterpieces outside of the canon which are much superior to some writings in it. And that the rabbis recognized differences in the Biblical writings is shown by the discussions relative to the inclusion of certain books like Ecclesiastes, ¹²the Song of Songs, Job, and even Ezekiel, in the canon. There was a vigorous national life, and its ramifications were as numerous as the number of individuals who possessed any originality. There were men in the days following upon the close of the canon who did not observe the Sabbath nor the ceremonial laws of the Pentateuch. There were men who even thought that the Bible was not adequate enough to contain all the rules and concepts for every-day life. And these men formed a party, later called the Pharisees, ¹³so large and influential that the whole of Judaism took on its attitude and its interpretation of both the oral and written Law from it. And there was another party called the Sadducees, ¹⁴“who opposed these,

and believed that the Biblical Law did suffice. That Judaism was a progressive, living, and vital religion is shown by the fact that the party that believed in the all-sufficiency of the Bible practically died out; though there is a remnant of a similar sect at present in the Crimea in South Russia, called Karaites, who disregard the rabbinical traditions. And there was still another party in Israel, that of the Essenes,¹⁵ a distinctively ascetic sect, whose definite mission was to clothe the naked, relieve the poor, attend the sick and perform those rites, which custom had sanctified for the dying and the dead; they segregated themselves from the pleasures of the world, lived in brotherhoods or communities, renounced their wealth, and even left their families after the latter had been properly taken care of, to consecrate themselves to this work. It was an order of the ascetic kind, but differed from Christian asceticism in so far as its devotees were principally men who had already reared families and thus acquitted themselves of the religious injunction to be "fruitful, to multiply and fill the earth."¹⁶ And between these definite parties there were all sorts of gradations. Not all ¹⁷Pharisees believed alike; not all thought alike; and he who wants to know the truth, may get it not from the New Testament, but from a little quotation from the Talmud, which, citing popular opinion criti-

cising certain kinds of Pharisees, says: "There is the 'shoulder Pharisee,' who wears as it were, his good actions ostentatiously upon his shoulder; 'the wait-a-little' Pharisee, who always says 'wait a little until I perform the good act awaiting me;' the 'bruised Pharisee' who in order to avoid looking at a woman, runs against the wall so as to bruise himself and bleed; 'the pestle Pharisee,' who walks with his heels down like the pestle in the mortar; 'the ever-reckoning Pharisee,' who says, 'let me know what good I may do, to counteract my neglect;' then there is the 'God-fearing Pharisee' after the manner of Job, and the 'God-loving Pharisee,' after the manner of Abraham." ' In this connection it may also be added that the hypocritical Pharisee received no more bitter denunciation from Jesus, than from the rabbis themselves by whom they were called not only "Pharisaic plagues," but "destroyers of the world." But, and the "but" should be repeated, these condemnations applied to the eccentric and hypocritical of the party; and in this greatest, most influential, and the most deeply religious and progressive of all Jewish parties, not all were cranks and ¹⁸"hypocrites, serpents and offspring of vipers." The men of the type of Hillel and Shammai, Akiba ben Mahalel, Gamaliel the Elder, Jochanan ben Zakkai, Simon ben Gam-

aeli, and the Hasidic martyrs of the Maccabean struggles, the century and a half before, are assuredly not the men to whom Jesus applied—if indeed the words of the gospels are his—"hypocrites, blind guides and vipers." That there were such, we believe, but the impression that the untutored Christian world has of the Pharisee—an impression gained solely from the gospels—bears impressively characteristic evidence of the historical untruthfulness of at least those portions of the newer canon which belittle a great deal; and it seems to us that the men who listened to the preachings of the Baptist or of Jesus or the apostles, did not differ a great deal in kind from the motley crowds that now listen to the ebullitions of the curbstone preacher. And can one dare say that the best, most conservative citizens of a city, will be found on the street corners or in church-vestibules arguing questions of dogma and religious law, especially with those preachers who come from the corners and crannies of the country districts, with their simplicity and inexperience, to teach refined and educated inhabitants of centers of culture and learning, what to do and how to live. If the crowds that listened to, and disputed with Jesus, and to which the gospels in all probability refer, are at all like the the crowds that do similar things today, there may have been some justification for the in-

dignant outbreaks of the sometimes impatient teacher, who perhaps on these occasions, more than on any other, so far forgot his own alleged ideals as to set himself squarely against them. But the injustice of the matter is that Christianity judges the gentle, religious, inoffensive, progressive, albeit unmentioned thousands of Pharisees, by these untoward specimens of the street and the crowd, with whom Jesus lost patience; and like him, too, those who come in his name fail to apply to the Jewish teachers and their descendants, those teachings of love and consideration which place Jesus in the estimation of Christians, above humankind. But this is another one of the many instances of the irony of history. And yet we do not wonder. Has it not always been the fate of the Jewish people to be judged off-handedly by its worst sons? And how should the Pharisees among whom were many of its noblest sons, escape this injustice?

In passing, we may touch upon a related matter. Much has been written about Jesus' method of teaching. ¹⁰"It was so natural, so elemental and so sympathetic, that everyone could understand him;" that of the scribes and sages was "highly formal and scholastic," while his was easy, informal, and illustrated by parables. One is prone to ask where the judgment of those is, who cannot

see that the life of the ancient teachers cannot be correctly estimated from the inimical passages in the New Testament—passages inserted by redactors who were not familiar with Jewish life! Were the methods of the rabbis formal to those who heard them, and has anyone ever counted the hundreds of parables in the rabbinical writings? Is it really true that the whole of the learning of the Jews in the days of Jesus, and their life too, centered around ²⁰“phylacteries, washing of cups and tithing of mint?” What an historical misjudgment for grave scholars to cite these passages, unfriendly as they are, instead of going to the tremendous Jewish literature—the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, the Midrash, the Talmud and the other sources—to be sure not as easily gotten at as the New Testament. What excellent application the words of ²¹Abtalyon have here: “Ye sages, be heedful of your words lest ye incur the penalty of exile and be exiled to a place of evil waters, and the disciples who come after you drink thereof and die, and the Heavenly Name be profaned.” Or, the words of ²²Simon ben Shetach might be used here with advantage: “Be ye very searching in the examining of testimony, and be heedful of your words, lest through them men learn to falsify.” And these teachers, too, taught “as one who had authority.”

Let it not surprise our friends who get their knowledge of Judaism from non-Jewish and Greek sources, that the parable was a highly developed pedagogical method in use among the Jews of the biblical and post-biblical days. Parables are found not only in the Old and New Testaments but on almost every page of the different Midrashim, and no one has ever yet found time enough to count those in the Talmud.²³ I am aware that the closing of the Talmud follows that of the New Testament by about three centuries, but it must not be forgotten that the contents of the Talmud antedate its closing by several centuries, and that some of this content is very old, dating from times much earlier than those of the Maccabeans. No one can maintain definitely how old the "Mashel," the parable, is, but there is more than ample historical proof of the fact that by the first century it had become a fixed method of instruction among the Jews. In looking over just at random one chapter of some five and one-half pages in the "Midrash Rabba" on Deuteronomy, eight stories or parables were found. It is well known that there is in the Talmud a parable relating to a king²⁴ who invited his servants to the wedding of his son; another parable very similar to the one of the rich householder²⁵ is found in the Palestinian Talmud and concerns the son of Rabbi Hiyya.

The parable had become a popular method of illustration and instruction in rabbinical times, and still continues so in certain European Jewish circles.

Not only the parable, but every rhetorical form which Jesus used was known and employed by his contemporaries; and just as he was a child of his day in almost everything else, so was he in his methods of teaching and preaching. Perhaps this is known to everybody, but if it is, then they who write on his methods ought to be more careful in the wording used in their books; for they come so very dangerously near to attributing originality to him in these matters, as to be almost guilty of falsification. It is not our desire here to detract from the merits of the Messiah of the Christians. All we desire is that justice be done to Jewish teachers and Judaism, a matter about which many scholars show a lamentable lack of consideration. True, he taught those whom others did not teach; he doubtless expressed himself differently at times; he even might have told new parables and new stories; his particulars were without a doubt different from those of others. But what of this? Did Hillel speak exactly like Shammai? Were the sayings of Jochanan ben Zakkai, just like those of his teachers? When one day he walked about the ruins of the Temple in Jerusalem,²⁰ and one of his disciples mourned over its

destruction, saying, "now that the Temple and the altar of sacrifice are gone, the means of repentance are also gone," Jochanan answered: "Let it not appear evil unto you; there is still means of atonement—kind deeds and charity will make atonement for our sins." And he is quoted in the Talmud²⁷ also as saying that "just as the sin offering atones for Israel, so the kindness of the nations atones for their sins." Perhaps exactly such combinations of ideas had not been uttered before in Israel; yet one who is acquainted with rabbinical thought and teachings need not have been told that these were rabbinic. Jochanan's way of putting them together might have been original; the thought was the result of his Jewish inspiration and education.

One could write volumes—as indeed volumes have been written—showing the breadth of rabbinical thought and life; one could select from the writings of the rabbis enough material to fill many shelves of only that which is of an ethical and moral character. There is no phase of life which they did not touch; there is no aspect of the holiness of life which they did not consider; they learned and taught to live, and they lived to learn and serve; but their learning was not only of the theoretical kind; they were true to the motto of Simon, son of Gamaliel, who taught: ²⁸"Not learning, but doing is the chief

thing." And their lives, indeed, expressed themselves in kindness and brotherliness to their neighbors. They studied the "Law; they fulfilled the requirements of the Temple service as long as it lasted, and they executed the commands of their God toward fellowmen, thus realizing the words of Simon, the Just, who used to say that "the world was established upon three things; upon the Law, the ritual or Temple Service, and upon the doing of good deeds." They exercised those ideals toward the poor which the religion of Moses and the prophets had taught them, and they laid stress on the words of Jose, son of Jochanan³¹ of Jerusalem, who used to say, "let the poor be as members of your own household." They tried to be just, and though they did not clothe their thought in the same words as did another—³²"judge not that ye be not judged,—they still were slow to judge, for their motto was, ³³judge all men in the scale of merit, yet ³⁴judge not thy neighbor until thou art come into his place;" and they believed too ³⁵"that with whatever measure man judges,—with that measure is he judged."

It was among men who thought thus that Jesus was reared—if any credence can be placed in the gospel story. With these he came in contact and their teachings he heard and learned. If he opposed sacrifice, and it

is not at all certain that he did, he must have thought with many others, that unless sacrifice is sincere, it is corrupting. "There is no atonement for him who repeats his sin," is not new to those who know what the rabbis taught, and this applied as well to sacrifices in the Temple as to prayers on Atonement Day. The words of ben Zakkai quoted above bear witness to the fact that the idea that "mercy and not sacrifice is important," was not new; indeed Isaiah, Amos and Hosea had so taught centuries before, and the word of the prophets³⁷ was by no means a dead letter. When Jesus says,³⁸ "therefore if thou bring a gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift;" he but stated in different words the thought that many of his contemporaries had uttered:³⁹ "The Day of Atonement will pardon the sins that man has committed against the most High; but it will not pardon those which man has committed against his neighbor unless the wrongdoer first seek the pardon of him who has been wronged." Perhaps it is a strange coincidence that this sentiment appears on the same page of the Talmud as does the Jewish saying concerning the Sabbath, "for the Sabbath is Holy unto you; it

was delivered into your hands, not you into its hands;" to which the quotation of Jesus, "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," is a parallel, as has already been pointed out.

It is stating the facts incorrectly to say: "The religious ideals of the age in which Jesus lived were represented by sacrifice, fasting, tithes and almsgiving, while his were judgment, mercy and love of God; and after surveying the painstaking piety of his contemporaries and their zeal in legal obedience, he said plainly to his disciples, 'except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the Kingdom of Heaven.'" Who the Pharisees were, we have already had occasion to say; but to characterize the times by setting the second set of qualifications over against the first, and attributing one set to Jesus, and the other to his contemporaries, is unhistorical and unjust. Is the dictum of the Men of the Great Synagogue, "Be ye deliberate in judgment," not "judgment?" Is the following not judgment: "Upon three things," said Simon ben Gamaliel, "the world is established: Upon truth, judgment and peace, as it is said, truth and the judgment of peace, shall ye judge in your gates." We have already mentioned the saying of Hillel, "judge not thy neighbor until thou art come into his place;" the words of Rabbi Ishmael, the son

of Jose, have a ring of practical truth as well as religious judgment: "He who keeps himself away from the judicial office keeps from himself hatred, robbery and vain oaths; but he who lays decisions down presumptuously, is wicked, foolish and arrogant of spirit." He used to say also, "judge not alone, for there is none who may judge alone, save One." In a passage in a Midrash, we find the following qualifications set forth for one who desires to be a judge: "He must be an able man, God-fearing, a man of truth, free from covetousness, a wise man, one of understanding, and known among his people." This, of course, applies to an official; but the qualifications are characteristic enough to show how much stress there was laid on judgment. These are only specimens of rabbinical thought about "judgment." Many more could be cited, and the field is rich for him who would search for them. Our purpose here is to show that if the best religious thinkers of the days of Jesus, and those immediately preceding and succeeding him, believed stoutly in sacrifice, fasting, tithes and almsgiving, they believed no less—and we maintain even more—in judgment, mercy and the love of God.⁴⁸ We ought not to forget, too, that aside from the rabbinical thought, the tremendous force of the Biblical writings was still effective, and teachings like the following were well known:

““Blessed are they that keep judgment, and they who do righteousness all the time;” or the words of Amos, ⁵⁰“let justice run down as water and righteousness as a mighty stream;” or the thought of Hosea, ⁵¹“I betroth thee unto me in righteousness, in judgment in loving kindness and in mercy;” or of Isaiah, ⁵²“cease to do evil; learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless and plead for the widow;” or the command of Jeremiah: ⁵³“Thus saith the Lord: ‘Execute ye judgment and righteousness;” or the great teachings of Ezekiel: ⁵⁴“He that hath not given forth upon usury; neither hath taken any increase, that hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man, hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept in my judgments to deal truly, he is just and shall surely live, said the Lord.” It is Zechariah who said: ⁵⁵“Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, ‘execute true judgment and show mercy and compassion, every man to his brother;’ ” and it was Micah who uttered the eternal religious truth: ⁵⁶“It hath been told thee O man, what is good and what the Lord requireth of Thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.” These passages, as will be seen by the order in which they were given, were not selected with any system. They were picked out at random from the Bible. The Psalms them-

selves contain almost as many references to "judgment" as the whole New Testament, and the reader would tire many times if all of the biblical utterances on this noble virtue were stated here. We have given enough to show that the ideal of judgment of which Jesus speaks, was ever a thoroughly Jewish one, whether in the age of the Bible or in the age of the rabbis. And it is Jewish today, though like many other splendid teachings, its force and its influence are not always permitted to direct our social relations.

The oft-repeated accusation that to the Pharisees "virtue, like religion, was primarily a technical affair," is emphatically not so. That the Jew of rabbinic times knew no virtue aside from the doing of the Laws of God, that is true; but did not just this conception of the Torah cause him to live a life of fine social and ethical largeness? Is it a fact that there was religious satisfaction only in the sacrificial rites? When the Lawgiver said that ethical laws and commandments were given to Israel which if they do them, they shall live; the rabbis added, "they shall live by them and not die by them." For to the rabbis the non-fulfilling of the laws of righteousness and judgment was the same as spiritual death. Man was made in the image of God, and the laws were given to him, that he may by his ethical life preserve in him-

self this divine image. We are told that when Moses said to the people, ⁵⁸“after the Lord, your God shall ye walk”; they took alarm at the impossible task laid before them and asked: “How is it possible for man to walk after God!” And Moses explained to them, ⁵⁹that “to walk after God means to imitate humbly His mercy and compassion, by clothing the naked, visiting the sick, burying the dead, and comforting the mourners.” Listen to this sublime though rabbinically commonplace thought from the mouths of teachers who lived in a day when it is alleged that legalism had strangled the sensibilities to mercy and righteousness: ⁶⁰“In the world to come, the righteous will stand higher than the angels!”

One who knows something of the life and the teachings of the rabbis cannot fail to regard with much pain the broad misstatements that are made by those who know little or nothing of the rabbinical ideals. It is true that these ideals cannot be placed within the limits of one or two centuries. They were in fact the accumulated religious culture of several centuries, covering not only the period preceding and following the close of the Testaments, but extending down to the closing of the Talmud in the end of the fifth century and even to our day.

Here are some of the “legalistic” thoughts in which justice, mercy, love and kindness

are supposed to have "found no place:" Rabbi Simlai said that the ⁶¹"beginning and the end of the Torah"—that is the religion of Israel—"is the doing of deeds of loving kindness." Others said: ⁶²"He who refuses to do a kind deed is like one who denies a principle of religion." ⁶³"The doing of good deeds is greater even than pure justice. "Love mankind and honor it and bend your will with respect to your neighbors for the social good." Commenting on the verse, ⁶⁴"He is my God and I will prepare Him a habitation," Abba Shaul said: "The meaning of this last word according to its Hebrew thought, is, 'be like Him;' ⁶⁵as He is merciful and compassionate, so be ye merciful and compassionate." Simon ben Lachish said: ⁶⁶"Whosoever exercises mercy in a place of wickedness, will find in the end that that place itself will exercise mercy." The rabbis teach us that if we ⁶⁷"shower mercy upon each other, God will shower mercy upon us." Do these thoughts sound as if they come from men whose only concern was the execution of the ceremonial Law in all its "labyrinthic" detail?

The following teachings will seem strange and perhaps unaccountable to those who are in the habit of accepting as truthful, many of the current descriptions of Pharisaical and rabbinical life and religion. For it has become an obsession with not a few, that charity and mercy were brought into social

life only with the coming of the teacher of Nazareth. It is true that the greater number of these teachings have no definite date; they do not need it to authenticate them, for they have become part and parcel of Jewish life. This one is characteristic: ⁶⁹“Charity, alone,” says Rav Assi, “is equivalent to all the commandments.” ⁷⁰Rabbi Eliezer said: “Greater is the doing of a deed of charity than all the sacrifices.” “The poor man who receives charity does more for the giver than the giver does for the receiver.” This is the idea of Rabbi Joshua ben Korcho who said: ⁷¹“Whoever turns away from charity, is like one who worships idols;” and those who know with what deep contempt the rabbis looked upon the idolaters, can understand well the meaning of these words. ⁷²Rabbi Yitschak said that “he who gives a little money to the poor is blessed with six blessings; but he who gives encouragement by kind words, is blessed with eleven.” ⁷³“And it was the irascible Resh Lakesh who taught: “If you haven’t any money to give to the poor, comfort him with words, and say to him, ‘my heart is with you, though I have nothing to give you.’” Many anecdotes are told of the tenderness with which the poor were treated, and the following anecdote must appeal strongly to those who have achieved refinement of heart. ⁷⁴Rabbi Jannai once saw a man give a beggar a coin in public. He re-

buked the giver mildly for giving in public and thus causing embarrassment, saying, "it would have been better if you had not given him anything, rather than help him publicly, and thus put him to shame." It was ⁷⁶Rabbi Eliezer of whom we have already learned something, who had the courage to say that "he who gives charity is greater than Moses." And Moses was the greatest of all Israel. And this same sage taught that ⁷⁷"everyone who acts justly and charitably, acts as if he fills the whole world with mercy." This idea reminds one of another well-known thought, namely: ⁷⁸"Every man can make himself a partner with God in Creation by judging in accordance with His ethical Laws." One of the finest of rabbinical utterances which bears eloquent testimony to the breadth of the rabbinical conception of life is this: ⁷⁹"Our rabbis taught that we should help the non-Jewish poor with the Jewish poor; that we should visit the non-Jewish sick with the Jewish sick; and that we should bury the non-Jewish dead with the Jewish dead, so that the ends of peace may be preserved." When one speaks of the narrow nationalism of the ancient Jew, or even the modern Jew, it is well to recall a sentiment like this, to remind us that there were ideals which stood higher than "Jewish nationalism," and that one of these was peace. But peace was not the only concept that was to

unite all mankind. Righteousness no less than peace, was one of the fibers in the cord of universalism. Here is a well defined and almost universally accepted principle among the ancient and modern Jews: ⁷⁹“The righteous of all nations will have a portion in the world to come.” What a wonderful conception this is when contrasted with the narrow dogmatism of today, which requires not only adherence to, or confession of some particular creed, but demands even the death rites, before the hope of a future life can be extended. Truly in this remarkable rabbinical dictum there is a breadth of sentiment and a largeness of human feeling which are overwhelming when compared with the sectarian bigotry and inhuman narrowness of religious parties and some religious “self-authenticated truths.” In all sincerity, should many of us not blush before the beauty of some of these religious gems of the old Jewish teachers?

It is somewhat tiring, perhaps very much so, to read thought after thought from minds that flourished centuries ago. But this would not be necessary were it not for the continual exposition of the ideas and sayings of another who lived just as far back, who drank at the fountain of the knowledge whence our quotations emanate, but whose followers fail to do justice to the teachers of the teacher. We should perhaps have been

content to let the gems of the rabbinical writings lay hidden in the unexplored tomes; we should have been content to let the pearls lie buried in the sea of the Talmud; but arrogance awakens in us opposition; and academic injustice, especially to his faith and to his teachers, is a challenge to the Jew. We were long ago aware of our treasures; now that others claim or deny them, we ought to assert our ownership before those who do not know of it. It is a sting to be told that Jesus was the first to preach a "higher righteousness," in the face of all the teachings of the sages and the rabbis. Like other teachers, there were certain elements of conduct that he stressed, but what teacher had not his individuality? In one respect perhaps there was a decisive difference between the righteousness that Jesus preached and that which was current both before and after him. The rabbinical righteousness was a "this world righteousness" par excellence, though they too, had an "other world." The righteousness of Jesus stressed the preparation of the individual for the coming of the "other world." Both are Jewish, pre-eminently; both serve their purpose. But it is neither the "righteousness" of this world nor that of the world to come, that will undervalue the one, to enhance the worth of the other; and this is being done by the Christian scholars. In this connection we may quote a saying which,

though a little severe, does yet apply. ⁸⁰Ben Zoma asks, "Who is the real hero?" And he answers that "he is the hero, who conquers his evil nature; but there are others who say that he is the real hero who turns hatred into love."

There is a great temptation to continue the citation of references, showing that Jesus was not the only one who gave his ⁸¹ message boldly, and looked at the world with a fresh and a clear eye for the life, great and small, which surrounded him. There were many who taught: ⁸²"Hate no man, and reject no thing for there is no man without his hour, and there is no thing without its use." There were some who believed that the most important sentence in the Bible is the verse: ⁸³"This is the generation of man, in the image of God, made He him." One teacher said that this is the great principle in the Torah, in the Law, because it refers to all mankind which was made in the image of God, rather than one part of it. The sages, too, loved life, though they would eagerly qualify it by the word "righteous." And they taught ⁸⁴"that every human being is commanded to believe that the world was created for his sake." What a responsibility such a thought throws upon us! What a world this would be if every man acted so that he indeed felt that the very existence of this earth depends on him! What a tribute

to human worth and human dignity! What a lesson in the valuations of life we could learn from this thought,—we who live in an age of irreverence, carelessness, and disregard for the most sacred thing in the universe—human life! Let it be known that the rabbinical writings breathe a tender love for God and His creation; that the rabbis regarded the doer of charity as higher even than Moses, and that to them, mercy sustained life and righteousness pillared the earth. No wonder that the Jew who knows his literature, speaks of the sages and rabbis with touching reverence and religious deference. If ⁸⁶the world exists for the sake of even a single righteous man, as the rabbis were wont to say, how much the more should it have existed for the sake of hundreds of righteous teachers who lived, taught and died that mankind may prove itself worthy of having been made in the image of the Almighty!

We have endeavored thus far to give the reader an idea of the religious thought of the teachers of Israel, expressed in the Talmud and Midrashim.⁸⁶ It may be urged that this literature can be no criterion of the religious ideals of the Jews of the time of Jesus, as it is not contemporaneous with his time. This objection is only partly true. For it must not be forgotten that the New Testament itself covers a period of almost two centuries.

Both the Talmud and the Midrashim, while collected late, contain portions earlier by several centuries than the writings of the New Testament, and in many are contemporaneous and later. It is not necessary here to go into a lengthy study of the sages who lived immediately after Jesus. One can find this in any ⁸⁷Introduction to the Talmud. But we may indicate here only this: The Talmud and Midrash contain the best thoughts of those of Israel's sages who lived in the first century before and in the immediate centuries following the rise of the New Testament—in that very period which non-Jewish scholars are accustomed to look upon as being the most barren of truly religious teachings and practice. What these sages taught is generally given in their names in these two great sources, so that we can very easily place their teachings and their contributions where they belong in the history of Judaism and Jewish life. While the teachers and the thoughts we have just quoted may not be precisely contemporary with Jesus and the Apostles, they yet fall within a period that is contemporaneous with the rise of the New Testament traditions.

But there is also another literature which dates back from about the time of Jesus, and which gives us a very definite idea of the ideals and thoughts which surged through the minds of the Jewish thinkers of

those days. Most of this literature was written during the period which extends from just before the closing of the Old Testament to the rise of the New; and from this literature too,—the apocryphal and the apocalyptic or pseudepigraphic—the newer canon received a decisive influence. It is impossible to go into details here, and the major works will hardly be more than named, though it shall be our purpose to quote enough from the better known ones, to show that not only was a higher righteousness known and taught two centuries before Jesus, but in his very day he breathed in the self-same teachings which some credit to him alone at the expense of Judaism in general. The scope of this work precludes a study of the religious thought of such works as the Book of Enoch, the Book of Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdom of Solomon, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. The Book of Jubilees, and those of lesser importance, like the Assumption of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Book of Judith, Tobit, Testament of Job, and many others, all of which had a strong influence on the various books of the New Testament, as stated in an earlier chapter. That the reader may judge for himself whether or not righteousness and mercy played a great part in Jewish life before the rise of the teachings of Jesus, we will submit some

evidence.

“The influence of the Book of Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than all the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books taken together.” This is the remark of a scholar⁸⁸ who stands without a superior in the world of scholarship pertaining to that particular period. There are over a hundred references in the New Testament which either repeat or are directly dependent on passages in Enoch, and in these references are included some of the most important ethical teachings of the New Testament as well as the idea and names of the Messiah, the conception of Sheol and the resurrection, and that of demonology.

But we are concerned less with dogma than with the social and ethical aspect of these ancient works. And it is these that we want to emphasize in the small space that we are able to give to this important literature.

CHAPTER III.

Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Ideals.

The ¹Book of Enoch is what we have left of a literature which was gathered together under the name of this son of Jared. It is apocalyptic in character and deals with the problems of suffering, reward and punishment. The content of the book,—it is composite, and not at all the work of the same author,—consists of the story of the visions and the translation of Enoch into the abode of God and the angels, and the knowledge gained during these visits. The collection belongs to the second and first centuries before the Christian era and represents the religious thought of the Chasidic or Pharisaic sect. It deals in the main with the contradiction between the promise that the righteous will be rewarded, and the actuality in life—the repeated prosperity and the apparent success of the wicked. Throughout the whole book, with the exception of one section which is a sort of astronomical treatise,—constant stress is laid upon righteousness; and prayers and appeals for righteousness are made by the author. It is true that a reward to the righteous is promised, but it is the same reward that is promised in the New Testament—that of the inheritance of the

messianic era or the Kingdom of Heaven. They who want to inherit final glory must make themselves worthy of it by living righteously, even though they be the Gentiles, who in the end are to be converted. It was because the fallen angels taught mankind wickedness that they were to be punished with an everlasting punishment, and in this will they too, be included, who will follow in their unrighteous ways.

The book is thus introduced: "The words of the blessing of Enoch wherewith he blessed the elect and the righteous, who will be living in the day of tribulation when all the wicked and godless are to be removed." Enoch tells of the vision in which he sees the Holy and Great One come forth from his dwelling with His hosts; how every one will be smitten with fear, how the angels and the earth will tremble, and how the mountains will shake and the hills will melt like wax; how the earth will be rent, and everything on it destroyed; and how everything will be judged; but to the righteous, "He will give peace, and He will protect the elect, and grace will be upon them, and they will all belong to God, and it will be well with them, and they will be blessed, and the light of God will shine upon them." * * * "But as for you, ye have not continued steadfast, and the Law of the Lord have ye not fulfilled but have transgressed it, and have slanderously

spoken proud and hard words with your impure mouth against His greatness—O ye hard-hearted ye will find no peace. But for the elect there will be light and joy and peace, and they will inherit the earth; but upon you, ye ungodly, there will be execration.”

In the next section God is represented as telling His angels to remove the forces of wickedness. To one of these He says: “And destroy all the lustful souls, and the children of the watchers, because they have oppressed mankind. Destroy all oppression from the face of the earth and let every evil work come to an end; and the plant of righteousness and uprightness will be established in joy forever more. And in those days will the whole earth be tilled in righteousness, and will all be planted with trees, and be full of blessings. And cleanse thou the earth from all oppression, and from all unrighteousness and from all sin, and from all godlessness, and from all uncleanness which is wrought upon the earth; and all the children of men shall become righteous. * * * And the earth will be cleansed from all corruption and from all sin, and from all punishment and torment, and I will never again send them upon it, from generation to generation, forever. Peace and justice will be wedded throughout all the days of the world and throughout all the generations of the world.”

Then follows: "And now my son, ⁸Methuselah, call to me all thy brothers, and gather together to me all the sons of thy mother * * * and he conversed with all the children of righteousness and spake: 'Hear ye sons of Enoch, all the words of your father and hearken befittingly; * * * for I exhort and say unto you, beloved, love uprightness and walk therein and draw not nigh to uprightness with a double heart; walk in righteousness my sons, and it shall guide you on good paths, and righteousness will be your companion.'"

"O, that mine eyes were a cloud of water that I might weep over you and shed my tears as a cloud of water * * * Who has permitted you to practice hate and wickedness? May judgment light upon you, sinners * * *

¹⁰Woe to you who fulminate irreversible anathemas: Healing shall therefore be far from you on account of your sins. Woe to you who requite your neighbor with evil, for you will be requited according to your works. Woe to you, lying witnesses, and to those who weigh out injustice, for suddenly will you perish. Woe to you sinners, for ye persecute the righteous; for ye will be delivered up and persecuted, ye people of injustice, heavy will their yoke be upon you."

¹¹"Woe to you obstinate of heart, who work wickedness and eat blood; * * * ye indeed shall have no peace. Woe to you who love the deeds of unrighteousness; wherefore do

ye hope for good hap unto yourselves? * * * Woe to you who write down lying and godless words; for they write down their lies that men may hear them and transgress against their neighbor. Therefore, they will have no peace but will die a sudden death. Woe to them who act godlessly and glory in lying words and extol them; * * * woe to them who pervert the words of uprightness and transgress the eternal Law, and transform themselves into what they were not, that is, sinners."

¹²"But in those days blessed are all they who accept the words of wisdom and understand them, and follow out the paths of the Most High, and walk in the paths of His righteousness, and become not godless with the godless; for they will be saved. Woe to you who hope for misfortune to your neighbor; for you will be slain in Sheol. Woe to you who make deceitful and false measures, and who tempt others on the earth; for they will thereby be utterly consumed. Woe to you who build your houses through the grievous toil of others, and their building material is nothing save bricks and stones of sin; I tell you ye will have no peace * * * Woe to them who work unrighteousness and aid oppression and slay their neighbors until the day of the great judgment. For He will cast down your glory and bring affliction on your hearts, and will arouse the spirit of indignation to destroy you all with the sword, and the

righteous and holy will remember your sins.”

¹³“And now I say unto you my sons, love righteousness and walk therein; for the paths of righteousness are worthy of acceptance but the paths of unrighteousness are suddenly destroyed and vanish. And now I say unto you, the righteous, walk not in the path of wickedness, nor on the paths of death, and draw not nigh unto them lest you be destroyed. But seek and choose for yourselves righteousness and a holy life, and walk in the path of peace that you may live and prosper.”

Many other passages could be cited to show that the aim of the authors of this collection was to instill into the lives of those who might read them a desire for righteousness. ¹⁴To lead a righteous life is the burden of the whole literature, and its message covered all the social relations. It included justice, mercy, love, honesty and kindness; and strange to say, there is a marked absence of reference to sacrifice. For the authors of Enoch placed mercy, justice and kindness above this, just as did most of the best and the greatest of Israel's sons.

¹⁵Another Jewish work which had decisive influence upon the teachings of the New Testament, though an earlier work than Enoch, is the Book of Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus, ¹⁶Son of Sirach, and known by the shorter name of Ben Sirach. This book was held in great esteem by both Jews

and Christians and was even looked upon as canonical. Its date is set at about 170-190 before the Christian era, and the work is a collection of maxims and precepts reflecting to a large degree the Jewish thought of that period. It is very similar to the canonical book of Proverbs, and not at all inferior to it in depth of thought and largeness of human experience. The author of this remarkable production does not condemn sacrifice, but he does condemn very strongly that kind of religion which is hypocritical, oppressive of the poor, and devoid of charity. He insists that a good heart is a necessary element in religion, and throughout the book there is an insistence on right-heartedness. He commands reverence for the priests, fear of God, and honor for His ministers, but these cannot be had except in righteousness, sincerity and goodness; indeed if we desire the ¹⁷complete blessings of God, one's hands must be stretched out unto the poor.

One can find in these fifty-one chapters much material of a surprisingly fine character, considering the early date of the work, and what is generally said about the Judaism of that day. Its parallels to both the Old and the New Testaments are numerous, and many of its details are of so high a character that one wonders why the book was excluded from the Bible. It is one of the most fruitful sources of the New Testament. The passages which follow deal with the funda-

mental precepts of social life, and are abundant evidence that what we today regard as the essence of religion and social conduct, did not have its birth in the New Canon.

Here are some precepts from this work:

¹⁸“Do no evil, so shall no harm come to thee. Depart from the unjust, and iniquity shall turn away from thee.

¹⁹In no wise speak against the truth, but be abashed of the error of ignorance.

²⁰Strive for the truth unto death, and the Lord will strive for thee. Be not violent with the tongue. Be not as a lion in thy house, nor frantic among thy servants.

²¹Let not thy hand be stretched out to receive, and shut when thou shouldst repay.

²²Seek not to be judged, being not able to take away iniquity; lest at any time thou fear the person of the mighty, and lay a stumbling block in the way of thy righteousness.

Be not faint-hearted when thou makest thy prayer, and neglect not to give alms. Laugh no man to scorn in the bitterness of his soul, for there is One which humbleth and exalteth. Devise not a lie against thy brother; neither do the like to thy friend. Be unwilling to speak any lie at all. And stretch thine hand out to the poor that thy blessings may be perfected.

²³Fail not to be with them that weep, and mourn with them that mourn. Be not slow to visit the sick for that shall make thee to be beloved.

²⁴Envy not the glory of a sinner, for thou knowest not what shall be the end. Delight not in the thing that the ungodly have a pleasure in, but remember they shall not go unpunished into their graves.

²⁵And he said unto them, 'men beware of all unrighteousness;' and he gave every commandment regarding his neighbor.

²⁶Return unto the Lord and forsake thy sins; make thy prayer before His face, and offend less. Turn again to the most High and turn away from iniquity for He will lead thee out of darkness into the light of health; and hate thou abomination vehemently. How great is the loving kindness of the Lord, and His compassion to such as turn to Him.

²⁷A man that breaketh wedlock, saying thus in his heart, 'who seeth me? I am compassed about with darkness, the walls cover me. What need I fear. The Most High will not remember my sins.' This man shall be punished in the streets of the city, and where he suspecteth not, he shall be taken. Thus shall it go with the wife that leaveth her husband, and bringeth in an heir by another."

We have often heard the statement that with the advent of the newer dispensation, only, was man taught to forgive his enemies; and what preacher has not delighted to quote the words of Matthew, ²⁸"ye have heard it said that thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love

your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." Without detracting from these words but only to show that they were commonly Jewish thoughts and not original in the gospels, I quote the few following verses:

²⁹"He that revengeth shall find vengeance from the Lord.

And he will surely keep his sin in remembrance.

Forgive to thy neighbor an injustice,

And then thy sins also shall be forgiven, when thou prayest.

³⁰One beareth hatred against another,

And doth he seek pardon from the Lord?

He hath not mercy on a man like himself,

And doth he ask forgiveness for his own sins?

If he that is but flesh nourisheth hatred,

Who will entreat for pardon for his sins?

Remember thy end, and let enmity cease,

Remember the commandments, and cherish not resentment against thy neighbor,

Remember corruption and death, and abide in the commandments.

Remember the covenant of the Highest, and overlook a fault."

One could cite many similar quotations showing what high ideals the Jews of those centuries had. The writer of these sayings seems to have been a representative of a large class which believed and taught as he

did; he was not an isolated teacher. But quotations are tedious, no matter how effective they would be in disillusioning so many, of the alleged faults which are attributed to the Jews of pre-New Testament days. Yet at the risk of this tediousness, we present a few more thoughts of this work concerning conduct towards each other.

“Yet have thou patience with a man in poor estate,

And delay not to show him mercy.

Help the poor for the commandment's sake,

And turn him not away because of his poverty.

Lose thy money for the sake of thy brother and thy friend * * *

And let it not rust under the stone to be lost.

Shut up alms for benevolent purposes in thy storehouses,

And it shall deliver thee from all ill-fortune.

It shall fight for thee against thine enemies,

Better than a mighty sword and a strong spear.

“Sacrificing what is wrongfully gotten is an offering of mockery,

And the mockeries of unjust men are not accepted.

The most High is not pleased with the offerings of the wicked,

Neither is He propitiated for sin by the multitude of sacrifices.

Whoso bringeth an offering of the goods of the poor,

Doeth as one who killeth the son before the father's eyes.

The bread of the needy is their life,

He that defraudeth him of it, is a man of blood.

He that taketh away his neighbor's living slayeth him,

And he that defraudeth the laborer of his hire, is a blood-shedder.

³³Do not think to corrupt (God) with gifts, for such He will not receive;

And trust not unrighteous sacrifices,

For the Lord is judge,

And with Him is no respect of persons.

He will not accept any person against a poor man,

And He will hear the prayer of him that is wronged,

He will not overlook the supplication of an orphan,

Nor the fatherless nor the widow when she pours out her complaint."

A piece of literature which is closely connected with Ben Sirach in its influence on the New Testament, is that known as the Wisdom of Solomon. Of course Solomon did not write it. It is generally dated about the first century before the present era, and is

considered to be the work of an Alexandrian Jew.

The book³⁴ is an exaltation of wisdom which is pure and comes from God. But he who would have wisdom must have righteousness, for both wisdom and righteousness are godly, and the ungodly cannot have wisdom. In the sense in which the writer uses his term, it included the elements of all knowledge that we possess, and all precepts and principles connected with our social relations. It is in this connection that we can get a view of what ideas were current about the time this work was written. We shall cite as few illustrations as possible, yet enough to show that righteousness, mercy and judgment, were principles which the Jews observed religiously, wherever they were, here in Egypt as well as in Palestine and Persia. The opening verses give perhaps the very best clue to the motive of the book, and set forth the purpose of the whole work:

³⁵“Love righteousness, ye that be judges of the earth; think of the Lord with a good heart * * * for He will be found of them that tempt Him not, and He sheweth himself unto such as do not distrust Him. For the Holy spirit of the Lord filleth the world, and that which containeth all things hath knowledge of the voice. Therefore he that speaketh unrighteous things cannot be hid, neither shall justice, when it punisheth, pass him by. For inquisition shall be made into the counsels

of the ungodly, and the knowledge of his words shall come unto the Lord for the punishment of his wicked deeds. For the ear of jealousy heareth all things, and the noise of murmuring is not hid. Therefore beware of any unprofitable murmuring, and refrain your tongue from back-biting; for secret speech shall not go unpunished, and the mouth that believeth, slayeth the soul."

In dealing with the fate of the wicked and the ungodly on the one hand and the just and righteous on the other, we meet with a very strong condemnation of the former. The idea expressed here has not yet reached that theological development which consigns the wicked to a place of punishment, but the belief that the righteous will live forever is already strongly intrenched.

The verses which are quoted below are preceded by a criticism of the kind of life that had been led. Some people were steeped in transgression, in pride and in madness for riches and wealth. In this they revelled, but in their wickedness they were consumed.

"“For,” says the writer, “the hope of the ungodly is like dust, that is blown away by the wind, and like a thin froth that is driven away by the wind; like the smoke which is dispersed here and there with the tempest * * * * But the righteous live forever more, their reward is with the Lord and the care of them is with the Most High. Therefore shall they receive the kingdom of glory and

a crown of beauty from the Lord's hand. For with His right hand He shall cover them, and with His arm shall He protect them.

³⁷“Hear therefore, O ye kings, and understand; learn, judges of the ends of the earth. For the rulership is given you from the Lord, and the power from the Highest, who shall try your works, and search out your counsels. Because being ministers of His kingdom, you have not judged right, nor kept the law, nor walked after the counsel of God; fearfully and speedily will He come upon you, for a sharp judgment is taken upon them that be in high places. For the lowest is pardonable through mercy, but the mighty shall be mightily chastised. For He who is Lord over all, will fear no man's person, neither will He stand in awe of any man's greatness; for He hath made small and great, and careth for all alike.”

There is need for an extended study of the religious content of the several books from which quotations are here given. Such studies have been made, but not by men who could without bias show their value as compared with that of the New Testament. It is not enough to say that Paul knew the contents of the Wisdom of Solomon. To show citations from Enoch by Jude is not enough. It is not enough to show by mere references that the writers of Matthew and other New Testament documents knew the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs or some of the

thoughts that this collection expressed. What we need is a critical study of the religious development of this whole literature from a point of view, which if not friendly to Judaism, should at least be just to it. An exhaustive study like this together with a similar work on the Mishnah, would establish authoritatively for the Christian world, that which the Jewish world has known all along, namely, that there were judgment, righteousness, even the "higher righteousness" and mercy, every place where the Jewish religion or "Law" was studied; and at all times did these have a place in the Jewish heart; we would find that although here and there dialecticism or legal dispensation seemed to claim the greater attention, that at bottom it was the ethical implication of the whole Torah which at all times, formed the basis and content of Jewish life; for Judaism is a life rather than a creed; and we would find too, that aside from the one dogmatic teaching concerning the unity of God, the whole fabric of Judaism was and is what we would call an ethical and sociological one rather than a theological one. There was a super-imposed stratum of speculation; just as Paul later super-imposed his theological speculation upon the ethical teachings handed down in the name of Jesus; but the difference between Judaism and Christianity is this: Judaism retained and stressed as important the ethical or social elements, while Christianity after Paul, prac-

tically became a flowering of Pauline speculation.

Before closing this very incomplete chapter on the extra-biblical literature, we ought to look into two books which give us a remarkable exposition of the thought of the schools of the authors of these works. The first of these, the Book of Jubilees³⁸ or Little Genesis, is an account of creation from its beginning to the Exodus. It is written from the Pharisaic and nationalist points of view, and teems with the protests against the deteriorating influences brought on by the hellenistic invasion of the Greek-Maccabean period. It defends the Pentateuchal laws and imposes purity and righteousness upon Israel and his priests. The book does not agree with Genesis in all particulars, but it is an excellent exposition of the ideas and ideals of that party to which this author belonged. The work is intensely nationalistic, and we cite references from it, to show that within that Jewish nationalism which this book represents, the channels of righteousness, mercy and judgment had never run low.

Jubilees takes for granted the Old Testament thought that God is a God of righteousness, and they who leave off righteousness, thereby are separated from God. The book opens with a conversation between God and Moses, in which Moses is commanded to write down as God dictates, the history of Israel. "I shall hide My face from them"—

as a penalty,—“and I shall deliver them into the hands of the Gentiles for captivity, and for a prey and for a devouring, * * * And they will forget all My laws and all My commandments, and all My judgments, and will go astray as to new moons, and Sabbaths, and festivals, and jubilees and ordinances. And after this they will turn to Me * * * and I shall disclose to them abounding peace with righteousness, and I shall re-establish them as the plant of uprightness with all My soul, and they will be for a blessing and not for a curse, and they will be the head and not the tail. And I shall build my sanctuary in their midst, and I shall dwell with them, and I shall be their God, and they will be My people in truth and righteousness.” * * * ³⁰Then Moses fell on his face and said: “Let Thy mercy O Lord, be lifted up upon Thy people, and create in them an upright spirit, and let not the spirit of Beliar rule over them, to accuse them before Thee and to ensnare them from all the paths of righteousness, so that they may perish from before Thy face.”

We turn from the ideal here laid down for Israel to that which Noah enjoined upon his descendants. ⁴⁰And * * * Noah began to enjoin upon his sons' sons the ordinances and the commandments and all the judgments * * * and he exhorted his sons to observe righteousness, and to cover the shame of their flesh, and to bless their Creator, and honor their father and mother, and love their

neighbor, and guard their souls from fornication and uncleanness and all iniquity. 'And now my children, hearken: Work judgment and righteousness that you may be planted in righteousness over the face of the whole earth, and your glory lifted up before God, who saved me from the waters of the flood.' "

"Abraham likewise called his children before him to give them instruction in the paths which they should follow. "And he commanded them that they should observe the way of the Lord; that they should work righteousness, and love each his neighbor, and act in this manner amongst all men; that they should each so walk with regard to them as to do judgment and righteousness on the earth; that they should circumcise their sons according to the covenant which He had made with them, and not deviate to the right hand or the left from all the paths which the Lord had commanded us; and that we should keep ourselves from all fornication and uncleanness."

"But serve ye the Most High God and worship Him continually.

And hope for His countenance always.

And work uprightness and righteousness before Him.

And ye will be for a blessing on the earth,
And all the nations of the earth will desire you,

And bless your sons in my name,

That they may be blessed as I am.”

When Abraham became old and felt himself going the way of all flesh, he called his son Isaac to his side, and concluded his last bit of advice.

““I see my son,

That all the works of the children of men are sin and wickedness,

And all their deeds are uncleanness and an abomination and a pollution,

And there is no righteousness with them.

Beware lest thou shouldst walk in their ways,

And tread in their paths,

And sin a sin unto the death before the Most High God.

Turn away from all their deeds and all their uncleanness,

And observe the ordinance of the Most High God.

And do His will and be upright in all things.

And He will bless thee in all thy deeds,

And will raise up from thee the plant of righteousness throughout all the earth, throughout all generations of the earth.

And My name and thy name will not be forgotten under heaven forever.”

Just as Noah and Abraham had departed, but not before instructing their children, so too, did Isaac do, when he felt that the end of his days was approaching: And he called his two sons together, and among other things

he said: ““And this I command you, my sons, that ye practice righteousness and uprightness on earth, so that the Lord may bring upon you all that the Lord said that He would do to Abraham and to his seed; and love one another, my sons, your brothers, as a man who loves his own soul, and let each seek in what he may benefit his brother and act together on the earth; and let them “love each other as their own souls. May the Most High God bless the man that worketh righteousness, him and his seed forever.”

These by no means exhaust the number of references that could be cited from this work, to prove our contention. Though the patriarchal characters are used, this work like the one to be considered next, was written during the reign of John Hyrcanus, between 135 and 105 before Jesus. Holding in mind the fact that we are in that period of Jewish history which in order to justify the coming of their Messiah at that particular time, Christians consider the very worst, it must seem that these sentiments are lofty indeed; and in the face of this great and sublime literature whose fringes only we have so lightly touched, this period—the first centuries before the present era—could not have been nearly as bad as apologetes desire to make them.

The book which we have reserved for the last part of this section is one of the most fertile of the post-biblical contributions. “It

is the work of a Pharisee who lived contemporaneously with John Hyrcanus; and the work has been dated between 109 and 106 before the Christian era. It represents the best Jewish thought of the day, dignifying in splendid manner those virtues which combine to make the very best in human character. This book has been of striking influence on the New Testament, and this is shown particularly in the so-called "Sayings of Jesus;" and no less than ninety-one passages are either taken from, or are directly influenced by the Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. It is in this book that we find the original of the famous command concerning God and man, later found in the New Testament, namely, "Master, which is the great commandment in the Law?" Jesus said unto him, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And if the book had nothing to commend it but this, it would still be one of the most important pieces of apocryphal literature, showing as it does so clearly, what the Jew knows, but what the Christian denies, namely, that in the mind of the author and his whole sect, religion was as much a duty and an attention to man, as it was to God. It is indeed a matter of much more than passing importance that earlier by 140 years at least, and probably by 180, a Jewish scribe published that precept, which the Christians have been giving later in the name of their founder, as the

very corner stone of Christian teachings and life. As one reads these monuments of the Jewish past, and sees more and more how utterly Jewish the best ethical ideals of the New Testament are, this question bounds back in spite of one's self: When will that credit and glory that belong to the Jews be given them by the unknowing world?

The form of this work is that of a series of testaments or wills, presumably written by the twelve sons of Jacob, and containing their instruction and advice to their children. The main events of the Bible which appertained to the lives of these men are given in the testaments, and from them religious lessons are drawn, and taught to those who are supposed to be listening. "The work contains not only the general teachings regarding the love of God and fellowman, but goes rather deeply into the ideas of forgiveness, hatred, deceit, jealousy and envy, righteousness, truthfulness, and all of those social relations which make for a religious life in the very highest sense, or unmake it. I believe that this work as a whole represents the highest type of Palestinian religious thought, and the word "Palestinian" is used here in the sense which also includes the New Testament writings.

Reuben, the first born of Jacob and Leah, called about him his children and after relating those experiences in his life which he deemed the most important, he closes with a

few verses of admonition: ⁴⁹“Beware of fornication; and if you wish to be pure in mind, guard your senses from every woman. Command the women likewise not to associate with men, that they also may be pure in mind. For constant meetings even though the ungodly deed be not wrought, are to them an irremediable disease and to us a destruction of Beliar and an eternal reproach. ⁵⁰I adjure you by the God of heaven to do truth each one unto his neighbor and to entertain love each for his brother. And draw ye near to Levi, (the priest) in humbleness of heart that ye may receive a blessing from his mouth.”

When Simeon became sick, his sons came to visit him, and while they were around his bedside, he took occasion to review his life, and to point out his mistakes. ⁵¹He spoke of the part he played in the selling of Joseph, and he told how deeply he had grieved over his cruelty. ⁵²He told of his repentance and commanded his children to “beware of the spirit of deceit and envy. For envy ruleth over the whole mind of a man, and suffereth him not to do any good thing. But it suggesteth to destroy him that he envieth. ⁵³Do ye also, my children love each one his brother with a good heart, and the spirit of envy will withdraw from you. For this maketh savage the soul and destroyeth the body—it causeth anger and war in mind and stirreth up into deeds of blood. ⁵⁴And now my

children, make your hearts good before the Lord and your ways straight before men, and ye shall find grace before the Lord and men."

Though sound in body and mind, ⁵⁶Levi had received a revelation that the end of his days was approaching, and in order not to leave his descendants without proper counsel he called them together. He related how he, together with Simeon had taken vengeance on ⁵⁶Hamor for the outrage upon Dinah; how the matter had distressed their father and how it caused the war between Hamor and Jacob. ⁵⁷He told of the vision in which he was appointed the priest of his people—a vision which came upon him after he had thought long and intently upon the "men corrupting their ways" and upon the fact that "unrighteousness had built for itself walls, and lawlessness sat upon towers." He told them how he grieved for the race of the sons of men, and how he prayed to the Lord that he might be saved. He described that vision in which he was commanded to ⁵⁸"put on the robes of priesthood, and the crown of righteousness and the breastplate of understanding, and the garment of truth and the plate of faith, and the turban of the head, and the ephod of prophecy;" and then he relates his anointing. And now prepared to stand as the teacher and priest of Israel and to set before them these ideals, he commands them to

““Fear the Lord your God with your whole heart,

And walk in simplicity according to all His laws.

⁶⁰Work righteousness, my children upon the earth,

That ye may have it as a treasure in heaven.

And sow good things in your souls,

That ye may find them in your life.

⁶¹Whosoever teaches noble things and does them,

Shall be enthroned with kings,

As was also Joseph, thy brother.”

⁶²“For as the heaven is purer in the Lord’s sight than the earth, so also be ye, the light of Israel, purer than all the Gentiles.” Other versions have it: “My children, be ye pure as the heaven is purer than the earth; and ye who are the lights of Israel shall be as the sun and moon.” ⁶³“But if ye be darkened through transgressions, what therefore will all the Gentiles do living in blindness? Yea, ye shall bring a curse upon our race because of the light of the law which was given for to light every man, this ye desire to destroy by teaching commandments contrary to the ordinances of God.”

The Testament of Levi is extremely interesting. It pictures Israel’s backsliding and enumerates the penalties. It gives a vivid description of Israel’s sins during the period of the writer, and at the end it closes with an

exhortation to choose either ““the light or the darkness, the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar.”

The Testament of Judah is one of the longest in the book, on account of the importance of the tribe of that name, in Israel's history. Judah, too, calls together his sons, tells them of his youth, his achievements and the blessings that were bestowed upon him, even to the kingship of Israel. He relates some things not found in the Bible, and describes vividly some of the experiences in which he and his brothers were the heroes. From these and the deed with Tamar, he draws the moral lessons which he desires to teach his children. ““Walk not after your lusts, nor in the imaginations of your thoughts in haughtiness of heart; and glory not in the deeds and strength of your youth, for this also is evil in the eyes of the Lord.”

⁶⁶“Beware, therefore, my children of fornication and the love of money and hearken to Judah, your father.

For these things withdraw you from the Law of God,

And teach arrogance,

And suffer not a man to have compassion upon his neighbor.

They rob his soul of all goodness,

And oppress him with toils and troubles.

And drive away sleep with him,

And devour his flesh.”

By way of interest we quote from this tes-

tament its description of the king of Israel, who is to occupy the throne after Israel's redemption when the messianic ruler will have come to establish Israel's kingdom, and when "the Lord will visit you (the Jews) when with perfect heart you repent and walk in all his commandments, and he will bring you up from captivity among the Gentiles * * *

"And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace.

And a man shall arise like the sun of righteousness,

And no sin shall be found on him.

And the heavens shall be opened to him
To pour out the spirit, the blessings of the Holy Father;

And he shall pour out the spirit of grace upon you,

And ye shall be unto him sons in truth,

And ye shall walk in His commandments first and last.

Then shall the sceptre of my kingdom shine forth,

And from your root shall arise a stem;

And from it shall grow a rod of righteousness to the Gentiles,

To judge and to save all that call upon the Lord.

"And after these things shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob arise unto life, and I, my brethren, shall be chief of the tribes.

And ye shall be people of the Lord and have one tongue,

And there shall be no spirit of deceit of Beliar,

For he shall be cast into the fire forever.

And they who have died in grief shall arise in joy,

⁷⁰And they who were poor for the Lord's sake shall be made rich,

And they who were put to death for the Lord's sake shall awake to life,

And the harts of Israel shall run in joyfulness,

And the eagles of Israel shall fly in gladness,

And all the people shall glorify the Lord forever.

⁷¹Observe therefore my children, all the Law of the Lord, for there is hope to all of them who hold fast to His ways."

The words of counsel in the Testament of Issachar sound like those of Ben Sirach or Wisdom, though they breathe a somewhat more refined religious spirit. After relating how he aided the poor, Issachar speaks thus:

⁷²"And now hearken to me, my children,

And walk in singleness of heart,

For I have seen it in all that is well pleasing to the Lord,

The single-minded man coveteth not gold,

He overreacheth not his neighbor,

But only waiteth for the will of God.

And the spirits of deceit have no power against him,

There is no envy in his thoughts,

Malice maketh not his soul to pass away,
Nor worry with insatiable desire in his
mind.

For he walketh in singleness of soul,
And beholdeth all things in uprightness
of heart,

Shunning eyes made evil through the error
of the world,

Lest he should see the perversion of any of
the commandments of the Lord.

Keep therefore my children, the Law of
God, * * *

⁷³Not playing the busybody with the busi-
ness of your neighbor;

But love the Lord and your neighbor,
Have compassion on the poor and the
weak."

After laying down these general principles,
he tells them how he lived, and commands
them to live likewise:

⁷⁴"Except my wife, I have not known any
woman. I never committed fornication by
the lifting up of my eyes.

I drank not wine to be led astray thereby,
I coveted not any desirable thing that was
my neighbor's.

Guile rose not in my heart,
A lie passed not through my lips.
If any man were in distress, I joined my
sighs with his,

And I shared my bread with the poor.
I wrought godliness, all my days I kept the
truth.

I loved the Lord,

Likewise also every man with all my heart.
So do ye also these things, my children,
Since you have with you the God of heaven
and earth,

And walk with men in singleness of heart."

The Testament of Zebulun contains repeated admonitions to be merciful. He is the one of all of Joseph's older brothers who shed tears of compassion when the brothers so harshly mistreated him. This is one of the tenderest bits of sentiment not only in this book but in the whole intertestamental literature, and some of its contents compare most favorably with the best in the Old Testament. Like the others, Zebulun refers to his past life, and lays especial stress on the sin against Joseph, for which he, too, has long since repented. An interesting fact not bearing on our subject, is the claim of Zebulun that he "was the first to make a boat to sail upon the sea."

Zebulun's testament is one of the few ancient works that advises kindness to animals. He bids his children to keep the commands of the Lord, and to show mercy to their neighbors, ⁷⁵"and to have compassion towards all, not towards men only but also towards beasts." He then tells how he shared his "catch with every stranger," and how he had compassion upon every one. He relates how he once helped a man in ⁷⁶"distress in winter and stole a garment from his father's house to give to him who was in trouble. "Do you

therefore," says he, "my children, from that which God bestoweth upon you, show compassion and mercy without hesitation to all men, and give to every man with a good heart. And if ye have not the wherewithal to give to him that needeth, have compassion on him in bowels of mercy. I know that my hand found not the wherewithal to give to him that needed, and I walked with him weeping for seven furlongs, and my bowels yearned towards him in compassion. ⁷⁷Have ye therefore, yourselves also my children, compassion towards every man, with mercy, that the Lord also may have compassion and mercy upon you."

There remain yet six Testaments, and each one contains precept after precept of that "judgment, righteousness and mercy" which Israel is supposed by many not to have had. To quote them all will be irksome, if, indeed those that have already been quoted are not so. And yet justice to the matter requires that some of these thoughts be here inserted. A few only have been selected and these are placed under the names of the testaments which contain them.

The Testament of Dan: ⁷⁸"I have proved in my heart, and in my whole life that the truth with just dealings is good and well pleasing to God, and that lying and anger are evil, because they teach man all wickedness. ⁷⁹And I tell you of a truth, that unless ye keep yourselves from the spirit of lying

and anger, and love truth and long-suffering,
 ye shall perish, for anger is blindness, and
 does not suffer one to see the face of any
 man with truth. ⁸⁰Observe the command-
 ments of God,

And hate lying, that the Lord may dwell
 among you,

And Beliar may flee from you.

Speak the truth each one with his neigh-
 bor,

So shall ye not fall into wrath and confu-
 sion,

But ye shall be in peace, having the God
 of peace,

So shall no war prevail among you.

Love the Lord through all your life,

And one another with a true heart.

⁸¹Depart therefore from all unrighteous-
 ness and cleave unto the righteousness of
 God and your race will be saved forever."

The Testament of Naphthali: ⁸²Be ye
 therefore not eager to corrupt your doings
 through covetousness or with vain words to
 beguile your souls; * * *

⁸³And if ye work that which is good, my
 children,

Both men and angels shall bless you;

And God shall be glorified among the Gen-
 tiles through you,

And the devil shall flee from you.

But him who doeth not what is good,

Both angels and men shall curse,

And God shall be dishonored among the
 Gentiles through him."

Testament of Gad: ⁸⁴“And now my children, hearken to the words of truth to work righteousness, and all the law of the Most High, and go not astray through the spirit of hatred, for it is evil in all the doings of men. Whatsoever a man doeth, the hater abominates him * * * though man feareth the Lord, and taketh pleasure in that which is righteous, he loves Him not. He dispraiseth the truth, he envieth him that prospers, he welcometh evil speaking, he loveth arrogance, for hatred blindeth the soul. ⁸⁵“Beware therefore, my children, of hatred; for it worketh lawlessness even against the Lord himself. For he will not hear the words of His commandments concerning the loving of one’s neighbors, and it sinneth against God. ⁸⁶“For as love would quicken even the dead, and would call back them that are condemned to die, so hatred would slay the living, and those that had sinned venially, it would not suffer to live. For the spirit of hatred worketh together with Satan through hastiness of spirit in all things unto men’s death; but the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long-suffering unto the salvation of men. Hatred therefore is evil, for it constantly mateth with lying, speaking against the truth; and it maketh small things to be great, and causeth the light to be darkness, and calleth the sweet bitter, and teacheth slander and kindleth wrath and stirreth up war, and violence and all covetousness; it fill-

eth the heart with evils and devilish poison. These things therefore, I say to you from experience, my children, that ye may drive forth hatred, which is of the devil, and cleave to the love of God. Righteousness casteth out hatred, humility destroyeth envy. For he that is just and humble is ashamed to do what is unjust, being reprov'd not of another but of his own heart, because the Lord looketh upon his inclination. ⁸⁷And now my children, I exhort you, love ye each one his brother, and put away hatred from your hearts, love one another in deed and in word and in inclination of soul. ⁸⁸Love ye one another from the heart, and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold no guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him, lest catching the poison from thee, he taketh to swearing and thou sin doubly. ⁸⁹But if he be shameless and persisteth in his wrongdoing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging."

Who can read these remarkable words and those which follow—without feeling the great injustice that is done Judaism by those who deny it the possession of some of religion's purest teachings.

Testament of Asher: "He who defraudeth his neighbor provoketh God, and swear-eth falsely against the Most High, and yet pitieth the poor; * * * ⁹⁰another commiteth

adultery and fornication, and abstaineth from meats, and when he fasteth he does evil and by the power of his wealth overwhelmeth many; and notwithstanding his excessive wickedness he doeth the commandments; this too, hath a two-fold aspect, but the whole is evil. ¹But do not ye my children, wear faces like unto them, of goodness and of wickedness, but cleave unto goodness only, for God has his habitation therein, and men desire it. But from wickedness flee away destroying the evil inclination by your good works; for they that are double-faced serve not God but their own lusts, so that they may please Beliar and men like themselves. ²Take heed therefore, ye also my children, to the commandments of the Lord, following the truth with singleness of face. For they that are double-faced are guilty of a double sin; for they both do the evil thing and they have pleasure in them that do it, following the examples of the spirits of deceit and striving against mankind. Do ye keep the Law of the Lord, and give not heed unto evil as unto good; but look unto the thing that is really good, and keep it in all commandments of the Lord, having your conversation therein, and resting therein."

Testament of Joseph: ³"Do ye also therefore, my children, have the fear of God in all your works before your eyes, and honor your brethren; for everyone who doeth the Law of the Lord shall be loved by Him. ⁴Ye see,

therefore, what great things I endured that I should not put my brethren to shame. Do ye also, love one another, and with long-suffering hide ye one another's faults. For God delighteth in the unity of brethren, and in the purpose of a heart that taketh pleasure in love. "If ye also, therefore, walk in the commandments of the Lord, my children, He will exalt you there and will bless you with good things forever and ever. And if any-one seeketh to do evil unto you, do well unto him and pray for him, and ye shall be redeemed of the Lord, from all evil."

What a remarkable revelation these words must be to those who constantly reproach the Jews with their harshness, and quote so continually the purported words of Jesus. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, 'thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy, but I say unto you, love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you.'" Was Jesus or the editor of Matthew acquainted with the Testaments of Joseph or Naphtali?

Testament of Benjamin: "Do ye also my children, love the Lord God of Heaven and Earth, and keep His commandments. And let your mind be unto good, even as ye know me; for he who hath his mind right, seeth all things rightly. Fear ye the Lord, and love your neighbor. "See ye therefore my children the end of a good man? Be followers of his compassion, therefore, with a good mind, that ye also may wear crowns of glory. For

the good man hath not a dark eye; for he showeth mercy to all men, even though they be sinners. And though they devise with evil intent concerning him, by doing good he overcometh evil, being shielded by God; and he loveth the righteous as his own soul. ⁹⁹If anyone does violence to a holy man, he repenteth; for the holy man is merciful to his reviler, and holdeth his peace. ¹⁰⁰The good mind hath not two tongues, of blessing and of cursing, of contumely and of honor, of sorrow and joy, of quietness and of confusion, of hypocrisy and of truth, of poverty and of wealth; but it hath one disposition, uncorrupt and pure concerning all men. It hath no double sight, nor double hearing; for in every thing which he doeth or speaketh or seeth, he knows that the Lord looketh on his soul. And he cleanseth his mind that he be not condemned by men as well as by God. ¹⁰¹And do ye my children, flee evil doing, envy and hatred of brethren, and cleave to goodness and love. ¹⁰²Do ye truth, each one to his neighbor, and keep the Law of the Lord and his commandments."

It is a pity that this great literature out of which there can be extracted some of the noblest ideals of conduct that have ever been written, should be closed to the ordinary reader of the sacred writings. If it is a fact that the canon contains many of the best thoughts that have ever been uttered, it is difficult to understand wherein much of the apocryphal

literature falls below it. Perhaps as it becomes the more generally known, it too will become the more valued.

CHAPTER IV.

The Jewish Ideals and the New Testament.

In evaluating the contributions of the older and newer covenants, it is hardly just to compare the ethics of Jesus and the New Testament with those of the Old. It is easy to say that some of the teachings of Jesus are higher than those of the older Jewish sages of the older canon, and it is just as easy to say that many of the teachings of the Jewish teachers who lived a century or two after the close of the Old Testament were also higher than those of the older sages of the Bible. But we must not overlook the fact that upon both Jesus and the other post-Biblical Jewish teachers the best portions of the Bible had already exerted an untold influence. So far as religious depth and height of spiritual essence are concerned, there is much of this outside of the Bible superior to a great deal in the Bible. Men grow with years, especially after they have a spiritual treasure and a religious guide by which to live. It is therefore not just to say that the New Testament teaches this and that, while the Old Testament teachers had only given hint of this or that. We ought rather to judge the teachings of the Old Testament in the light of

the civilization about them; and compare the New Testament, or more explicitly the alleged teachings of Jesus, with the contemporary Jewish literature: That is, the works cited in the preceding chapter, the Mishnah, the early Talmudic and Midrashic sources, and the Prayer book. In this vast literature we may gain some idea of the ideals, the thoughts and the deeds which constituted the religious life of the people; there we may find what the Jews of those days regarded as the means of their salvation; there shall we find the principles—high and ennobling, which underlay a truly Jewish life; and there will we find too, that the utterances of Jesus fitted, and could have been spoken by almost any of the well-known sages, rabbis and teachers of the Law. But these sources are difficult to get at; few non-Jews are at home in them, and fewer still think them important enough. For justice to Judaism seems to occupy little of their concern. A new light, however, has dawned, and for the first time in our days there has appeared one who feels that Jewish life and belief have long enough been distorted, and that it is time that those who misunderstand unwillingly shall be given an opportunity to judge dispassionately. To quote the writer of this new and excellent volume: "I have not sought to write a panegyric on them (the Pharisees), but so far as may be possible for one who is not a Jew, to present their case

from their own standpoint, and not, as is so often done, as a mere foil to the Christian religion. This is one reason why I have not referred to the writings of other scholars, except in the one case of Weber. He is typical of them all in their attitude towards rabbinical Judaism." And further: "Pharisaism is usually judged from the outside, as seen by not very friendly eyes; and, even of those Christians who have studied the Pharisaic literature and who thus know it to some extent from the inside, there are few who seem able to imagine what it must have been to those whose real religion it was. * * * The knowledge will be chiefly valuable if it helps the reader to realize that the Pharisees were 'men of like passions with us,' men with souls to be saved, who cared a great deal for things of the higher life, men who feared God and worked righteousness, and who pondered deeply upon spiritual questions, though they did not solve them upon Christian lines, nor state the answers in Christian terms." * * * "And I hope that when I have done, I shall have left with the reader some clear idea of who the Pharisees were and what they stood for, and a more just appreciation of them than is indicated by the word 'hypocrites.'" And in the last chapter of the book, we find these emphatic words: "He (Weber) must have been perplexed by the want of the agreement amongst his authorities, but he got over that by regarding the more promin-

ent doctrine as the rule, and the other as the exception; the former was a part of the system, the latter was aberration. Christian scholars are pathetically grateful to Weber for having given them an orderly and methodical arrangement of the medley of Pharisaic doctrines; certainly he has done so; but with as much success and as much truth as if he had described a tropical jungle, believing it to be a nursery-garden."

How different these words are from those which we find in the classic masters of Christian theology! The very unfair attitude has become so classic that it is almost beating against a stone-wall to cry for a change. In reading the various standard works of some of the best known Christian scholars, one gets the opinion that they not only do not know the Jewish sources, but they do not want to know them. For a study of the originals is not out of the question; they are accessible, if one really wants to study them.

However, one is not forced to consult the originals, for there are a number of excellent translations of the most important portions of the rabbinical literature. It is the fine sense of justice that seems to be lacking—that sense of justice, which because of its absence in Christian scholars, caused the late Prof. Schechter to speak of a certain kind of scholarship as the "higher anti-Semitism."

The Fatherhood of God.

There is a very definite relation between one's conception of God, and one's relation to society. He who thinks of God as Creator and Father will probably regard himself as a brother to his fellow-men. This point of view becomes an exceedingly important one in the strivings of modern society, since the basic idea of brotherhood is one of the greatest motives we have in the solution of our social problems. The steps of humankind upward can be well measured by the progress of this ideal, and where it fails to influence men, there civilization has lagged. The strife, struggles, warfare and murders among civilized mankind indicate how much this teaching is needed.

Among the Jews of old as well as among those of our days, God was and is the Creator and Maker, Shaper and Father of mankind. This thought is elemental and universal. But after reading religious works bearing on the contributions of the Bible to life, we are invariably led to believe that the lofty sentiment which regards God not only as Creator and Maker, but also as Father, is of late origin and use.⁵ It was Jesus they say who read into the word "Father" as applied to God, a meaning hitherto unknown and unthought of. One might not object to statements of this sort were they made in a man-

ner which did not belittle the faith of the Old Testament, and take from those who lived according to it, that credit which is theirs by right of thought and deed. That one Jew said something original and lasting—this is neither new nor alarming. But that this same one, later made into a deity, eclipsed all others, simply because they who say this do not know or care what the others did—that is a different matter. Certainly the facts in the case will warrant an examination.

No one would take away from the teacher in the gospels, the fact that he felt himself near to his God, and that he conceived a relationship of fatherhood on the side of God and sonship on his own side. Nor can any one deny that a deep tenderness and a fervent piety characterize his alleged utterances to his Father. But did not the psalmists—those who looked to their Father with meekness and longing; did not the rabbis who felt themselves at all times in the very bosom of their Father—did not all of these look to their God as the Father and God of all mankind, equally merciful, equally kind, equally just to all? With Israel there was a special covenant which the other nations had refused. But this made no difference in the relation between the other nations and God. “Have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us all,” though first spoken to Israel, was later extended to include all man-

kind. And this universal idea was further carried out by the rabbinical dictum: "The righteous of all nations have a portion in the world to come."

The writers of the gospels, in their desire to show the strong filial relationship between Jesus and God, attribute to him, a number of passages which because of the occurrence of the word "my" before Father, become exceedingly narrow. It is true that in a number of other passages Jesus put the word "thy" or "your" before Father. But it is strange that in all the gospels the word "our"—which is the common rabbinic word used before Father, occurs only once, and that in the Lord's Prayer, which is a distinctively rabbinical supplication. Some examples of passages of this kind, are the following: ¹⁰"Who-soever will confess me before men, him also will I confess before MY Father, which is in heaven; but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before MY Father which is in heaven." ¹¹"Not everyone that sayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of MY Father which is in heaven." ¹²"All these things are delivered to me of MY Father, and no man knoweth the son but the Father; and neither knoweth any man the Father, save the son; and he to whomsoever the son will reveal him." ¹³"Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on the earth as touching anything that they shall

ask, it shall be done for them of MY Father who is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." ¹⁴"So likewise shall MY Heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not everyone his brother." ¹⁵"And I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as My Father appointed unto me." ¹⁶"For whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother." ¹⁷"In MY Father's house are many mansions, if it were not so, I would have told you, for I go to prepare a place for you." ¹⁸"Blessed art thou, Simon bar Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but MY Father who is in heaven." ¹⁹"And behold, I send forth the promise of MY Father upon you."

Against these highly particularistic passages ascribed to Jesus, are a number of others by him which are broad, universal, and much more like those one would believe Jesus uttered. They utilized the rabbinic conception of the universality of the Fatherhood of God, and they occur often enough to warrant the statement that he felt this relationship very deeply, and sought by its frequent use to impress it upon others. What he read into it that was not known in his days, one fails to ascertain. The following passages which universalize God, and which occur especially in the Sermon, are emphatic, but they have parallels in the Old Testament,

in the intertestamental and in the rabbinic literature: ²⁰“Be ye therefore perfect even as YOUR Father in heaven is perfect;” ²¹“But I say unto you, love * * * that ye may be the children of YOUR Father which is in heaven; for he maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. ²²Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall to the ground without YOUR Father. And call no man YOUR Father upon earth; for one is YOUR Father, which is in heaven. ²³Even so, it is not the will of YOUR Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish. ²⁴If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall YOUR Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him. ²⁵Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify YOUR Father which is in heaven. ²⁶And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against anyone, that YOUR Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses; but if you do not forgive neither will YOUR Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses. ²⁷But love your enemies, and do good and lend, and never despairing, and your reward shall be great and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for He is kind unto the unthankful and the evil. Be ye therefore merciful as YOUR Father also is merciful.” The verse preceding is peculiar. For according

to other utterances of Jesus, it is the evil and ungrateful who are to be excluded from the Kingdom.

The use of the word "my" and "your" in these passages and others, is very noticeable. One would expect the word "our;" as it is, one feels that these words are intended to impress the fact that Jesus and the people to whom he speaks, are not on a par in their relationship to God, but that Jesus stands nearer, as the son of the Most High.

The Jewish view, of course, is different. According to Jewish teachings, all are the children of God; He is their Creator, and the thought that God is the Father of not only one son, but many—though indeed Israelites—is common in the Old Testament. We shall not exhaust the list of references—and like in the cases above, we will quote just enough to substantiate the assertion. ²⁰"Ye are the children of the Lord your God" was said by a writer in Deuteronomy. ²¹"Is not He thy Father that hath gotten thee? Hath He not made thee and established thee?" ²²Thus hath said the Lord: "My son, my first-born is Israel." ²³"Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of Thy holiness and Thy glory * * * for thou art our Father, our Redeemer from everlasting is thy name." ²⁴"But now, O Lord, our Father art Thou; we are clay and thou art our fashioner, and the work of thy hand are we all." ²⁵"Can a woman forget her suckling child, not to have mercy

on the son of her body! Yea, should those even forget, yet would I not forget thee, * * * saith the Lord." ³⁴"Wilt thou not call unto me from this time, my Father, the guide of my youth art Thou?" ³⁵"When Israel was young yet, then I loved him, and out of Egypt did I call my son." ³⁶"Return, O backsliding children, saith the Lord * * * I thought my Father thou wouldst call me, and that from me thou wouldst not turn away." ³⁷"He will call unto me, 'thou art my Father,' and the rock of my salvation." ³⁸"For I am become a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first born." ³⁹"Have we not all One Father, hath not One God created us all?" There are a number of psalms, notably 103, 106, 107, 108, and 136, which breathe a tender and passionate message of affection, consideration and love; and with these can be classed chapters of Job especially the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth. While the word Father is not mentioned, God is described in such intimate and fatherly terms that one feels his nearness just as much as if he were called "Father."

Like the Old Testament, the later literature has a well defined conception of God as Father. ⁴⁰"O Lord, Father and Governor of the world, leave me not to their counsels and let me not fall by them. ⁴¹"Be as a father unto the fatherless, and instead of a husband unto the mother, so shalt thou be as a son of the Most High, and He shall love thee more than any mother doth. ⁴²"O Lord, Father and God

of my life, give not a proud look, but turn away from thy servants, always, a haughty mind. "But thy providence, O Father, governeth it, for thou hast made a way in the sea, and a safe path in the waves, showing that thou canst save from all danger, yea though a man went to sea without art. "He (the righteous) professeth to have the knowledge of God and he calleth himself the son of the Lord. "There declare his greatness, extol him before all the living; for He is our Lord, and He is the God our Father forever. "The heavens shall be opened, and from the temple of glory shall come upon him (the priest) sanctification, with the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac. "And after these things shall a star arise unto you from Jacob in peace, * * * and the heavens shall be opened unto him, to pour out the spirit even the blessings of the Holy Father, and he shall pour out the spirit of grace upon you, and ye shall be unto him sons in truth, and we shall walk in his commandments first and last. "For he shall take knowledge of them that they be all the sons of their God, and shall divide them upon the earth according to their tribes."

One cannot appreciate the injustice of the writers who misrepresent Jewish traditions until one glances over some of the Talmudic passages on the divine Fatherhood of God. Only a few will be cited. We shall not consider the phrase, "Our Father, Our King,"

which is so plentiful in the prayers and the prayer-book, and which has been treated at length most capably.⁴⁹ We will content ourselves with a few bits of evidence that the rabbinic idea of the Fatherhood was as lofty and inspiring as the finest uttered in the gospels and that too, these were not influenced by Christian thought. ⁵⁰“The ancient pious,” we are told, “used to spend an hour in meditation so that when they prayed to their Father in heaven they could direct their proper attention to him.” ⁵¹“The Day of Atonement does not atone for one unless he first acts favorably towards him whom he has offended;” Rabbi Akiba said, “happy are you, O Israel, on account of Him before whom you may be purified—your Father in heaven.” ⁵²“Israelites lift up their eyes to their Father in heaven.” ⁵³“As long as Israel will direct himself to God, and serve with their hearts their Father in heaven, so long will they prevail.” ⁵⁴“Blessed be the God of Israel for this son of Abraham, who has penetrated into the glories of our Father.” ⁵⁵In the first century Jochanan ben Zakkai referred to the altar as “establishing peace between Israel and his Father in heaven.”

In speaking of the death of various teachers and what departed with them, the Mishnah says: ⁵⁶“Upon whom then, shall we lean? Upon our Father in Heaven” (or upon our Father who is in Heaven.) ⁵⁷“To Honi, a very pious and saintly rabbi, the children

came during a great drouth saying, 'Father give us rain.' " Whereupon the saint prayed: "O Ruler of the world, for the sake of these little ones who cannot discriminate between the Father who giveth rain and the father who can only pray for but cannot give rain, hear my prayers." ⁵⁸"Sampson judged Israel as did their Father in heaven." ⁵⁹"One who is blind or cannot determine his direction, shall direct his heart in prayer to his Father in heaven." ⁶⁰Judah ben Temah said: "Be as strong as a tiger; have the voice of an eagle; run like a deer and be as powerful as a lion to do the will of your Father in heaven." ⁶¹Joshua ben Levi said: "Even a wall of iron could not separate Israel from his Father in heaven." ⁶²Rabbi Jochanan said in the name of Rabbi Jochai: "What does Scripture mean when it says, "for I am the Lord, loving judgment and hating robbery with burnt offerings." It is like a parable of a "king of flesh and blood"—the rabbinical way of saying a human king as contrasted with the divine King—"who goes to the custom house and says to his servants: 'Give me some tax money for the tax gatherers.' They say to him: 'Our Lord, does not all the tax that is gathered belong to you?' Then he answers them: 'Certainly, but I want all travelers to learn from me, that they may not try to shirk the payment of their tax.' Thus is it with the Holy One, blessed be He. 'For I, the Lord * * * hate robbery with sacrifice. From

me let my children learn that they must shun robbery.' ”

The particularistic passages ascribed to Jesus show a relation between the Father and his creatures, which is decidedly inferior to the one in the Old Testament and the rabbinical references cited. If the God as “Father” idea had any value, it lay in this, that it was the primary basis upon which was built the idea of the complete brotherhood of mankind. To feel God as a Father is not enough; the idea must be complemented by the feeling of kinship of humankind, and the particularistic passages certainly do not bring this out. They rather put mankind at a lower level by putting one particular person between it and God. The Creatorship expressed in terms of the Fatherhood of God in the Old Testament, and in fact, in the other Jewish traditions made all men kin in a manner not conditioned by the acceptance or the rejection of any one personal mediator. Its value lay just in this broad conception of an all-including Fatherhood. It is true that the universal passages in the Old Testament at first applied only to the community of Israel. But even this is broader than the narrow sense of the particularistic passages credited to Jesus. It must be said, however, that even the conception of Israel’s sonship was later broadened out to include all mankind, just as later Christianity broadened out the more general passages of the gospels. There are more than fifty

passages in the gospels in which the term "Father" is applied to God. Of these about twenty apply this relationship only with regard to Jesus. The rest have it, as in the other writings, as a relation between God and those to whom or of whom the writer or the utterer of the passages, is speaking. But a decided broadening of the term, that is to say, a universalization of it, was very well known to Judaism long before the teacher of Nazareth, as anyone who knows the Jewish sources, can testify. The following words of Harnack can very well be applied not only to Jesus, but to many others who taught before, contemporarily with, and after him: "The very apostrophe, 'Our Father,' exhibits the steady faith of the man who knows that he is safe in God, and it tells us that he is certain of being heard." It is perhaps asking scholars too much to read the Old Jewish liturgy. But it, and the rabbinical writings are full of tender apostrophes of this character. It is not true that to the Jew, God was a far away transcendental, infinitely distant Lord. It is just the opposite. "He was indeed the great, Almighty King, Creator and Father; but He was also the just, merciful, long-suffering and compassionate One; "He was the Goodness of the world, the Life of the world, and the Father of the world." The old Jews were indeed near to Him and He was their "Strength, their Shepherd, their Hope, their Salvation and their Safety." He was "near to them in every kind

of nearness." "While the sages so fondly pictured Israel as His people, and as His first-born son and treasure, there were other sons. "66 "In brief," says Schechter, "there is not a single endearing epithet in the language such as brother, sister, bride, mother, lamb or eye, which is not, according to the rabbis, applied by the Scriptures to express this intimate relation between God and His people." We have been told that all this was later, and that it came about through the influence of the New Testament upon Jewish traditions and Jewish belief. "67 They who know what the relations were between the Jews and the early Christians; they who know of the inner struggles of the early church itself, and they who know how little the Jews and the early Christians had to do with each other at first, and how the Jews were persecuted by the Christians later—they will realize how little Christianity could have influenced Jewish thought and Jewish life. The matter does not need discussion here.

The conception of the Fatherhood of God had become very common during the rise of rabbinical literature, and Jesus used the idea—used it much, and used it well. If he uttered the particularistic passages and felt that he lived more righteously than others,—nearer to God and His commandments—and therefore was justified in singling himself out, he did what they at all times did, "68 who felt that spiritual refinement and ferv-

ent piety brought them nearer to their Creator. In fact it was for this that the Jew lived, but he did not deny that same privilege to others. This indeed was his mission, and for this was he created. Recall the words of Jochanan ben Zakkai: "“If thou hast learnt much Torah, ascribe not any merit to thyself, for for that purpose wast thou created.” One dislikes to believe that Jesus really uttered the particularistic passages ascribed to him. They seem rather the words of non-Jewish followers who had as little knowledge of Jesus' Jewish idea of the Fatherhood of God, as some who deny it have today. Like the prophets, like the psalmists, like the sages of his own day, he seems to have felt that God was the Father of those to whom he spoke; that their prayers were to be directed to Him, that he was the All Good, All Merciful, Fatherly God. His idea, at any rate in the general passages, like that of the Jewish teachers was a broad one, and he doubtless believed as they did, "that there is an Almighty Father who looks after the wants of His children; whose love is abounding, whose mercy is exceedingly great; who is gracious and ever compassionate, and who teaches his children how to live, how to understand and how to fulfill the words of His Law.

It is generally forgotten, or not known, by those who seek to read into the sayings of Jesus an originality of meaning, that a universal tenderness had already been attached

to God's Fatherhood before the rise of the New Testament. They say that the Jewish idea was "national and narrow." But who has yet found decisive evidence that the idea of Jesus was broader? I speak of evidence within the New Testament, not of the external evidence of professors of theology. Not in one instance have we any clue that non-Jews were included by Jesus in his Fatherhood conception. He spoke to Jews; the apostles were Jews; and those who heard him were almost exclusively Jews. The expression "my Father" was a particularistic one, and he certainly does not apply it to Gentiles; and when he speaks to his followers and uses the term "your Father," or when he has them gathered about him, "to send them out, he assuredly does not send them to Gentiles. Moreover, did Jesus use the Greek, Latin or Aramaic language when he spoke? It is easy for us to overlook nineteen centuries and believe that he spoke in Greek and to Greeks, or to overlook five centuries and believe that he spoke English as we do. It is easy to read the term, "my father" or "your father" and interpret it as "our father." But let us not forget that Jesus spoke in Aramaic, and that the terms he used were Jewish terms whose meaning Jews knew, and which were the vehicles of their mode of thinking. It was Paul who really universalized the term "Our Father" as far as Christianity was concerned, though for some hundred and fifty years, this

process had been carried on by Israel, while scattered, when many who had not known God became Jewish converts. Nay, so much had already been done toward universalizing God's Name and His Fatherhood, that Paul found easy material for his conversion among those who had become Judaized, and had accepted the Jewish faith. The incident of the centurion whom Jesus commended above some of the seed of Abraham is not unparalleled in Judaism. We have already referred to the liberal-mindedness of the sages and rabbis who regarded worthily all who lived righteous lives. Numerous stories are told of the very high esteem in which righteous non-Jews were held, even to the extent of inheriting the world to come, in which unrighteous Jews were not to share. There is this to be said about the teacher in the gospels: The sayings which are attributed to him exhibit a deeply religious soul, fervent in its closeness to God, and conscious of this relation to Him. But who that is acquainted with Jewish literature will say that Jesus is the only Jew whose soul was linked to the Almighty, and whose every heart-beat responded to the holy will of the Divine?

The hope expressed by thinking men today that a time might come when the world will unite itself in the Fatherhood of God finds this expression in the modern ⁷³Jewish prayer: "May the time not be distant, O God, when thy name shall be worshipped over all

the earth, when unbelief shall disappear, and error be no more * * * May all created in thine image, recognize they are brethren, so that they, one in spirit and one in fellowship may be forever united before thee. Then shall thy Kingdow be established on earth, and the word of thine ancient seer be fulfilled. The Eternal shall rule forever and aye. "On that day, the Lord will be One, and His name will be One."

Throughout all these ages, this world-hope has come down to mankind and has now become an ideal, and a uniting, cementing conception. Thoroughly, originally and vitally Jewish, it appeals to us through all of our religious inspiration, urging us onward, to establish between ourselves and our fellowmen a kinship founded on God's Fatherhood. What a profound social effect a sincere application of this conception would have upon our rivalries, our struggles, our injustices, and our selfishness!

The Brotherhood of Man and Brotherly Love.

In the discussion of brotherhood and love, or as some prefer to say, brotherly love, we start where Christianity ought to start, namely, with the Levitical injunction, "Thou shalt love thy brother as thyself."

The Jew who uses this, however, uses what is his own, while the Christian borrows this from the Pentateuch. The idea of brotherly love is perhaps the richest ethical possession of Christianity; perhaps this is the reason why Christians so often overlook the original source.

The accusation has often been made that the injunction as originally given never was intended to be universal, and that the term "neighbor" in it referred only to fellow-Hebrews. Aside from the fact that this is not so, the application in the gospels must then also be so, for both times was it spoken to Israelites. The universality of this injunction and another almost exactly like it, can be proved from another context, in which almost the same words are used, and in which the meaning is identical. "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in any land, ye shall not vex him; as one born in the land among you, shall be the stranger that sojourns with you, and thou shalt love him as thyself. For ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." The word "neighbor" does not occur here; but the term "stranger" is even stronger, and most decisively refutes the accusation that the love commanded was intended only for a fellow-Hebrew. Even in those days, the Hebrews had seen enough to open their eyes to heartless hatred born of national narrowness, and they, not a later one who sprang from their loins, first gave forth the word which may,

when we shall have taken it to heart sufficiently, help to make away with groundless prejudices. Yet even before this, if the results of the higher criticism be adopted in judging the chronology of the Biblical books—Israel had already been commanded “not to abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother” and “not to abhor and Egyptian,” because he was a “stranger in his land.”

Nor was the idea of brotherly love confined only to the Five Books. It had become a part of the social life of the Israelitish people; perhaps not of all Israelites, was this true. Nor could it be expected, if so few among us even 2000 years after the newer dispensation practice so little of it. Yet not even from one generation of teachers was it lost. The prophetic insistence was no less strong than the Mosaic or Pentateuchal, and the voices of the prophets found reverberating echoes in the teachings of the rabbis. The corruption of the kings and their followers who sought to engulf the ideals of Judaism in the foreign cults which they introduced, was overcome by the power of the prophetic appeal; and the smoke of thousands of sacrifices did not choke the voices of those whom that prophet represented, who thundereth forth: “Love, I desire, not sacrifice.” The vain burn offerings and the empty sacrifices of splendor found more than a lasting opponent in the spirit of that mighty Micah whose words will live long after heathen cults shall have been

forgotten, and whose conception will endure as long as man has faith in his Maker. For him religion has its origin not in externals and rites, but in the very heart of humankind itself; and what he said is not like the sacrifice which may be consumed by a short-lived ritual fire; rather is it eternal like the unquenchable fire of the soul itself: ⁷⁸“Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the Most High? Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old; will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams or with myriads of streams of oil; He hath told thee O man, what is good and what the Lord doth require of thee: But to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God.” Who can say that this does not define brotherliness as the very essence of religion? The more so is this true in the light of the manner in which the rabbis defined, ⁷⁹“walking with God,” namely, the being like Him, merciful, compassionate, tender and just.

To the Biblical teachers, the virtue of brotherly love was second in importance to justice, and the number of references is not as large as one could desire. But neither is there a multiplicity of such references in the New Testament, though from pretensions made by ministers and theologians, we might think that this ideal occupied a place of no small importance on every page. As a matter of fact the New Testament passages on

brotherly love are so few that one feels that without the references to the Old Testament, the New Testament has contributed very little to this noble ideal. But possibly the reason that so little appears, is the fact that this teaching already was a deeply-rooted one in the minds of Jesus and his immediate followers and their contemporaries. It was taken for granted—and it didn't require nearly as much emphasis then, as it does now. The Golden Rule and the parable of the Good Samaritan are the best of the near-original contributions on this matter. The "rule" has its counterpart and prototype in the famous words of Hillel already quoted. ⁸⁰"What is hateful unto thee, do thou not do to anyone else." But of all that we find, there is nothing more sublime whether in the Old or the New dispensation than the words of a writer, whose name though unknown, shall yet live on: ⁸¹"Wherefore have we fasted, and thou seest us not? Have we afflicted ourselves and thou regardest us not? * * * Is this the fast that I have chosen, a day that a man afflicteth his soul * * * Is not this rather the fast that I have chosen—to open the snares of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke; to let the oppressed go free; and to break asunder every yoke? Is it not to distribute thy bread to the hungry, and to bring the afflicted poor into thy house; when thou seest the naked that thou shouldst clothe him, and that thou shouldst not hide thyself from

thine own flesh? If thou remove from the midst of thee the yoke, the stretching out of the finger, and the speaking wickedly; if thou pour out to the hungry thy soul and satisfy the afflicted soul, then shall thy light shine forth in the darkness and thy obscurity be as a noonday * * * and thou shalt be called the repairer of the breaches and the restorer of paths to the dwelling-place."

We have already intimated that we could wish to find in the Bible much more than we do on the topic that has now become one of the world's cherished ideals. The paucity is the more marked simply because so much has been made of the idea both by the church and society. The theological books on the New Testament which contain so much upon this theme are elaborations of their own author's ideas, not the thoughts and sayings of the Biblical writers, and all that the Bible says on "brotherly love" can be encompassed in a very few pages of an octavo size volume. Much more is found in the later sources, especially the Talmudic. We should keep in mind that brotherly love in the broad sense that we give it, is a comparatively modern ideal and one that is the outgrowth of the complexity of modern society. Even in our days, with all of our education and broad-mindedness, we look down upon those who are of another race or color. And prior to the great war our masses found it very difficult to apply the principle of brotherly love

to any but Americans—and then not all Americans were included in our love. Differences of faith, sectional strife and racial characteristics, make decidedly difficult the application of this ethical teaching, and among the ancients also, racial distinctions, tribal differences, and national hatred made impossible that universal interpretation which many moderns give to the Bible commandments of love. We must not forget historical impossibilities, and we must see the whole life of both the Old and New Testament peoples in their true perspective. In the Occident we may well say that “love your neighbor as yourself” could be applied to us in our relation with any nation anywhere or anybody anywhere. We here may feel that now that we know mankind, we may learn to love anyone whether he be of our faith or not, or of our nation or not. We know that human nature is alike all over; that there are good men and bad men among all people, all nations and all faiths. But how could so wide a meaning have been given to these words by the Law-giver himself in Leviticus, who spoke only to Hebrews and knew only their immediate neighbors, or by Jesus who spoke only to Jews? The best that can be said is that these commandments certainly did apply to non-Hebrews or non-Jews who lived among the Israelites when these words were uttered. But the time was not ripe for giving these words a universal application. Nor

are they given this today except by so few that the number is hardly large enough to be considered. It is an extremely high ideal, and one not easily realized. Some years ago it seemed as though civilized mankind was on the road to a deeper appreciation of the importance of this great teaching. But the horrible violations of every rule of civilized warfare by the Central Powers has set this hope back again, unless, indeed, it be that the horror of their acts may so affect men that they will see with quicker understanding the beauty and the worth of brotherly love—both in war and in peace.

In this connection we may indicate the utter futility, in matters of practice, of the oft-quoted precept of Jesus: "But I say unto you that hear, love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you; to him that smiteth you on the one cheek, give him the other also, and from him that taketh away thy cloak, withhold not thy coat also; give to everyone that asketh thee, and of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again." Nationally, as well as individually, this precept is impossible of realization. Just think for a minute where we would be—where the civilized world would be—if we had applied this principle in our recent crisis, and permitted ourselves and the civilized world to be deprived and robbed of

every avenue of industry and achievement which contributes to life!

And yet the murders, the depredations and the violations of civilized warfare are being committed by Christian nations—and the consuming irony—the arch-fiend of the Central Powers claims God as his aid! He was the nominal head of the Church in Germany, and the Christians whom he governed are also disciples of Jesus. What a terrible inconsistency, what a travesty on religion, what a violation of these magnificent words are the acts of the so-called Christian nations! The matter would be one of lighter vein had these countries not been fighting supposedly in his name and for his principles. And indeed is this not but a repetition of what has been going on for these twenty centuries—the believing in one thing, the doing of another? One often wonders what would be the mental state of the Galilean teacher if he perchance would return and find his Jewish teachings, renamed and appropriated by others, but yet violated in almost every respect by those very ones who claim him as their own, and who acknowledge him as their law-giver and savior. No more beautiful words and no finer sentiment towards enemies was ever uttered; yet quoted and requoted, taught and learned by all Christendom—it still is only a sentiment, whose practice is universally unknown.

To revert again to “brotherly love.” While it is true that the Central Empires violated

every rule of conduct in their relations with their enemies, let us not forget the bigoted prejudices within our own country. The law of brotherly love preached every Sunday to millions of people, finds as little realization among the masses as do many other of the great commandments. And many of those very ones who call themselves after the name of Jesus are the worst offenders. The Christian ministers have a duty. It is the sacred duty of teaching their parishioners to exterminate the vile prejudice that exists in clubs, hotels, fraternities, and sororities, against the blood and flesh descendants of their savior. One would not expect anti-Semitic prejudice in America; yet it exists, and its poisonous influence is given almost free play. It has been truthfully said that if Jesus were to return to earth, he would turn away in wretched despair from those who presume to be his followers, and seek consolation and peace among those lowly co-religionists of his, into whose faith he was born, of whose ancestors' flesh and bone he was a part, but who now are deemed of clay inferior to that of the modern banner-bearers of the precepts of this ancient teacher.

There is something more to be said about the command of Jesus, ⁸³“to him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and from him that taketh away thy cloak, withhold not thy coat also.” This was not

a rabbinical principle. The rabbis were students of human nature—they knew human instincts and human habits of mind. If they did not have a Darwin, a Wallace or a Spencer, they still knew that self-preservation was the first law of nature and they knew that a human being will not ordinarily permit himself to be injured and robbed without defense or retaliation. They did, however, approach the principle here set forth by Jesus. Indeed there are some authorities who say that this is but an extension of the rabbinical principle, ⁸⁴“acting within the limits of justice,” that is to say, acting more than justly. Be this as it may, the very fundamental idea of self-preservation is here involved, and men will not do that which openly and surely means danger to themselves. After all, if an ideal is valuable pragmatically, and therefore only insofar as it may serve mankind in practice, this principle which cannot be put into practice must lose a good deal of its old, especially homiletic, value. Is it not true that whenever mankind shall reach a point where each one who is mistreated will court more mistreatment, and each one who has been taken advantage of, will leave himself willingly open to greater disadvantage—there will be no need for ideals, for we will surely have passed the stage where ideals will be of any use!

One need not spend a long time in the

study of Jewish sources to find that brotherly love was a very potent virtue among the Jews who lived both before and after the new canon. In the second century before the common era—and some say even the third,—the writer of the Book of Tobit makes him tell his son ⁸⁵“to do that to no man which thou hatest.” A century later the writer or writers of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, put into the mouth of Issachar this counsel to his sons, ⁸⁶“love the Lord your God, and your neighbor, and have compassion on the poor and the weak.” He later emphasizes this by telling them what he did: ⁸⁷“If any man were in distress, I joined my sighs with his, and I shared my bread with the poor. I loved the Lord, likewise, every man with all my heart.” Nor is this traditional patriarch the only one who feels the weight of the well-known double commandment. Dan, too, is made to say to his sons, ⁸⁸“love the Lord thru all your life and one another with a true heart.” ⁸⁹Benjamin says also, “fear ye the Lord, and love your neighbor.” Sometimes one feels that it must have been in a moment of prophetic inspiration that the authors wrote these words. Surely they did not foresee that later they would be needed as evidence that these virtues were commanded even in their day.

The Talmudic and Midrashic references are plentiful. Contrary to the allegations of

many whose knowledge ought to be profounder, the rabbis believed that the ⁹⁰“beginning and the end of the Torah was the doing of deeds of loving kindness.” A bit of information like this must strike rather heavily upon those who have the current opinion of the belittled pharisaic rabbis.

These same teachers believed that ⁹¹“mercy and compassion are the great virtues which bring with them their own rewards, for they are recompensed with mercy and compassion from the mercy-seat of God.” In the same section in this source we find the thought that if people are kind and merciful to each other ⁹²God will be merciful to them. And further on, Rabbi Samuel bar Nehemiah cries out: “Woe unto the sinners who have perverted loving-kindness.” There is a story to the effect that when Moses commanded his people to ⁹³“walk after the Lord your God,” they took alarm at this task, and they asked how it was possible for man to walk after God ⁹⁴“who hath His way in the storm and His path in the whirlwind, the dust of whose feet are the clouds; ⁹⁵whose way is in the sea and whose path is through the mighty rivers.” And Moses explained as we have already indicated, ⁹⁶ that to walk after God, means to imitate His mercy and loving kindness by clothing the naked, visiting the sick, comforting the mourner and burying the dead.

What have we not heard about the narrowness and the rigidity of the Law? Nothing has been too opprobrious for the pharisaic rabbis, who are believed to have twisted and spoiled what little good there was in Judaism. We never hear of the gentleness of the rabbis; of their kindness and their humanitarianism, of the sincerity and truthfulness which characterized their lives and teachings, and of their beautiful patience. The stock-in-trade books have no room for this. Yet when we turn to Jewish sources, there is nothing plainer than the finer characteristics of the Jewish teachers, sages, rabbis, and their disciples. They loved mankind and believed in human worth and dignity. The verse in Genesis which says that ⁹⁷God created man in His image, "is the greatest in the Torah," said ben Azzai, "for look how it exalts man." ⁹⁸It is true that Akiba disagrees with him. But he says that the verse, "love your neighbor as yourself, is the greatest principle in the Torah." In another place we are told that God said unto Israel, ⁹⁹"all that I seek from you my sons, is that you love and honor each other." The words of Resh Lakesh remind us of certain ideas in the New Testament: ¹⁰⁰"He who even lifts his hand against his fellowman, though he does not smite him, is wicked. In commenting on the verse "thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart," the rabbis say: ¹⁰¹"One might think that one

ought not to smite his brother, or injure him, or even curse him. But it is more than that. One must not even hate his brother in his heart." There might have been some haughtiness, some self-complacency and hard-heartedness among the Pharisees and the pharisaic rabbis. But certainly the few such are so outnumbered by the many of the higher type that the accusation ought to be forever silenced. Was tenderness a characteristic only of Rabbi Yehuda, who said that he ¹⁰²who violated the principles of loving kindness, is like one who denies a fundamental principle of religion? Was there only one rabbi who commanded his students to be of the ¹⁰³"disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing it, loving mankind and bringing it near to God's Law?" Could it have been a bad lot who taught with Rabbi Elozer that the doing ¹⁰⁴of deeds of loving kindness is greater even than almsgiving; and that he who ¹⁰⁵loves his neighbors, who is near to his relatives, who marries off his poor sister's daughter, and who lends to the poor in times of distress, to him does this passage in Scripture apply: ¹⁰⁶"If thou seest the naked, and thou clothe him—if thou hidest not thyself from thine own flesh—then shalt thou call, and the Lord will answer, thou shalt cry and He will say, 'here am I.' "

The list of references in which brotherly love was inculcated is not exhausted. They

would fill a good sized volume, nor would they be dry and uninteresting. The sayings, the parables and the stories are many—no wonder the Jew has not forgotten them. If religious precept is to be judged by result, the charitable endeavors of the Jews in the last few years alone would bear incontrovertible evidence of the lasting power of their precepts of loving-kindness and brotherly love.

There are some things that all Jews do not know; not all know the minute details of the laws regarding a thousand things which make up the religious life of the strictly observant Jew; not all are acquainted with the prayers and blessings which lit up the path of the Jew of old, when all about him was thick, hopeless darkness; not all the Jews know their own spiritual truths. But there is one thing that every Jew knows; there is one thing that every Jew feels; there is one thing that every Jew learns, whether from his parents or from experience, and that is, that the heart of a Jew feels deeply for anyone that suffers. He knows that he ought to be charitable, and that his people are charitable, that his faith is charitable, and that the real essence of Jewish philosophy and Jewish life is the practice of the social virtues, among which is not the least important are loving-kindness and brotherly love. How can he help knowing this? Through the successive generations of all his forbears he has heard and re-

heard the words of ben Zakkai: ¹⁰⁷“Do not take it to heart that the Temple is in ruins. There is left a means of atonement as good as the altar which was destroyed. It is the doing deeds of loving-kindness—for hath not God said, ¹⁰⁸‘I desire love more than sacrifice.’” What else could that Jew do who still calls himself by the name of Israel, and believes in his God, when a thousand teachers have re-echoed in his ears: ¹⁰⁹“Be like God; as He is gracious so be you gracious; as He is merciful so be you merciful.” How it hurts to be told that only with the new dispensation were the gates of mercy and charity opened!

We have considered only a few of the New Testament passages, and a few from the Jewish sources. Our purpose is to throw light on the idea of brotherly love, previous to and soon after, the canonization of the New Testament writings. We hope that we have cited enough references to show that this ideal was distinctly Jewish, and that it was as vital in the life of the Jew of the centuries gone by as it is in the life of the Jew of today. For a proof of the latter statement, let some one tabulate the bequests of Christians and non-sectarians to Jewish institutions, and those of Jews to Christian and non-sectarian institutions. The results will be abundant proof.

¹¹⁰According to the teachings of the rabbis, the path to salvation in this world and to

bliss in the next, is open to all men. Religious observances, the Temple, and sacrificial services, are not indispensable conditions to the attainment of these goals. Moral purity and a loving heart are the major requirements. Contrast with what has just been said, the statement of the Christian theologian Wendt:¹¹¹ The pharisaic scribes, the recognized teachers and patterns of righteousness set the worst example to the people of this abuse of the Law. They expounded the Law with all manner of casuistical subtleties * * As quibbling sophistry trifling with the Law, it is ludicrous; but it is revolting when we regard it as the teaching of a religion which had the highest pretensions, and as directing men how to win the Divine favor and eternal life. And what evil qualities sheltered under the cloak of zeal for the righteousness of the Law, ambitious vanity which vaunted its superiority in good works; haughty self-complacency, arrogantly comparing and contrasting itself with others; uncharitable and harsh judgment with which they spurned those of less righteous repute, and hypocritical zeal, which under the pretext of reforming others sought but to enhance their own reputation for righteousness. The reproofs leveled by Jesus against the Pharisees show us plainly what vicious consequences resulted from this external zeal for the Law." And to prove this gratuitous outburst, this great theologian

cites not one passage from the whole Jewish literature but refers to another German work¹¹² and to the New Testament! Now to cite a passage, from Lazarus, the great Jewish theologian: ¹¹³“Perhaps no province of human activity can show such perfect congruity between idea and life, between moral requirements and actual reality, as the Israelitish race has attained since ancient times, in realizing the humanitarian idea in fulfilling the requirement of charity. The soul of the Jewish people is so impregnated and enthralled with the duty of love of neighbor that it is not left wholly unperformed by individuals of a moderately acute moral sense, even by positively reprehensible characters. And no wonder! For how this duty has ever been urged upon the people, how it has been expounded and inculcated from every point of view!”

Do you know the real difference between the Christian and the Jewish author? It is one only of knowledge. Lazarus was thoroughly at home in Jewish sources in which he was an authority; Wendt takes his view from the New Testament, bolsters it up by knowledge gained at second hand, and then violates all canons of scholarship by totally ignoring all Jewish sources. If he doesn't know them, one feels he ought to learn them; if not in the original, certainly in the translations of which there are many. What a perversion of

fact and justice! Can Jews who know even a little, imagine Hillel uncharitable; Sham-mai self-complacent; Jochanan ben Zakkai, arrogant; the great Yehuda Hanassi, self-righteous, and the rest, the Joshuas, the Eliezers, the Yehudas—all seeing things with hypocritical zeal and reforming pretexts! What a travesty upon the justice of Christian scholarship, and upon the Christianity of Christian apologetes! Has the Jew not given the world enough, and has he not suffered enough to merit at least at the hands of specialists, that they know his story before publishing false and unholy judgments of it?

Social Justice

Ask a laboring man who has been on a strike or who is dissatisfied; ask a labor leader or even an agitator, what the cause of the trouble in the labor world is, and invariably you will hear the reply, "we want justice." The idea of asking for and getting that which labor calls "justice" has become a very obsession not only with the working masses but with all those who see pointed injustices and patent iniquities in social and industrial life. Men want bread and want the time which will enable them not only to eat it, but also to enjoy it. They want

health, strength, leisure and opportunity to grow. Workers feel that they are justified in desiring these. We need not encroach upon any of the economic theories to realize that when fortunes of fabulous sizes are accumulated on one side, and misery and wretchedness indescribable occur on the other, there is something wrong. We need not be students of political economy to understand that when in one household a part of the family is overfed, and the other part is underfed, when there is more than enough for all—a fact which is evidenced by a large waste, there is a matter there for correction. Nor need we be philosophers to understand that the human family comprises but a larger and much more complex household, for which too, there is more than enough, but in which many are underfed, many overfed, and much wasted. The child of the worker who barely ekes out a livelihood is entitled by the right of having life, to have also those advantages which develop, strengthen, better and enoble life. The end of a life-time spent in contributing to a community the best of one's efforts, should not be made miserable and wretched when these efforts can no longer be forthcoming. The weak and those unable to work ought not to be bartered away and made to make room for the stronger workers, merely to increase the fortunes of individuals, while being made thus more

dependent themselves. And where this is done, those deprived through inability, ought not to have to starve, to degenerate or to commit suicide, when we are more than rich enough to provide some kind of fair and honorable means for their subsistence. If we need and seek a certain kind of foreign population to do work which native Americans do not do, we ought to provide some means for taking care of these foreigners until they are assimilated by the process of Americanization, or until at any rate they earn a livelihood, which will keep them from becoming insane from privation, or deluded by false theories of economy and labor. In the splendid magnificence of our untold resources we ought not to have want, poverty, and wretchedness except in such instances where the breadwinners through sheer laziness, intemperance or unwillingness bring these upon themselves. But children, child-bearing and nursing women, sick and decrepit humans, ought not to be made the more unhappy, when the exercise of justice could avoid it. It is not so much the desire for luxuries and splendor, as the horror of dependence and indigence or starvation, that causes the hatred and clash in the industrial world. The knowledge that breadwinners make too little to insure independence of family in case of illness or death, makes them almost desperate in the face of constantly growing for-

tunes, increasing wealth of the country, and withal a steady increase in the cost of living.

It is the cry for justice that accompanies the industrial disturbances of labor outbreaks, and though the cry manifests itself in various ways, such as strikes, lockouts to prevent strikes, mob violence, and even bomb throwing, yet it is the lack of justice which is the fundamental factor in the dissatisfaction in the rank and file of the workers.

The cry for justice is an old one; it was heard in Babylonia and Assyria; it resounded through the ranks of those who overthrew powerful Egyptian dynasties. Greece and Rome were certainly not strangers to it; and Western Europe has heard it so often that it has become a threatening storm cloud; while Eastern and Southeastern Europe have taken up this cry under the guise of Bolshevism, and are menacing civilization and life itself. Perhaps as good an example as any of national struggles for justice, and one which is closer to us on account of the part played by the Bible in our national life, is that of the early Jewish people. Their social condition in many ways was analogous to our own, and though of course, theirs was anything but an industrial country, there were injustices there too, on the part of the greedy, the corrupt and the rich, which produced conditions similar to those we normally face. The early simplicity of Israel, the rapid

growth, the accumulation of wealth, and the indifference and the injustices of the classes, were very similar to ours. Israel had passed from the rough nomadic state to that of the agricultural. The land apportioned to the tribes which had entered Canaan, had passed through different hands, and the new adjustment consequent upon a complete change of social conditions had gone well under way. With the rise of the kingdom new forces came into play, and with these new forces, came new economic conditions. The ideal ways of the wilderness—ideal now during the political and economic changes, served to reawaken in the hearts of many, a desire for a re-establishment of the old social life. ¹¹⁴ But with the increase in population and wealth consequent upon the broadening out of Israel and its larger life, there had come what always accompanies such a change,—a new economic and social era. The land that was formerly parceled out to the different tribes and clans was gradually being bought up or taken up for debts by individuals or noble families. With the increase in resources there came more distinct divisions of society and a more decisive separation of the classes. The few became wealthier and the many poorer. With the establishment of the monarchy Israel took its place beside the nations of the Orient; and in the assumption of national pretensions, the standards of liv-

ing became more complex than those of the earlier agricultural period. The splendor of the Egyptian, the Phoenician and the later Assyrian and the Damascan courts, could not be noticed without effects on that of Israel's. Imitation set in, and as this process advanced, a gradual displacement of the stern and homely habits, economic and social, of early days took place. As the more luxurious habits of other peoples began to be noted, those of Israel who had the desire, ability and wealth to imitate them, began to do so. ¹¹⁵From the ruddy, healthy, simple shepherd folk of the period of Judges, there arose a complex nation, seeking splendor and elegance and aping the other nations in their search for wealth and expansion, but finding within itself an almost impassable rift between the economically dependent and the other and smaller class which enjoyed to the full, the recently acquired blessings of increasing wealth and growing magnificence. A population of Jewish and non-Jewish paupers and slaves sprang up. ¹¹⁶The privileges of the Jewish slave, though much greater according to the Law than those of the non-Jewish, availed little. Both slaves and dependents, Jewish and non-Jewish, were used as much as possible to serve the purpose of those who had been favored by the administration with offices and posts of influence, or who had friends who were favorites with

the powers in control or who were themselves in power.

Just as it was true that it was the object of the rich and the influential to keep the dependents in their grasp, so was it equally true that as long as the latter were in this condition, they could never rise above the want line. For their masters had the keys to whatever solutions would solve the problems involved in their wretchedness. Only by subversion of the interests of society in general could the interests of the nobility and the rich be served, and in this subversion the so-called leaders of the commonwealth had no small share. In fact, it was only to the mighty prophetic mind¹¹⁷ alone, that society was composed of others besides the nobility and the priesthood. To the political and priestly leaders, those whom we designate by the phrase "the common people" were of little concern, the more especially after they had contributed to the wants and power of their oppressors. Opportunity for redress there was little. For it seemed that the principal duties of the judges and administrators—priests may have been discharging the duties of both—were the proper taxing and collecting of money for the maintenance of the State first, and then for the sustenance of those very ones who ground down the poor. Nor could anything else be expected, when we consider that these officers were minions

of the king who held their places by virtue of their "pull" or influence with those at the Court.

It was under these adverse conditions that the rich grew richer and the poor poorer. Overwhelming poverty threw many into the worst moral condition, sapping the desire for healthy life and normal growth. Where it is difficult or impossible to earn a decent living, people will very often get an indecent and immoral one. And on the other hand, where wealth is acquired without regard to method, and where it therefore beclouds the moral and ethical sensibilities, immorality and vice follow. Thus it was among the Israelites during the days of the prophets. Lack of justice and righteousness became the obnoxious fault. Unrighteousness possessed alike to a large extent the rich and the poor, the judges and the judged, and the priests and the worshippers. The rights of others were disregarded, and where injustice and corruption could be of any avail for the enrichment of those in power, these were resorted to. Promises of luxury and bribes became means of corruption, and where these did not suffice, oppression through the tools of those in power was made use of. ¹¹⁸There was little hope for righteousness and justice; for corruption cannot beget social justice, nor can selfishness be the parent of economic equality. He who had the courage to speak

uprightly or dared to utter words of protest, was hated; a judge who gave just decisions was abhorred, while those who profited from the unjust decisions, from the oppression of others, and from vice and bribery, grew fat in the enjoyment of their feasts and banquets. The wretched condition of the dependents interested them but little. Their main desire was to get the most out of life, no matter at what expense to others. The value of human life and the regard for high ideals sank in the general degradation of the extremely rich and the wretchedly poor, and a slavish materialism took the place of the high ethical aims and aspirations evolved and taught by the great teachers.

With slight changes here and there, the description of ancient Israel's development could well fit us. In a few leaps and bounds we have emerged from a small nation in the extreme West, to a first rate power wielding a world-wide influence. Our captains of industry in peace times command empires richer and greater than kingdoms of days gone by. Our fortunes have swollen into fabulous figures. Our power has grown so great that comparison with that of a century ago is altogether out of question. The ancient landmarks have long ago been removed, and they who kept apace with the growth of the land have reached a commanding position of wealth and influence. The simple agricul-

tural life has to a large extent been transformed into a fast, nerve-racking industrial one; and the standards of living have so changed that we can hardly believe that they were as simple and as natural as they really were. New ideals have loomed up before the growing generations, and that which was sought after half a century ago, is now seldom thought of. Our habits of mind and body have changed, and our desires, pleasures and pastimes have their birth and direction in new surroundings and under new conditions and stimuli. The forces which molded character have been changed and in many ways corrupted; and the growth of character itself has not kept pace with the developments in the fields of industrial and economic achievement. We, too, had set our eyes upon the luxurious standards of other countries, and a good deal of our old simplicity has given way to continental extravagance. It is true that we do not have the nobility and all that foppery which that institution carries with it. But we are rapidly developing certain traditions with regard to wealth and family. Wealth, rather than character, is more than likely to command position, and though we have no titled class, we are unconsciously developing a title standard, based, if not on the possession of lands and estates, on the possession of money and monied interests. The poor have been grow-

ing poorer in the proportion that the rich have become richer, and the higher does the standard of living of the rich grow, the lower does that of the dependent become. Never before did it cost so much to live; yet never before has the earth yielded her products so bounteously. The cost of living does not seem to be regulated by the law of supply and demand, but rather by the ability to pay because wealth seems plentiful. With all the increased yield of farm products, the number of poor seems to diminish but little proportionately. The increased wealth goes somewhere, for year by year our property valuations grow. But it is the large fortunes which seem to reap the benefits of our increasing production, while the poor remain poor and the dependents are still among us. The desire on the part of our government to regulate, through commissions, the price of necessities, and its success, tells a tale of unjust price manipulations, and suits by the Attorney General of the United States, throw some strong light upon the arbitrary setting of prices; and the law of supply and demand seems to have played a minor part in the cost of many commodities. But the result in general has already been stated: Vast fortunes on the one side, an imitating, aping middle class straining every nerve to accumulate fortunes in the centre, and enervating, grinding and dehumanizing wretchedness and

poverty on the other side; a point of view highly materialistic; a perverted idea of the purpose of life; a blunting of high ideals, and a consequent deadening of those sensibilities which make for the highest type of character. Men are willing to sell their labors, their bodies and their souls for money.

It was for the purpose of displacing a condition like this, and the consequences of its moral deterioration that the great prophets¹¹⁹ preached in ancient Israel. They lifted their mighty voices against a confused materialism and pleaded for that social justice and righteousness which we strive for in this twentieth century, and for the establishment of which we threw ourselves into the great war. They believed that the evil lay in the willful misunderstanding of the true relation that should exist between man and man. They taught that the deepest devotion to God could be realized only by the fondest service to mankind; and they decried the constant violation of this great teaching. Within their mighty souls they felt that the strength of the belief in their God lay primarily in the interpretation and application of the ethical teachings arising from belief in Him, and they labored for an active and virile realization of their point of view. ¹²⁰Their philippics against the besetting sins,—the crushing of the poor, the taking of bribes and the corruption and unrighteousness, were but their

means of destroying the structure which an unsocial and an unjust viewpoint had erected. They felt that their nation was being consumed by the wickedness of injustice and unholiness; they feared that the soul of their people was losing its finer aspirations in the overwhelming chaos of individual and national demoralization. ¹²¹“Run through the streets of Jerusalem,” says Jeremiah, “and see if you can find one man who deals out justice and seeks the truth, and if you can, I will pardon its sins.” The indictment is strong, but this condition seemed real enough to the overwrought mind of the prophet.

¹²²Out of the general degradation incident to the breaking down of the religious conceptions, emanated the numerous social evils. Our common sins in times of peace were theirs, too—debauchery, intemperance, adultery, murder and the rest. The idle rich had their orgies and indulged in their misdeeds, and the city had its lewdness and its shame. The land of the poor was appropriated, and they were unable to get juridical satisfaction. ¹²³“They hate him who acts righteously, and they take from the poor what belongs to him, robbing him of his lands and his crops.” This is the lament of Amos. Many there were who enjoyed life and their ill-gotten splendor; there were those who called the evil ¹²⁴ good, and the good, evil, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that called the

bitter sweet, and the sweet bitter. But only by disregarding or blinding themselves to the lofty teachings of religion and right living, could these obtain the kind of life which wealth on the one hand, and moral slothfulness on the other, made them crave. ¹²⁵Unrighteous laws were made to benefit particular interests, and with the assistance of corrupt judges, who applied judgment wrongly, widows were made a prey; orphans were robbed; the poor were put at a terrible disadvantage, and were later, when the struggle became too strong, sold. ¹²⁶Vanity, luxury, bribery, corruption, oppression, hopelessness and violence—these seemed to combine to swallow up the needy and to make the weaker more wretched and miserable. ¹²⁷And many of those who caused this degradation owned great vineyards and lived in palaces. They revelled in gay parties and at magnificent banquets. ¹²⁸They indulged themselves in the choicest drinks, the costliest viands, and in the grandest amusements. In winter they had their beautiful winter palaces; in summer their days were passed in their luxurious summer homes. In beauteous extravagance and in gorgeous style were these furnished while the female occupants strutted about; they were like the fat, sleek cows of ancient Bashan; haughty, proud and bedecked with ornaments, they demanded more and greater splendor,—urging on their husbands to re-

newed misdealings, oppressive if necessary—to keep them supplied with the daintiest fads and costliest fancies copied from the nations round about. ¹²⁹But for the poor, for the widow, for the fatherless, and the needy, there was little concern, and for the plaintive appeals of the weak and the oppressed they had neither ear nor heart.

With righteous indignation, stern rebuke, and towering rage did the prophets set out to change this social obliquity. They saw just wherein their people had missed the mark of religion and righteousness; they saw wherein the injustice lay and how it could be remedied. But they had no definite social program. All that they could do and endeavored to do, was to reiterate and emphasize the teachings of their faith and recall wandering Israel to the true worship of God, in the manner set forth by them. With unexcelled might and superhuman foresight they sounded Israel's salvation and the salvation of mankind: Righteousness and social justice—based on man's faith in God and service to man. How truly remarkable was the forevision of these prophets who taught us how to worship God in truth, and how to realize this worship in human service!

Upon this thought, Micah based his great dictum: ¹³⁰“It hath been told thee O man what is good and what the Lord doth require of thee, but to do justly, to love kindness, and

to walk humbly with your God." To the prophetic mind, the application of justice and kindness to every day life was the only remedy for social evils. According to their belief, regeneration could come about only through faith in God, and through godliness to men. The worship of Yahveh had no meaning, if it did not realize itself in ethical deed. The burden of their message was the doing of the right on the ground of faith in a righteous and holy God. Nor was this righteousness, or as the Hebrew has it generally "justice," to be exercised at odd times or in the sanctuary alone. It was to be perennial, motivating all the thoughts and activities of life, and pervading their every social endeavor, as the air pervades everything above the surface of the earth. It was no small thing; it was the very life-principle of human existence. The whole social and economic fabric was put on an ethical basis, and the solution of the problems which arose in social intercourse was to be directed from the ethical view point. Organized religious institutions were to be subservient to this idea. Religion was made eminently ethical, and this point was most strongly stressed. Men could offer sacrifices and offerings, and indulge themselves in sacred music, but at bottom there must be the proper ethical spirit. ¹³¹"I hate and despise your feasts, and I will not smell your offerings (saith the Lord), but let jus-

tice run like water, and righteousness like a mighty stream." ¹³²Wash from wrong-doing thy heart, O Jerusalem, how long wilt thou let lodge within thee the thoughts of wickedness? ¹³³Hear, O Earth, I will bring evil upon this people, the fruit of their thoughts; because unto my words they have not been attentive, and as regards my law, they have despised it." To what purpose serveth me the frankincense which cometh from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far off country? Your burnt offerings are not acceptable, and your sacrifices are not agreeable to me." Thus hath said the Lord the God of Israel: ¹³⁴"Amend your ways, and your deeds, and I will permit you to dwell in this place. Do not rely on the words of falsehood saying, 'the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord,' as they say. But if ye truly amend your ways and your deeds, if ye thoroughly execute justice between a man and his neighbor; if ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, the widow, and do not shed innocent blood in this place, and walk not after other gods to your own hurt, then will I permit you to dwell in this place, in the land" * * *

¹³⁵"What are your burnt offerings * * * and the fatted beasts and the blood of bullocks and sheep and he-goats; * * * continue no more to bring an oblation of deceit; incense of abomination is it unto me * * I cannot bear misdeed with festive gatherings * * * your

appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a burden unto me * * * Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean, put away the evil of your deeds from before my eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, do justice to the fatherless and plead for the widow." These words cannot be misunderstood. The worship of God was to be realized in service to fellowman. He who served his God truthfully could not wilfully oppress man; he could not wilfully disregard the demands of justice; he surely could not wilfully turn a deaf ear to the pleadings of the weak, the distressed and the dependent. The truly religious man who reveres God and loves his fellowman, ¹³⁶ glories not in his wisdom, nor in his might, nor yet in his riches; but he glories in that he knows God, and understands that He is the "Lord who exercises mercy, justice and righteousness, in the earth." "For in these things" like God, does he "take a delight."

With such teachings and ideals did the prophets attempt to eradicate the unrighteousness of their times. They believed that social justice and social love, were fundamental to life; and that the proper application and observance of these social laws, would in the end, bring about harmony in society. Stern justice, alone, could not suffice as the guiding principle. Therefore they pleaded for mercy and loving-kindness.

They had visions of the day when mankind would live in accordance with these eternal verities, and they hoped with an eternal—if sometimes a wavering hope—that the government of Israel would become the model and exemplar of such social justice. They believed as we do today, that the oppression of the weak, the bribing of the corrupt, and the depravity and the immorality of the unjust, could not thrive where there is a definite and a rigid sense of duty on the part of the stronger toward the weaker; nor could it exist when man would once realize what he owes to his neighbor. And this belief was born not merely out of a vague sense of justice and not out of a shallow or sentimental love for mankind, but out of the deep realization of the fundamental fact that the group can survive only through the dominance of the higher social interests, and through the cultivation of those ideals which teach, inspire and spread the practices of the high, ethical and Godly conduct for which these peerless teachers stood.

Against that kind of a civilization in which the few prospered at the expense of many; or in which the many suffered to support the few, Judaism has always protested. But at no time has the protest been keener, nor has the cry raised against it been more penetrating, than during the days of that period in which Israel had a land of its own, where

it could feel the deadening grasp of unsocial and unjust practices. Time and again those mighty teachers lifted up their matchless voices in behalf of those to whom fortune was unfavorable, and against those whose position prompted them to take advantage of this condition. ¹³⁷And the strength of the prophetic message lay not only in its challenge to the individual, but also in its call to the commonwealth. Whether it be Judah or Israel or a citizen of either land to whom the castigation applied, the burdens of the prophet's messages are unmistakable. ¹³⁸No land and no citizen of any land can have any right, human or divine, to arrogate to itself or to himself the privilege of oppressing or mistreating those who may come within its or his power. On the contrary, by divine example, and by virtue of the duty of each one to follow the divine example, ¹³⁹it is the bounden duty to do justly, to act righteously, and to conduct one's self blamelessly towards his neighbor. A nation of wrong-doers cannot form a righteous commonwealth; therefore must that people which would perform a righteous mission in the economy of the universe, become individually righteous; this was the task of every Israelite, in order that the kingdom of Israel may become the exemplar of that social justice which was first born in the teachings of their greatest and grandest leader, Moses. If the nation is to

be saved, the individuals must be reformed. Only in the light of such a point of view can many of the prophets' words be understood. ¹⁴⁰"Sow righteousness for yourselves so that you may reap the fruits of loving-kindness; cultivate the fallow ground and at the proper time seek God that He come, and that righteousness be taught among you." The passages in the first chapter of Isaiah quoted above, appeal too, to individual righteousness, in the hope that the realization of this will make a righteous nation. ¹⁴¹"Through justice shall Zion be redeemed, and her inhabitants through righteousness." When Jeremiah decries the ways of the king, he warns him that unless he rules in righteousness, he will drag down with him not only his own house but the whole nation as well. It is not a matter of one's own desire or whim. It is the duty of the people, and the duty as well of him who rules the people. ¹⁴²"Thus saith the Lord," says Jeremiah, "go down to the house of the King of Judah, and speak there this word. And thou shalt say, 'hear the word of the Lord, O King of Judah, that sitteth upon the throne of David and thy servants and thy people that enter in by these gates. Thus hath said the Lord: Execute justice and righteousness, and deliver him that is robbed out of the hand of the oppressor; and the stranger, the fatherless and the widow shall ye not oppress; and

do them no violence and shed no innocent blood. For if indeed you will do this, then shall ye enter in through the gates of this house, kings sitting upon the throne of David. * * * But if ye will not hear these words, I swear by myself, saith the Lord, that this house shall become a ruin * * * and I will surely change thee unto a wilderness, cities which are not inhabited.' ”

¹⁴³It was the salvation of Israel as a people that stirred the hearts of the prophets. Upon it they lavished their deepest concern and undying love, and for it they poured out their most fervent prayers. It they idealized, and for it were their most exalted truths to be lived and fulfilled. Israel was to be the kingly priesthood among whom social justice was to be enthroned and righteousness exalted; with tender mercy and loving kindness were its sons and daughters, the remnant of God's chosen, to conduct themselves. They were neither to ¹⁴⁴deceive nor to speak lies; but in the land which was to be God's own footstool, they were to take proper counsel so that the night might shine forth as the day. ¹⁴⁵Their God was to be the God of Righteousness, and His people's land the Kingdom of Righteousness; and the work of this righteousness was to be peace, and its effect was to be quietness and assurance forever, for the nation and for its citizenship.

Like the dying echoes of a distant strain

which has been taken up by a symphony before us and made real and present again, seem the impressive plaints of the ancient seers, made now the reasons for our entry into the greatest war since history began. With an alarming force does their reality impress us now. We too would have the cry for social justice answered not only for ourselves, but for all men and all nations. Our desire is it too, that this, our land, be one of individual righteousness and national purity. Our workers, too, would have justice done to them, to their offspring, to their strangers and to their dependents. Not the justice of one or that of the few; but the justice of nations do we seek. We too, desire to be a Democracy of Righteousness; and here too, would each be a doer of justice and loving-kindness. We too, are answering the prophetic call, ¹⁴⁶“to amend our ways and our deeds, and execute justice between a man and his neighbor,” and our answer now is not only for ourselves and our country, but for civilized humanity as well.

Individual Righteousness

Side by side with the growth and development of the idea of social justice there developed that of individual righteousness. It seems only natural that both should grow up as they did, yet at one time one idea seemed to be emphasized and at another time, the other. Let it not seem strange to us that

these ideas are differentiated. Apparently individual righteousness ought to inculcate community rectitude; and community righteousness ought to include individual rectitude; but it has not always been so. The time has not even yet passed when men can violate truths, obligations and duties of an altruistic or public nature, and after discharging their individual church obligations, feel that they are at one with the Creator.

Nor have the days long since passed when men could be hypocrites, scoundrels, adulterers, and even murderers, and yet be assured of salvation through certain theological processes. With many it is only the outward requirements that are heeded; as long as the rules of the church or sect are obeyed, or apparently obeyed, so long the path to everlasting life is clear. Things are fortunately changing now. Our conception of religion is higher, and righteousness is no longer only a theological term. Its meaning extends outside of the church walls, and no matter how earnest one's profession is or how loyal one's church affiliations are, one's actions outside of the church must measure up to a high standard, before one will be regarded as righteous. Hypocrisy is no longer condoned within the church walls, and social turpitude can no longer be wiped out by a mere confession of one's sins. An unchurched doer of good is accounted righteous, and even he

who shuts himself off completely from every benefit that a churchman hopes for, may be righteous and religious if he fulfills in sincerity the ethical and moral requirements of everyday life. We have transferred the meaning of "righteous" and the requirements of "righteousness" from the walled church to the unwallled world, and with this transfer has come that consequent broadening which includes all of life instead of just that part limited by the confines of a particular creed or sect. Righteousness pertains to every endeavor of life; and they are righteous who by their actions fulfill the highest demands of social, moral and religious conduct. If this definition be accepted, we have but returned to the old Jewish understanding of the term.

It was not until after the destruction of the first commonwealth that the idea of individual righteousness became dominant in Israel. Community justice no longer received the attention it had when Israel was in a land of its own. In exile the bond of solidarity was based upon the national traditions and the common spiritual possessions, and the heritage became dearer and holier as time passed. Here the individual religious consciousness became stronger, just because there was no national political life, and the truths enunciated by the prophets were applied by men to themselves just as the prophets desired that they be applied to the life

in Palestine. If the expatriation of Israel was caused by its sins, then its rehabilitation was to be brought about by its righteousness; if in aforetime it had turned away from the judgments and the precepts of its God, then did it latterly believe in the words of old: ¹⁴⁷“After the Lord God shall ye walk, and Him ye shall fear; His commandments shall ye observe, unto His voice shall ye hearken; Him shall ye serve, and unto Him shall ye cleave. For the Lord would repent, since He is ¹⁴⁸merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands and forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin.”

To develop the kind of Jewry which it would please the Lord to take back to the Promised Land, became the dynamic ideal of Ezekiel and his contemporary leaders, for there was an undying hope of a return. The prophets had been concerned about the nation as a whole; they had believed that it would be eternal, and that as long as God had witnesses on earth, so long would Israel endure. But the events of the fall and the destruction of Jerusalem, produced a change; and the stronger emphasis shifted from the people as a whole, to the individual. Personal righteousness became the key that would unlock the gates of national salvation; and individual rectitude towards God and man, based on the carrying out of His com-

mandments, became the most sacred religious duty. Jeremiah had sowed the seed when some years before he taught that ¹⁴⁹“in those days they shall say no more the fathers have eaten the sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.” Every man was to be held responsible for his own shortcomings, and he who ate the sour grapes was himself to suffer the consequences. ¹⁵⁰The fathers were no longer to be put to death on account of the sins of the children, nor yet the sons, for the sins of the fathers; but each must die for his own sin. Yet not to die, but to live was the desire of the Jew; and to live so that the restoration might come about was his self-imposed religious obligation. To be a righteous man and to realize that which the Lord desired and commanded—that was the task before the Jew of that day, even as it is the duty of the Jew today; though to accomplish this now, we do not have to return to the ancient homeland. To that obligation Ezekiel particularly gave direction. This greatest priest-prophet of the exile, who towered so high above most of his contemporaries, seemed able like his colleagues of the prophetic school, to pierce the veil which separated the human from the Divine; and he knew, too, what kind of life fulfilled the religious hopes, yearnings and aspirations of those, who like him, had been torn from the land of their birth, their early scenes, and

their hopes. He had abiding faith in his God and in his people, and he felt that these had been reserved for a fate better than that of slaves, farmers and traders for ancient Babylonia. It was because he felt all of this that he desired individual righteousness, and counseled with his people: ¹⁵¹“What mean ye that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying the fathers have eaten sour grapes, but the children’s teeth stand on edge? ‘As I live,’ saith the Lord God, ‘ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold all souls are mine; as the soul of the father so also the soul of the son, is mine; the soul that sinneth it shall die. But if a man be just, and do that which is just and right, * * * neither lifted up his eyes to idols, * * * neither defiled his neighbor’s wife * * * nor oppressed anyone; but he hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given bread to the hungry and hath clothed the naked, hath not given forth upon usury nor hath taken any increase; hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man; hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly: he is just, he shall surely live,’ saith the Lord.”

The restoration in the sixth century did not weaken the obligation of personal righteousness. The post-exilic prophets, psalm-

ists, and sages, sing of it. As time went on this ideal became more and more important and the later psalmists gave it a meaning that has never been surpassed in point of spiritual depth. A difference might be indicated here between the earlier and the later idea of righteousness in Scripture. The righteousness of the heart or inner righteousness is strongly emphasized in the Psalms; the righteousness of conduct is extolled in the prophetic and wisdom literature. The seeking for righteousness of the soul in its innermost depths assumes a spiritualizing force in the Psalms, unequalled in any other Jewish or Christian literature. About this righteousness there was no sham nor artificial formality. It was a deep seated and genuine inner consciousness of right, whose lofty aspirations put its possessors in unison with God. Its oral expressions were prayers which bound the souls of men to the spirit of their Maker, and its spiritual devotions lifted the worshippers out of this mundane sphere and gave them a taste of what seemed to be the bliss of the world to come. Its songs were religious symphonies whose notes sounded from the depths of the soul, and seemed to re-echo with the music of God's own spheres. No wonder the Jews were lifted upward by their wonderful Psalms, and that in them they found comfort in the darkest and thickest hopelessness; no wonder that a world, though

hostile to the Jew, has appropriated them as one of its most highly prized religious possessions!

¹⁵²“Judge me O Lord,” cries the psalmist who looks to his righteous God as a child to its perfect Father, “according to my righteousness that is within me.” “Let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end and establish Thou the just. For the righteous God trieth the hearts and the souls of men. My shield is God who saves the upright of heart.” When in contemplation of the holiness which lifts to divine heights, the singer thinks of man’s duty to God and man, he cries out in the ecstasy of his religious fervor, ¹⁵³“who shall ascend the hill of the Lord and who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive a blessing from the Lord and righteousness from the God of his salvation.” According to this standard only they were to stand on Zion’s holy crest whose righteousness united them with the Righteous One.

The following might be a reminder to those who insist that the God of the Jews was so far from his people that the distance between Him and them precluded that intimate relationship which those need, who would throw themselves upon the mercy and goodness of their Creator. ¹⁵⁴“Unto Thee,

O Lord, do I lift my soul. O my God I trust in Thee. Let me not be deceived. Let not mine enemies triumph over me, yea, let none that wait on Thee be ashamed. Let them be ashamed who transgress without cause. Show me Thy ways O God, teach me Thy paths, lead me in Thy truth, and teach me, for Thou art the God of my salvation. On Thee do I wait all day. Remember Thy tender mercies O God, and Thy loving kindness. Good and upright is the Lord, therefore will He teach sinners in the way. O keep my soul and deliver me * * * Let integrity and uprightness preserve me, for I wait on Thee."

Sometimes the psalmist gets into a didactic mood; sometimes he speaks with a prophetic voice. He would have mankind know what righteousness and godliness are, and he would have his fellowmen understand how to be at one with the Shield and the Savior. He lays down the rule that God rewards those who follow in His paths and who live according to His commandments. ¹⁵⁵"Come ye children and hearken unto me, I will teach you the fear of the Lord. What man is he who desireth life and loveth many days in which to see good? Keep thy tongue from evil and thy lips from uttering guile. Depart from evil and do good, seek peace and pursue it. The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous and His ears are open to their cry. The face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to

cut off their remembrance from the earth." Here is the meditation and praise of an early psalm, showing what a deep faith in God this writer had! ¹⁵⁶"The Lord hath rewarded me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me. For I have kept the ways of the Lord, and have not wickedly departed from my God. All His judgments were before me, and I did not put away His statutes from before me. I was upright before Him, and kept myself from iniquity. Therefore hath the Lord recompensed me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands in His sight. With the merciful, thou wilt show thyself merciful, with the upright thou wilt show thyself upright, with the pure wilt thou show thyself pure, with the froward thou wilt show thyself froward, for thou wilt save the afflicted people, but thou wilt bring down the proud looks. For thou wilt light my candle, the Lord will light up darkness * * * * The way of God is perfect, His word is tried, He is a buckler to those that trust in Him."

The foregoing passages are cited to show with what feeling righteousness was regarded by the Old Testament teachers. Many other passages could be shown—the Old Book teems with them. The Psalms, Proverbs, Job and the Prophets are especially rich. But was this not to be expected? If

the ideal of the priestly kingdom meant anything to the Jew of old, it meant that the individual Jew should feel his own righteousness as deeply as the prophets desired that the whole people should feel its uprightness. Was the God of Israel not a God of Holiness? How could His people be otherwise? And if here and there the nation showed a tendency to backsliding, was there not always a remnant that would still raise its voice in God's behalf, and recall to wandering Israel the love of his early youth? With an ever deepening consciousness of the beauty of righteousness, this recall was sounded as years went by, and the call is not yet over, for Israel's righteousness is not yet completed, though the call has been sounded for more than forty centuries. Yet shall he live on and strive on, in the knowledge that the ¹⁵⁷"law of his God is perfect, refreshing the soul; the testimony of his Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the statutes of his God are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of his Lord is pure, making wise the simple; the fear of his Lord is true, enduring forever; the judgments of his Lord are true, and righteous altogether." And thus firm in his faith, and loyal to his ideals, the true Jew will strive and continue to be a blessing to the families of the earth.

The Christian apologete will grant the sublimity of Old Testament ethics. He will agree

that spiritual depths have been sounded and godly heights have been scaled, but he will do this with the reservation that however great some of the writings of the Old Book are, the writings of the New One are greater. This is with him a foregone conclusion, and needs no proof. He maintains that the idea of love in the Old Testament is not as spiritual as that of the New; the spirituality of the Old, is less refining than that of the New; the justice of the Old Testament teachers is too stern and its brotherhood too narrow. There has to be "superiority"—it might as well be in these regards. No matter how effective the ethical elements of the Jewish Bible were in Biblical days, they did not accomplish much at the time of the rise of Christianity. The Jews had failed to make proper use of them, and the few good things in the Old Testament fell into disuse. There were some who still clung to the ancient heritage, but the Scribes and Pharisees had become such hypocrites and narrow legalists that all the ethical content of Judaism was lost. All they cared for was the execution of minute sacrificial laws and ritual regulations; all they wanted was to show themselves conforming in public. They cared only to parade their piety before God and man by practicing what the law demanded. True righteousness, they had not; true love was wanting; the fountains of mercy had dried

up in those generations; the soul that craved to do charity was not in a Jewish body; justice and love did not exist, and every Jew was as blind to them as Justice is pictured to be blind to contending parties. It was for this reason that the new dispensation was needed. Justice, love, mercy, brotherliness, charity, and peace—all these had vanished, and sprang up anew only when the young teacher from Galilee put a new life into them. Clothed in new precepts, commandments, parables, teachings and sermons, these were then incorporated into a holy collection after his death. And this collection is the source of all modern social ideals and social inspiration. All that is valuable in the life of mankind comes from it—our highest hopes, our soul's deepest cravings, mankind's loftiest ideals, society's noblest strivings,—the very principles for which democracy is now fighting.

The above is not quoted from any single Christian work, but such thoughts may be gathered from any standard work on Christianity or the Teachings of Jesus. Many statements will be found stronger, and very few less strong. The real character of Jews and Judaism is passed over unnoticed, and the picture of Jewish life is drawn altogether from the polemic and partisan New Testament. Yet when one realizes how late some of the very finest of the psalms are, and how

rich in ethical material much of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature is, one fails to understand the Christian writers. This is simply a question of misinformation. Throughout the literature of the second and first centuries before Jesus and the early centuries after him, we find remarkable examples of most inspiring teachings; just how so many could have been written and how they could have been cherished if Jewishness had sunk to the depths so often pictured, they do not say! Is it too much to hope that a day of a more just evaluation of Jewish life, on the part of Biblical expositors, will dawn?

Something has already been said of the influence of this early literature upon the New Testament. We need here quote only a few passages that deal directly with righteousness to show that this ethical quality was not only not dead, but that it was a very common teaching in the New Testament period. In the whole range of these works there is nothing that exceeds the advice of Tobit to his son: ¹⁵⁸“Be mindful of the Lord thy God * * * and do uprightly all thy life long, and go not in the ways of unrighteousness. ¹⁵⁹For if thou practice the truth thou shalt be prosperous in all thy works. Do good, and evil shall not touch you; prayer is good with fasting, and alms and righteousness; little with righteousness is better than much with unrighteousness, and those that practice

almsgiving and righteousness shall be filled with life."

The Book of Enoch, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses—all late works—testify strongly to the fact that righteousness was a goal much sought by the Jews, and that the ideal started in the early days of the Mosaic inspiration was ever present as days and years rolled on. It is true that not every individual Jew was righteous; but it is equally true, that at no time in Jewish history was this idea absent from the religious consciousness of the Jew. In the vision of Enoch, God says to Michael: ¹⁶⁰ "Go * * * and cleanse thou the earth from all oppression and from all unrighteousness and from all godlessness." In the admonition to his sons, Enoch outlines a most righteous course of conduct: ¹⁶¹ "And now I say unto you, my sons, love righteousness and walk therein, for the paths of righteousness are worthy of acceptance, but the paths of unrighteousness shall suddenly be destroyed and vanish * * * But seek and choose for yourself righteousness and an elect life, and walk in the path of peace and ye shall live and prosper." And among the final sentences, we find, ¹⁶² "be not godless in your hearts, and lie not, and alter not the words of uprightness, nor change with lying the words of the Holy Great One, nor take account of your idols; for all your lying and all your godless-

ness issue not in righteousness, but in great sin." The following strong condemnation sounds as though it were Biblical: ¹⁶³"Woe to you who work unrighteousness and deceit and blasphemy; it shall be a memorial against you for evil. Woe to you, ye mighty, who with might oppress the righteous, for the day of your destruction is coming."

The Book of the Wisdom of Solomon opens with the injunction: "Love righteousness, ye that be the judges of the earth * * * for the holy spirit of wisdom will flee deceit, and will remove itself from thoughts that are without understanding, and will be frightened away when unrighteousness approaches." Let us not forget that this book was written before the birth of Jesus. About two centuries before that another sage wrote: ¹⁶⁴"Do no evil, and evil will not befall thee; depart from what is unjust, and it will turn away from thee." We have already had occasion to speak of the remarkable work known as Ecclesiasticus or Sirach, which grew so popular that it was confounded with the Biblical books." ¹⁶⁵"Bear not hatred to thy neighbor over any wrong," it says, "and do not anything at all by violent practices. Blessed is the man that hath not offended in his speech, and is not pricked with grief for sins. ¹⁶⁶Lend to thy neighbor in time of need, and pay thou thy neighbor again in due season; keep thy word and deal in good faith with him, and

thou shalt always find the thing that is necessary for thee. ¹⁶⁷To depart from wickedness is pleasing to the Lord; and to depart from unrighteousness is a propitiation."

Individual righteousness in the Book of Jubilees is illustrated by these three quotations. The first is an extract from the prayer of Moses to God, as follows: ¹⁶⁸"Let thy mercy O God, be lifted upon Thy people, and create in them an upright spirit, and let not the spirit of Beliar rule over them before Thee, and to ensnare them from all paths of righteousness, so that they may perish from before Thy face." The answer of God is in thorough keeping with the religious hope of the age in which this book was written, namely the first century before Jesus, or perhaps a few years earlier: ¹⁶⁹And the Lord said unto Moses * * * "And after this they will turn to me in all uprightness and with all their heart and with all their soul * * * and I shall create in them a holy spirit * * * and they will be called children of the living God * * * and they will know that I am their Father in uprightness, and that I love them." In the book further on, Abraham's last words have special interest for us: ¹⁷⁰"I see, my son, that all the works of the children of men are sin and wickedness, and all their deeds are uncleanness and a pollution, and there is no righteousness with them * * * Turn away from all their deeds and all their uncleanli-

ness and observe the ordinance of the Most High God, and do His will, and be upright in all things.”

For the author of this work, and his school, the Jews were the priests of the Most High until that time when “all will be called the children of the living God.”

The important Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is replete with evidence that when it was written, a little before the first century before the Christian era, Judaism was not without the many who deemed righteousness and uprightness a primary virtue. We have already dealt with this work as with others, in Chapter III, yet a few quotations will emphasize our point. “And now my children,” says Gad, ¹⁷¹“I exhort you, love ye each one his brother, and put away hatred from your hearts; love one another in deed and in word, and in the inclination of the soul. Love ye one another from the heart, and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him * * * ¹⁷²Put away therefore jealousy from your souls, and love one another with uprightness of heart.” ¹⁷³Issachar too, would have his children live in uprightness, and he counsels them: “When therefore I grew up, my children, I walked in uprightness of heart * * * And my father blessed me, for he said that I walked in rectitude before

him. ¹⁷⁴And I was not a busybody in my doings nor envious and malicious against my neighbor. I never slandered anyone, nor did I censure the life of any man, walking as I did in singleness of eye. And now hearken to me my children, and walk in singleness of heart * * * The single-minded man coveteth not gold, he over-reacheth not his neighbor * * * and beholdeth all things in uprightness of heart. Keep therefore my children, the law of God, and get singleness, and walk in guilelessness, not playing the busybody with the business of your neighbor, but love the Lord and your neighbor, and have compassion on the poor and the weak." And this was a document that was circulated nearly two hundred years before Christianity began to have any power!

There are two other books which throw valuable light on this matter. They were both written within about the first half of the first century of the present era, and are therefore almost contemporaneous with the supposed sayings of Jesus. To summarize to some extent the teachings of these and other works, one need only read an observation of Prof. Charles, in his *Apocalypse of Baruch*. Commenting on the term "the righteousness of all" he says: "Dr. Sanday writes (Romans, p. 29): ¹⁷⁵For a Jew the whole sphere of righteousness was taken up by the Mosaic Law. His one idea of right-

ousness was that of conformity to this Law. Righteousness was for him essentially obedience to the Law.' That these words are true of the conception of righteousness entertained by the writers of this book will be seen by a perusal of the note on XIV. But naturally the conception of righteousness varied according as it was used by the legalistic or the prophetic wing, if I may so speak, of Pharisaism. With the strict Legalists righteousness meant the fulfillment first and mainly of the ceremonial observance, and secondly, but only in a very subordinate degree, of works of mercy. See, for instance, The Book of Jubilees. With the prophetic wing, from which emanated most of the Messianic apocalypses, righteousness was taken in its large sense as the fulfillment of moral duties, and only a very secondary degree of ceremonial. The Ethiopic and Slavonic Books of Enoch are illustrations of the latter statements. * * * "

In this one paragraph Dr. Charles tells the story of the attitude of the older school towards the Jews of the first and second centuries. The opinion cited by Dr. Sanday is typical of nearly every other commentator. Yet how statements of that sort can be maintained in the face of the literature which we have from that period is hard to understand. Certainly there were legalistic Jews; there are such now. But to say that the one idea

of even legalistic Jews was the "conformity of the Law" in the sense of excluding the ethical spirit from this "conformity," is doing violence to the religious conscience of the Jew and to the whole institution of Judaism. One wishes that Professor Charles had been more emphatic in his supplement to, or rather correction of, Sanday's statement.

We have thus far tried to show that from the days of the prophets, to the rise of the New Testament writings, Judaism emphasized the principle of righteousness. Were this not so, the literature of those periods could not have reflected it so strongly. That there were backsliders is admitted. There are some today—and on moral backsliders, Judaism has no monopoly. That there were hypocrites is very conceivable if human nature be judged by men of today. But this no faith has yet eradicated, and no belief has yet exterminated.

We have endeavored to adduce enough evidence to show as false, the statement that at the time of the rise of Christianity the religion of the Jew was a heartless legalism and that "all was formal, legal and prescribed." We have tried to show that righteousness with the Jew was spontaneous, sincere and of a truly spiritual character. The Jew tried to do that which he fancied his God desired. He endeavored to live according to the Torah which prescribed righteousness,

and according to the statutes which gave life and which helped to better it. But the "Law" in itself as Law was not the end. The Jew who thought of his spiritual welfare and wanted to be righteous, knew that he could attain this through proper observance of the Torah; and this term meant much more than the word "Law." To say that the aim of the Jew at this time was to execute the Law only as a legalistic proposition, and to imply that rectitude and righteousness were secondary considerations or none at all, is as far from the truth as are some of the statements made by writers who are neither friendly to Judaism, just to its cause, nor proficient in its thought.

The Talmud and the Midrash, portraying the innermost recesses of the cosmopolitan Jewish life, have given us plenty of evidence that the ideal of righteousness was as virile in the days of their development as at any other period. The old sages, teachers, and rabbis believed with all their hearts that righteousness was as instinctive to Judaism as worship itself. He who would enjoy bliss in the future must live righteously here in the present. And this righteousness was not a one-sided affair. It was not an affair only between man and God; it was a matter between man and man, no less than between man and God. Some even believed that he who committed an act of unrighteousness

against his fellowman was less deserving of divine forgiveness than he who committed a sin against his God. ¹⁷⁶“God will forgive the sins that you commit against Him,” says one authority, “but the sins which one commits against his fellowman will not be forgiven by God until he who has been sinned against has been asked forgiveness.” They say that the Judaism of those days was an affair of outward piety towards God. Hardly can we believe this, in the face of the following commonly known saying: ¹⁷⁷“It is fitting and proper that one should be right in the sight of God; but one should act also, that he be just and right in the eyes of man.” If righteousness were not sincere, and was only another cloak for hypocrisy, we could hardly have embodied in popular literature the statement that ¹⁷⁸“the righteous stand higher than the angels.”

There is perhaps no more beautiful saying in the whole literature than the one ascribed to the Rabbi who said that ¹⁷⁹“he who does justly and loves mercy, fills the whole world with love.” How deeply this touches the heart! If true love, unselfish, altruistic and godlike, is at the bottom of the “higher righteousness” of Jesus, as Harnack ¹⁸⁰maintains, then there were many other Jews beside the New Testament teacher, who were teachers and exemplars of this higher righteousness. They probably did not stop to measure every

act, but they acted justly and they yearned for the "Shekinah," the Holy Presence—in their midst. How highly they valued justice may be gained from the saying that ¹⁸¹"justice is one of the supports of God's throne." To those who insist that sacrifice and not ethical ideal was the more important thing in life, one should cite the words of comment on the ¹⁸²verse of Proverbs: ¹⁸³"To do justice and righteousness is more acceptable to God than to offer sacrifices." "Sacrifices," the old teachers said, "availed only during the Temple. Righteousness and judgment atoned both before and after the Temple." ¹⁸⁴"Righteousness," said one of the popular rabbis, "is nobler than sacrifices, for while sacrifices apply only to this world, righteousness applies also to the world to come." This may be to us a theological fancy, but it shows the place of righteousness even in the popular theology of the early centuries. ¹⁸⁵We are informed also, that the Lord told David that his charity and his righteousness were more acceptable to Him than the Temple.

The righteous, according to the rabbis, are they who permit the good inclination ¹⁸⁶instead of the evil one, to direct their actions. One of the characteristics of these righteous, is that their "aye" is "aye," and their "nay" is "nay." ¹⁸⁷This is not from the New Testa-

ment, but from a Midrash compiled of older sources.

Another Midrash of early date tells us that God says: ¹⁸⁸“Be like unto me; as I requite good for evil, so do thou requite good for evil.” The one rabbinic saying which in these days is quoted more than any other is that of which the New Testament Golden Rule is the positive. The story in which it occurs is interesting: A Gentile once came to Hillel and asked him to teach him the Law while he stood on one foot. ¹⁸⁹“What is hateful unto thee,” said the gentle teacher, “do not unto thy neighbor. This is the sum of the law, the rest is commentary, go and learn.” In the thought of Hillel, a righteous man will commit no offense against anyone. It seems to us that the Golden Rule of Hillel and the Golden Rule of Jesus supplement each other in a most marvelous way. Neither is complete without the other: “What is hateful unto thee, do not unto others, but do unto others as you would have others do unto you.” On this Golden Rule, all men ought to be able to unite.

These passages ought to convince any one that righteousness was a most vital force in the religious life of the Jew during the Pharisaic period, and that the accusation that this religious principle was so deadened as to be of no telling value, is fallacious. To be a “tsaddik,” a righteous one, in Israel, has al-

ways been the desire of many, but the privilege of the few, just as it is among people in our own days. The "tsaddik" was a man of religious scrupulosity, of honor and respect, and to be known as one was as holy and as fervent a desire before the advent and growth of the new faith, as it has been since that time. Our American individual as well as national ideal of righteousness is a Jewish ideal, prophetic in its origin and in its inspiration, and pharisaic in its spiritual longing to attain godliness, perfection, and oneness with one Creator. The ideal of righteousness sought for today is no different from that of the Rabbis of the Talmud, from the pharisaic teachers of the inter-testamental period, and from that of men of the stripe of Ezekiel who taught and believed that if a ¹⁰⁰ "man be just and do that which is right and just, * * hath executed true judgment between man and man, hath walked in My statutes and hath kept My commandments, to deal truly, he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord."

Charity

Some one has said, and it has been repeated, that there is no Hebrew word for "charity." This is not quite correct. The Hebrew Bible contains no word for charity; but the word "tsedaka" in later literature assumes that meaning and that of almsgiv-

ing. In the Talmud and Midrash, "righteousness" takes on the meaning of our word "charity," and is regarded as one of the fundamental religious requirements. The worse the economic conditions of Babylonian and Palestinian Jewry grew, the greater became the virtue of charity; and so exalted a principle does it later become, that the writings of the first few centuries simply abound in it. It becomes the standard for the truly religious life, and the mark of the righteous man; they who refuse to do charity forthwith read themselves out of the party of the godly; and he is held in dishonor who refuses to heed the cry of the poor and the needy. Charity became an ideal than which none stood higher. It became the very symbol of the saintly life; it opened the eyes to the sufferings of others; it warmed the hearts of men, and made them responsive to the cries of the needy. It was the pillar of light in the darkness of poverty, and it was indeed literally the ¹⁹¹"deliverer from death." Something has already been said about charity, in the preceding pages, yet for the sake of greater fullness a few more references will be given to show that charity was not a creation of Christianity, as millions of Christians faithfully believe, but before the newer faith had even felt itself as a force, the Jews had already exalted charity as one of their noblest and most

deeply religious teachings. We speak of this social ideal because it still has a distinctive function in our society. It is still a necessary element in our social makeup, though we hope for the day when the dominant application of the principle of social justice will do away with this particular virtue.

Though the word charity does not occur in the Bible, the idea had been highly developed by the close of the Old Testament books; the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature deals with it, and the Books of Enoch, Ben Sirach, Tobit, Jubilees, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs all speak of it freely.

¹⁹²“Stretch thine hands unto the poor that thy blessings may be perfected,” says Ben Sirach, “for a gift hath grace in the sight of every living man, and for the dead detain it not.” ¹⁹³“He that is merciful will lend unto his neighbors.” “Lend to thy neighbor in time of his need, yet have thou patience with a man of poor estate and delay not to show him mercy. Help the poor for the commandments’ sake and turn him not away because of his poverty.” Tobit tells how he commanded his son to bring home to the meal, ¹⁹⁴“what poor man soever thou shalt find out of our brethren, who is mindful of the Lord.” He tells how he gave alms to his brethren and bread to the hungry; clothing to the naked and burial to the dead. It is in

this book that we find the proverb ¹⁹⁵“righteousness delivers from death” repeated, but righteousness here, means charity.

We can refer here again to the Testament of Zebulon: ¹⁹⁶“And now my children, I bid you to keep the command of the Lord; to show mercy to your neighbor and to have compassion towards all. Not towards men only, but also towards beasts. Have compassion in your hearts. I sailed * * * catching fish, and through compassion I shared my catch with every stranger. And if a man were a stranger, or sick, or aged I boiled the fish * * * and offered them to all men * * * grieving with and having compassion upon them.”

¹⁹⁷“I saw a man in distress through nakedness in winter time, and had compassion upon him and stole away a garment secretly from my father’s house and gave it to him who was in distress. Do you therefore, my children, from that which God bestoweth upon you, show compassion and mercy without hesitation to all men, and give to every man with a good heart.” This quotation is a very unique one. Here the author represents himself as violating one of the Ten Commandments rather than see a man in distress suffer. It is a telling commentary on the statements of those who insist that Judaism was, at that time, a hard, heartless legalism.

Among the most beautiful sentiments about charity and kindness, are those found in the Rabbinical writings. Rabbi Samuel ben Nechemia said: ¹⁹⁸“Woe unto the wicked ones, who would overthrow the quality of mercy.” ¹⁹⁹“Deeds of loving kindness,” says one sage, “are worth more than charity. Charity is done at the mere sacrifice of money; but deeds of loving kindness are done both with sacrifice of money and with personal efforts. Almsgiving benefits only the poor; but deeds of loving kindness are for both the poor and the rich.” ²⁰⁰There were some who regarded charity even higher than justice, and who proclaimed “first charity, then justice.” There were those who believed that giving in secret was a great virtue and Rabbi Eliezer did not hesitate to say that ²⁰¹“he who gives in secret is greater than Moses.” While at the same time we are told that Rav Assi said that “almsgiving is equivalent to the doing of all the other commandments of the Torah.” To those who say that among the Jews the offering of sacrifices was the principal religious duty, we would give in reply the words of Rabbi Elozer, who maintained that ²⁰²“charity is greater than all the sacrifices.” Nor was poverty thought to be a disgrace among the Talmudic-time Jews. For a well known teacher, Rabbi Joshua, taught that the ²⁰³“poor who is aided, does more for the

giver than the giver does for him whom he helps." It was accounted a meritorious deed to aid a poor man, and the more the opportunities to help were taken advantage of, the more comfort did the righteous receive. ²⁰⁴"He who closes his eyes to the needs of charity," said the teacher, Joshua, "acts as if he were an idol worshipper." If one knows that idol-worshipping was one of the three cardinal sins in Judaism, one may understand how lowly an uncharitable person was esteemed in the community of Israel. And even today, the Jew who can afford to, but does not give to charity, is generally regarded as the lowest of his people. "Take care," says an injunction in an early book of etiquette, ²⁰⁵"that your door is not shut while you are sitting at a meal." The implication, of course, is to keep no one who may be hungry away from your table. An old tradition has it that God thus spake to Israel: ²⁰⁶"My sons, what do I seek of you? I desire nothing of you but that you love one another and honor one another." And in that code in which we found the statement just referred to above, we find also the precept, "love mankind and honor it." These were not the ideals of one Jew. They were the common thoughts of the Jews who made Judaism and lived the Jewish life. It is true that some of these aspirations are from literature later than the New Testament.

But all of them show the habitual thought and life of the Jews, who would not have been influenced by the writings of the New Covenant, for these writings were taboo among Jews, and were not recognized as holy even by all Christians until the latter part of the fourth century. The bitterness between the early Christians and the Jews had the effect of nullifying any influence that the New Testament might have tended to have upon Jews. Moreover, they hardly knew these writings; the early Christians themselves hardly knew them; and their circulation among Jews except perhaps among the larger cities of Paul's sphere of activity, was so insignificant that the larger portion of Jewish teachers neither knew them nor took cognizance of them. Charity, mercy, and kindness were always Jewish ethical motives, and the incorporation of these into the new canon, in no wise lessens their Jewishness. In closing this section, the words of Tobit may well be repeated: ²⁰⁷“My son, be mindful of the Lord thy God all thy days, and let not thy will be set to sin, or to transgress His commandments; do rightly all thy life long, and follow not the ways of the unrighteous. Give alms of thy substance; and when thou givest alms let not thine eye be envious, neither turn thy face from the poor; and the face of God shall not be turned from thee. If thou hast abundance, give alms accordingly, and if thou

hast little, be not afraid to give according to that little. For thou layest up a good treasure for thyself against the day of necessity, because that alms do deliver from death, and suffereth not to come into darkness." And to these we may add words which are as true today as they were when first uttered: ²⁰⁸"There is no limit to the doing of deeds of loving kindness."

Peace.

Aside from the horror of bloodshed itself, nothing has given a greater impulse to the ideal of universal peace than the Bible; and never have the visions of peace been more gloriously described than by the Jewish prophets; the Jewish consciousness has been a repository of the wish for that messianic era which was to free mankind from bloodshed, and the Jewish heart beats with the fervent hope that those visions will some day be realized. Yet the modern works on peace scarcely mention the Jews' splendid contribution; and hardly is it referred to in the histories which purport to give authentic accounts of the ideal of Universal Peace. And this is not as strange as it is painful to the Jew. For he knows that from the earliest days war was at the opposite pole of his thought. The ancient altar ²⁰⁹if made of stone, was not built of hewn stone; iron would have to be used to hew such stone, and how could iron

be used in the construction of that which was consecrated to God, when out of that same material those instruments were made, which took that which was most sacred to God, life itself? It was not, however, until later that the idea of peace took a real hold of the Jewish leaders' minds in all of its glorious grandeur. And it was the matchless Isaiah first, who made use of that great vision towards the realization of which mankind seems now to be tending. It was Israel who was to be the teacher from whom other nations were to learn how to destroy the instruments of destruction. Peace was to be founded upon righteousness and truth; and the word of God as Israel understood it, was to be the fountain from which the waters of peace were to issue. The prophet's vision was not founded upon the empty hypocrisy of modern cant. Perhaps he was too hopeful; perhaps he and his colleagues were carried away by the holy beauty of a peaceful humanity that would come with trustfulness, righteousness and truth, even though only one nation may become among these, the instructor of others.

Through the years of toil and turmoil following the best period of Israel's first monarchy, the thought of peace never left its consciousness. Not only Isaiah but Micah proclaimed, ²¹⁰“and it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established firmly on the top of

the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and unto it people shall flow; and many nations shall say: 'Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, that he may teach us of his ways, and that we may walk in his paths, for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord out of Jerusalem; and He shall judge between many people, and decide for strong nations even afar off; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, nations shall not lift up sword against nation, and they shall not learn war any more.' The world shall not only learn international peace, but more secure yet shall men be, for ²¹¹"every man shall sit under his own vine and fig tree, with none to make them afraid." The picture is colossal, indeed, when one considers the frightful loss of life, the awful waste of strength, the enormity of the outlay and the horrors of civil and international warfare. What a stupendous lesson the world has yet to learn from the Jews of prophetic days! Indeed the prince of peace was not he whose followers read in his name: ²¹²"Think not that I have come to send peace on the earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword. For I come to set a man at variance with his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his

own household." The princes of peace have they rather been in whose hearts there flamed the prophetic love of peace, and upon whose bodies there fell the stripes of bigotry, oppression and persecution. They are the princes of peace who refused to sell their souls for an outward peace and an inner distraction, and who in spite of every mode of relentless barbarity, still longed for it, and hoped for it in the face of the seeming hopelessness of the struggle to obtain it.

It is true that there are pages in the Old Testament which are records of bloody wars won and lost; it is to be granted that there are ideas set forth in it which cannot be messages for today. Yet a collection like that has its fine elements as well as the other; and the contents of the Bible ought not to be judged simply because they occur on its pages, but by the part they play or have played in the history of the thought of Judaism. We would hardly be justified in saying that Jesus preached war because of a few warlike passages; and so, the records of wars in the Book do not prove that war was desired or advocated. Not war, but peace, is the stronger Jewish theme; not blood and slaughter, but mercy and life are the aims of Jewish endeavor. It may be pleasing to some to select portions of warlike ferocity and label them Jewish; but in the highway of Judaism, these had negative values, and

in the heart of Judaism, bloodshed found place only when circumstances forced them into the exigencies of Jewish life. The noblest purposes of the Jewish soul were not those of desolation and war; but greater by far, were they those of life-preserving justice, love, mercy and peace.

If ever there were dreamers of a universal peace in which a spirit of holiness and fine humaness would pervade, they were the prophets and the sages. Nothing in modern peace literature compares with that simple picture of Isaiah in which he portrays the future of the people whose social regeneration will be completed. ²¹³“Then judgment shall dwell even in the wilderness and righteousness shall remain in the fruitful field; and the work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness shall be quietness and assurance forever. And my people shall dwell in a peaceful habitation and in sure dwellings and in resting places.” It is the simple, peaceful, calm, untroubled life of a nation whose citizens attend to their duties; whose inhabitants filled with the spirit of justice and righteousness, fulfill their responsibilities, and live in that tranquility which produces lasting peace and happiness. What a strong contrast between this old Jewish ideal and the pogroms, massacres and savagery in Russia, Belgium and France, and now, since the war, in Galicia and Poland!

In the face of the late unheard of cataclysm let us recall the immortal words of that Prince of Peace whose prophecy seems farther than ever from realization: ²¹⁴“And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord, and it shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord. And he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked; and righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. * * * They shall not hurt nor destroy in my whole kingdom for the earth shall be full of knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea.” Yet there are those who say that the messiah has come!

The words of Isaiah, Micah, Zechariah, and the psalmist made lasting impressions upon Israel. Their lessons have ever been present in the teachings of Israel's sages. With the close of the Old Testament, the post-biblical books took up the hope of peace, and Ben Sirach, Enoch, The Testaments, Jubilees and Tobit repeat the refrain. ²¹⁵"The fear of God," says Ben Sirach, "is a crown of wisdom making peace and restored health to flourish." In a reverie of the glories of the past, the writer in speaking of Solomon, says, ²¹⁶"How wise were thou in thy youth, as a river filled with understanding. Thy soul covered the earth * * * and for thy peace wert thou beloved." And then looking toward the future with that yearning for Israel's glory that only a Jew who knows his history can have, Ben Sirach prays, ²¹⁷"May He grant you wisdom of heart, may there be peace among you, that peace may be in Israel forever, that the world may confirm His mercy with us, and deliver us at His time." With righteousness and mercy, with brotherliness and love, peace was intermingled, that all of these may engender a complete harmony among Israel and among all the children of men.

No vision of Enoch showing him the glory to come, was complete without peace, and time and again is this hope repeated. In the messianic era, ²¹⁸"truth and peace shall be as-

sociated together throughout all the generations of men," and as for the righteous, ²¹⁹"their lives shall be increased in peace, and the years of their joy shall be multiplied in eternal gladness and peace all the days of their life." The author of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs who probably voices the best thoughts of his day, looks forward to that same state of peace for which the others hoped, as a reward for that kind of conduct which is god-like. ²²¹"There shall be peace in all the earth, for those who have been cleansed from their iniquities." In the Testaments of Judah, Issacher, Dan and Benjamin, peace is held out as the highest blessing, not only for the righteous of those among Israel, but also for those among the Gentiles. And the words of Dan sum up very succinctly the whole trend of thought with regard to the kind of life the religious Jew must lead, and what his ultimate reward is to be: ²²¹"Observe the commandments of the Lord, and keep His law; depart from wrath and hate lying that the Lord may dwell among you. Speak truth each one with his neighbor, so shall ye not fall into wrath and confusion; but ye shall be in peace, so shall no war prevail over you. Love the Lord through all your life and one another with a true heart."

In the Book of Jubilees more than in any other work, occurs that oriental expression in

vogue among Semites and used much among the Hebrews, "Go in peace." The phrase of salutation among many of the Jews even to-day is, "Peace be unto you." The wide use of this expression alone may be an index of the depth of feeling attached to the sentiment which these words express. Other expressions of the peace-hope occur there, among which the loftiest are these: ²²²"May thy seed be perfect in the joy of heaven and earth forever; and may thy seed rejoice and on the great day of peace may it have peace. * * * ²²³"And when thou sittest on the throne of honor or righteousness, there will be great peace for all the seed of the sons of the beloved, and blessed will be he that blesseth thee." Tobit and Baruch, too, show the continuity of this old Jewish hope. There is only one difference between their conception of peace and ours. Theirs was a religious peace for all mankind, ours is one of political security for the safety of men and nations.

In the rabbinical literature we get a larger view of the popular sentiments with regard to this ideal. But again we may meet with the objection that "peace and good will" had been announced to mankind through the New Testament sources which antedated the rabbinical. We must again reply that the chaotic condition of the New Testament books with regard to their holiness, and the wall of hatred which had been set up between the

early Christians and the Jews, precluded the writings which later became the new canon, from having any influence upon the Jews and their beliefs. Aside from this, peace plays a very inferior part in the New Testament. Certainly we find no passage in the gospels in which war was denounced, and if one were so inclined one could readily cite some passages which might more easily be unfavorable to peace than favorable. The passage in Luke: ²²⁴“But those mine enemies which would not that I should reign over them bring them hither and slay them before me,”; or the passage in Mark: ²²⁵“He that believeth not shall be damned”; or the passage already cited: “I come not to bring peace but the sword,” certainly would indicate that peace, one of the noblest ideals of the Jews, was far from the mind of Jesus or from those who interpreted his teachings. It is true he said, ²²⁶“my peace I give unto you,” but that is rather a matter only between Jesus and his disciples. We have a few distinctive sayings such as “blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the sons of God.” But this is again a Jewish idea which seems out of harmony with some of these other sayings attributed to Jesus. The other strong passages which can be taken as indicating the gospels’ tendency in this direction are from the prayer of Zacharias ²²⁷ and from the song of the ²²⁸heavenly multitude, the first stating

that the prophet "shall guide our feet in the way of peace," and the second, "glory to God in the highest and peace among men in whom he is well pleased." Some of the later books repeat the ideals which the Bible and the post-biblical literature have inculcated, and this is particularly true of the Pauline epistles. The influence of these, however, upon Christianity has been more upon the theological side than the social, and the marked tendency of modern Christianity is to emphasize the gospels rather than the epistles.

The Talmud is replete with sentiments born out of the deep desire for the peace for which the Jew so strongly hoped but which was so seldom his. ²²⁹"Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing it," was a trite saying. Of Aaron it was said that ²³⁰"in his mouth were Torah and truth; it was he who went around among neighbors making peace among them." Of God it was said that His name is "peace." ²³¹One teacher addresses God, saying: ²³²"Thou art peace and Thy teaching is peace." ²³³"The Torah was given for the sake of peace," some said. And to Rabbon Simeon ben Gamaliel is credited the saying that ²³⁴"the world rests upon three things, upon truth, justice and peace." ²³⁵"Peace is one of the pillars of the earth and they who pursue it will profit both in this world and in the next," was another popular sentiment.

Rabbi Eliezer ²³⁶ in the name of Rabbi Chanina says: "The wise will increase the peace in the world," and Shamaiah ben Abtalyon taught that the Gentiles who pursue peace are more ²³⁷worthy than the sons of Aaron who do not pursue it. ²³⁸Simeon ben Chalafta believed that God found no greater blessing for Israel than peace, and others believed that it was the lack of peace that caused the destruction of the second Temple although piety, charity and wisdom were practiced there. ²³⁹We are reminded that it was one of the virtues of Jochanan ben Zakkai that he used to be first to salute everyone, even the stranger in the market place, by wishing him peace. We have noted that to wish one peace was a method of Jewish salutation. The later fancy ²⁴⁰ of the Jewish teachers made peace one of the seven servants of the throne of glory, just as in the earlier literature the spirit of wisdom which led to peace was identified with God Himself.

Peace was sometimes placed higher than truthful exactness and we are told by Rav Eli ²⁴¹in the name of Rabbi Elozer ben Simeon, that one is even permitted to modify a report for the sake of preserving peace. The Day of Atonement was made a day of general peace-making, and the fact that man had first to make peace with his fellow-man, before he could make it with God, has already been referred to. For the sake of peace, the

gleanings and the left-overs in the fields at harvest should not be denied to the poor, whether they be Jewish or non-Jewish; and another bit of rabbinical wisdom worth quoting in this connection ²⁴²is: "We should support the non-Jewish poor with Jewish poor, we should visit the non-Jewish sick with Jewish sick, and we would bury the non-Jewish dead with the Jewish dead, for the sake of peace."

Of the numerous prayers in the Talmud the conclusion of Rav Safro's concerns us particularly: ²⁴³"May it be thy will," he used to say, "O Lord our God, that thou mayest establish peace between the family above and the human family here below." The concluding prayer in the daily prayer book, recited three times a day by the orthodox Jew, and retained in the reform ritual reads: ²⁴⁴"He who makes peace in the heavenly heights may he establish peace unto us and all Israel," ²⁴⁵and later authorities have substituted the phrase "unto all of His children" instead of "unto all Israel."

These illustrations show how essentially Jewish the hope for peace is. It was and is one of the fundamental ideals of the Jewish faith. Yet it must not be thought that the peace which Israel has yearned for is a "peace without honor." No people has lived which has desired peace more—yet no people has lived who has sacrificed more, for a peace

with honor. The terrific persecutions which Israel has undergone are the very best proof that its peace was not to be a coward's peace. Perhaps no example of steadfastness to an ideal, is more glorious than the fate of Israel in recent Russia. All that the Jew needed to do there to gain peace—and equality, too—was to mark the sign of the cross on his door. But the Jew did not do this; he chose all that the dreaded Black Hundreds had in store for him; he bore all the indignities of the unholy Romanoffs—but he did not surrender his soul to a peace of dishonor, though three times a day he prayed and sighed and longed for peace and quietude. What he wanted was a lasting peace with righteousness, security and justice.

As these lines are being written, the end of the great cataclysm which has shaken the world for more than four years, has come. The fields of Europe and Asia have been drenched with the blood of millions of men who have been fighting, with Jewish civilization at stake. On the one hand we had the ideal of the Teutons—the ideal of the strong and the mighty, the ideal of the powerful and the superman; on the other hand, we have the ideal of the Bible—the ideal which has become the bread and life of the Allies, and more especially of the grand Republic of the West. On the one hand we had the armies of a war-crazed clique fighting for

empire, for more power, for greater commerce, for more extended self-aggrandizement; on the other hand, the armies fighting for the brotherhood of mankind, for justice, for liberty and for a lasting and assured peace. It was the fight of the heathen against the advocate of civilization—it was the fight of the Germanic gods against social democracy—and again the God of Israel has won. And when the peace negotiations will have been concluded, and peace will again be the world's boon, it will be a peace based upon the ideals of President Wilson and his advisors, a peace based in the last analysis upon those very Jewish ideals which have been so loosely treated here—the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, Social Justice and Individual Righteousness and Charity, and a Peace with assurance and safety to all nations and to all men!

CHAPTER V.

The Attitude of Liberal Jews Toward Jesus.

After our study of these Jewish social ideals, let us turn our attention to the considerations of the attitude of the liberal Jew toward the highest Christian ideal, namely Jesus. There is, of course, no officially ¹Jewish point of view with regard to him, any more than there is with regard to Paul, Luther or Wesley. Official Judaism never took notice of him except insofar as the persecutions committed in his name, forced the Jew to regard it with dread as an omen of ill-fortune. Who does not know of the oceans of blood spilled by his worshipers, and of the terrible atrocities committed under the banner bearing his name? The wonder is not that Judaism took no official notice of him; rather it is that amidst the thick darkness of ages gone by, libraries of anathema and curses have not been produced by the Jews.

²But times are changing, and with them views and feelings. If at one time the name of Jesus was synonymous with the word persecution, his name now, where thoroughly understood, stands for a Jewishness much misunderstood by his followers. The Jew

feels that the story of Jesus and the whole development of Christianity up to the period of the American Revolution has been for him a tragedy in which Jesus, not of his own will, was the cause, while the Jew was the innocent victim. The Jew understands that excepting the not numerous passages which purport to show the indignation and hate of Jesus for his enemies, the general tenor of his teachings follow the principle of the rabbinic saying, ³“be ye of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing it.” It is only they,—and unfortunately they are by far the greatest in number,—who have never understood their master, that hate, persecute and murder in his name. The educated co-religionists of Jesus—he never severed his connection either with his people or with his faith—feel that he desired to gather the scattered sheep of Israel, in fulfillment of a duty righteously conceived and sacrificingly undertaken. And Jesus was neither the first Jew nor the last to die for what he conceived to be his duty, his truth, and his mission.

In discussing the attitude of Jews towards Jesus, we may consider him from three points of view, viz: as Jesus Christ or the Messiah of the Gospels; as the Son of God and the Redeemer of Mankind; and lastly, as Jesus, the Perfect or Sinless Man of liberal Christianity. In reference to the first point of view, we can get into the depth of the matter by

simply considering the question, why did not the ancient Jew and why does not the modern Jew accept Jesus as that Messiah? A short study of the messianic development in Judaism will answer.

The messianic idea among Jews had received a new impetus with the publication of the ⁴Book of Daniel between 167 and 165 before the birth of Jesus. The sufferings under Antiochus Epiphanes had influenced the writer of Daniel to supplement the messianism of the prophets with a more virile and realistic content. Daniel prophesied a deliverance from the oppression of Antiochus; the saints of the Most High were to receive the kingdom, and all peoples and nations were to serve them; the righteous who had died, were to awaken again to participate in this new kingdom. It was to be ushered in by a son of man, a messiah who was to come from the clouds. A glorious future was in store for Israel, who was now to become a nation of saints. Daniel became the ground work for the other books containing the messianic expectations, although here and there, modifications of the fundamental ideas developed. ⁵One of these apocalyptic visions stated that after judgment upon the heathen would be pronounced, Israel would be delivered from all troubles, regathered, and again established as a nation under the leadership of the seed of David. This latter idea is common to

nearly all the later messianic documents. Sometimes we find that not only the saints of Israel are to be restored, but the righteous of all nations are to be included in the messianic rebirth. Another prophecy states that God is to send His messenger who will put an end to all war, slaying many, but ⁶“the people of God will be laden with wealth and riches; the kings shall, after fighting one against the other, unite and throw themselves against the Temple and the Holy Land; then with a mighty voice God shall speak unto the undisciplined empty-minded people and judgment shall come unto them and they shall perish. The earth will shake at the hands of the Eternal and the souls of men and the sea will shudder. God will rend the mountains and hills, and He will judge with war and sword, with fire and cataclysms of rain. And they shall know the immortal God who ordains these things. Then will the sons of God live quietly around the Temple rejoicing in the gift which their Creator and Righteous Judge shall give them, for He Himself will be their champion. And God will set up an Eternal Kingdom for all ages and over all men, and from every land shall they bring incense and gifts to the House of the Great God. And wolves and lambs together shall crop grass upon the mountains, and leopards shall feed with kids; prowling bears shall lie with calves, beasts shall be incapable of

harm; serpents and asps shall sleep with babes and shall not harm them, for God's hands shall be outstretched over them."

A number of ⁷books containing these ideas and similar ones, moulded public opinion after the close of the Old Testament and before the completion of the New. The Book of Enoch, Psalms of Solomon, the Assumption of Moses, the Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Apocalypse of Baruch and the Sybilline Books, are among those which deal with and mention the ushering in of the much hoped-for messianic era of peace, justice and love, which was to be established in the land of Israel, and particularly in the City of Jerusalem, the seat of the House of the Only God. These expectations became a national possession and a perennial hope. The most important among them, just before Jesus, were the coming of the Messiah who was to deliver Israel from the surrounding enemies; the gathering of Israel by this Messiah; the re-establishment of a Davidic dynasty; the bringing about of eternal peace, and the religious predominance of Zion. Side by side with these expectations had grown up the belief that just before the final redemption there would be insufferable trouble and affliction. Sin, ungodliness, madness and war would reign, and when these would be at their worst, the Messiah would appear, after being announced by Elijah, his forerunner.

After the fulfillment of all these expectations Israel was to be a holy nation, sanctified by God, and dedicated to His services and the service of mankind. Israel's was to be a kingdom of righteousness without wickedness; justice tempered with mercy was to be supreme, and peace was to be everlasting. The Holy Land was to be the home of a kingdom of priests, an example of civic righteousness, political wisdom and social justice to the other peoples of the earth. ⁸Concerning the Messiah himself, there were varying speculations. Some thought that he would be altogether human, others were not so certain; some thought he was created even before the world; others thought differently; some thought he would redeem only the righteous Israelites; others extended his mission to righteous Gentiles also; some thought Israel alone would be resurrected by him, others included Gentiles and their conversion, in the resurrection; there were these and other minor differences of opinion, but in the main, the ideas were in agreement with the larger expectations pointed out above.

Let us now examine the political condition of the Jews at about the time of Jesus, and keep in mind at the same time, these fundamental ideals as they stirred their breasts. Ever since Pompey had been invited by the warring sons of Salome Alexandra to adjudicate their claims to the crown, Roman power

in Palestine was gradually assuming the ascendancy. Never did Rome settle civil or international disputes on the ground of humanitarianism. This instance was no exception. The dispute between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus gave Pompey a pretense for entering Judea, and after a three months' siege and a frightful massacre, the Temple Mount fell, on the Day of Atonement, 63 before Jesus, and for the first time since the days of Antiochus, a heathen entered the Holy of Holies and profaned it. With the fall of the Temple, came also the end of the freedom of the Jewish people. The leaders of the party that opposed the Romans were beheaded, the city and country were made tributary to Rome, and Hyrcanus was recognized as High Priest, but not as king.

The ⁹Roman governors who administered the political affairs of Judea were unfriendly to the Jews, and consequently no opportunity was overlooked by these for the over-throwing of the hateful yoke. In 57 before Jesus, Alexander, the son of Aristobulus made an attempt to regain a foothold with an army of more than 11,000, but he was defeated by the Roman proconsul, who at the same time took away from Hyrcanus what little political power he had left. He was now only a High Priest, but to such political depth had Judea fallen, that the only thing left of the glory of the Maccabean rulers was the care

of the Temple. In 56, and the year following, the sons of Aristobulus again attempted to wrest Judea from Rome and were again defeated. Two years later another revolt broke out, and when the Romans emerged as victors, 10,000 of the party of Aristobulus had been slain. Between 53 and 51 the followers of Aristobulus again made an effort to win and this time their leader was killed, and 30,000 of his partisans were sold into slavery.

In a few years thousands of Jews had succumbed to the ravages of the wars against Rome. The land was literally cut to pieces. The Temple had been robbed several times, and the exactions of the Roman governors had become intolerable. If the Temple failed to supply the funds needed, a special tax was levied, and if this was not forthcoming thousands were sold into slavery. The lot of the Judeans became more hopeless and more bitter. In 49, Julius Caesar became dictator of Rome. He seemed more kindly disposed to the Jews, and especially favorable to Hyrcanus and to Antipater, his advisor, an ambitious and crafty Idumean, who cherished ambitions for himself and his sons, and therefore encouraged Hyrcanus in his trouble with Aristobulus. As long as Caesar retained power, there was a measure of peace in Judea. But after his death in 44, trouble again commenced. Money was needed, and when it did not come forth from tax levies, it came in

the form of proceeds from the sale of slaves. The Jews were helpless before the Roman terror. In the meantime, the sons of Aristobulus were not idle. The sufferings of Israel kept their cause fresh in its memory and followers were not wanting. Judea never lacked patriots who were willing to die for it. In the year 40 the Parthians invaded Syria, and Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, again raised an army and succeeded in gaining Jerusalem and proclaiming himself king and high-priest. His period of supremacy, however, lasted only a short time, as in the spring of 37, Herod, the son of Antipater and governor of the province of Galilee, appeared at the gates of Jerusalem, and with the help of the Romans, took the city. Antigonus was taken to Antioch and executed, and Herod became king, an office to which he had been proclaimed by the Roman senate three years before.

The ascendancy of Herod gave to the outside world a semblance of peace in Judea. But the wounds of the last quarter of a century could not be healed. Palestine had been made desolate by contentions, anarchy, tribute and war. Its fields were soaked with blood, and the best of its sons had been taken away in battle. The continued unrest was making the Judeans desperate, and the exactions of Rome completely sapped the once wealthy land. Yet to the Jewish mind it

could never be possible to think that God had forsaken His people. He was their everlasting God even as they were His everlasting people. The prophets and psalmists bore witness to this, as did many of the later and apocalyptic writers. Over and over again the messianic expectations welled up in the hearts of the hapless people, and as their conditions grew darker the expectations of the Messiah became more vivid. Herod was thoroughly hated, though outwardly there was an appearance of calm. Within, the land was full of sorrow, and although it prospered materially, there was a deeply growing discontent and bitterness. Herod was untrue to the best Jewish traditions, and disregarded whenever he could, the teachings and the faith of those whom he ruled. He was more than friendly to the customs of Rome—indeed only by such an attitude could he maintain himself. Though supposedly a Jew, he had little interest in the religion of Judea, and though he erected a magnificent Temple, the land was in a spiritual turmoil. His desire for renown, and his love for vanity and public display caused him to build palaces and cities, but the reputation he gained abroad could not lessen the hatred he had earned in his own land. To the hate and distrust that the Jews had for him whom they regarded as a traitor and usurper, there was added the resentment caused by the heavy taxes and the financial burdens.

The longer he reigned the more deeply was he despised. His interest in the Temple, its service and priesthood, was regarded as hypocritical, and he was looked upon as a man whose hands had been stained with the blood of martyrs; and as it was recalled that ¹⁰David was not permitted to build the first Temple because he had shed innocent blood, surely Herod's sin could not so easily be forgotten. His efforts in the direction of peace and contentment in his kingdom, were frustrated by his wish to please Rome and the Romans, and as the years rolled by, he became aware of his failure and then embittered by it. The mistrust within his household was as deep as that without it, and as the truth of this grew upon him, his frenzy knew no bounds. His own wife and children fell victims to his madness, and for the Judeans, matters became as bad as they possibly could get. But the mad acts of the king only heightened their hopes for the final deliverance. In 4, before the birth of Jesus, the old king, worn out by madness and disease went the way of his fathers, hated by his people and unwept by those of his own house who were left. His will provided that his son, Archelaus, he made his successor, but before Archelaus had time to leave Jerusalem for Rome to be confirmed in this office, a rebellion against him broke out. The people de-

manded a release from their oppressive tyranny; a reduction of the taxes; the freedom of many that were imprisoned by Herod; the removal of his high priest, and the punishment of those who had advised Herod to execute several rabbis who tore down from the Temple gate, a Roman Eagle which had been put there. The answer of Archelaus was an attack by his army, and after the multitude had dispersed, 3,000 people were found slaughtered. Archelaus then departed for Rome, but before his claims were settled, the oppression of the procurators became so unbearable, that a number of rebellions took place in different parts of Palestine, against Rome. The disorders were quieted, but in Jerusalem alone 2,000 men were crucified and the Temple again robbed. Archelaus returned from Rome as Ethnarch, but was banished in the year 6 for political excesses.

After this, Roman procurators whose capital was Caesarea, governed Palestine, but their periods of office were short, unsuccessful and cruelly oppressive. In 26, Pontius Pilate became procurator of Judea. Pilate cared even less for the feelings of his subjects than did his predecessors. A test of his disregard for the feelings of the people whom he governed came when he asked them to pay homage to the Roman emblems, and upon their refusal, threatened to have them killed. When he saw that they preferred to give up

their lives rather than their religion, he removed the cause of the trouble. Later he made some improvements near Jerusalem, but robbed the Temple of some of its treasures to pay for them. When the people protested he ordered some of his soldiers to disguise themselves as Judeans, mingle with the crowds and attack them. Many were thus killed and wounded; and Roman oppression grew worse.

The Judeans were kept in constant fear of Pilate's plans and acts which became more unbearable day by day. He seemed to have full sway and there was no appeal from his barbarity. The cowardice of the Judean aristocracy, the corruption of the high priests and the seeming hopelessness of the whole situation, increased the hopes for a Messiah to such an extent that any superiorly gifted man could have found followers if he but announced himself as the Chosen One. Indeed even before the coming of Pilate, pseudo-saviors had already appeared; and during this period of oppression no fewer than six important rebellions were started by men who believed themselves messiahs. Thousands of lives were lost in these worthy attempts to free Israel from Roman tyranny. Indeed to initiate the Kingdom of God became the obsession of many religious Jews and the indwelling ambition of the great and popular leaders¹¹.

About this time Jesus of Nazareth appeared. He was a young man whose antecedents were unknown except in the city of his birth, where his father was a carpenter and spent his time at his trade. ¹²The family had no special distinction, and the feeble efforts of the Gospels to give Jesus Davidic ancestry have been largely discredited by scholars. If the mortal father of Jesus had been a descendant of David, something of honor and prestige would have been attached to the family. We might also add, that in view of the part assigned in the Gospels to Joseph and adopted by Orthodox Christianity, the alleged Davidic descent of Jesus can not be considered. For according to Jewish custom the fact that Mary might have been descended from David would not make any difference, as descent counts on the side of the father, not that of the mother. Jesus grew to manhood in Galilee and there he must have inherited those characteristics which distinguished the Galilean commoner from the cultured Judean. If Jesus were expert in the knowledge and practice of Judaism, it is not probable that he obtained such knowledge in Galilee, as we have no record of any of the greater teachers living there during the time of Jesus; nor do we know of any important school in his native province at this time. Jesus might have known more when he left home than the ordinary Jew of Galilee, where

the possibilities of becoming a student under proper guidance were very limited. But these external disadvantages did not deprive Jesus—and others for that matter—from having individuality and character, and in these, rather than in learning, does the importance of Jesus lie.

When near the age of thirty—the authorities are not agreed—Jesus set out for the heart of Judea. There is no need to discuss here the question as to whether or not he had messianic aspirations at this time. But he had a task, and the fulfilment of this he set before himself. For this purpose he left his parental roof and the city of his birth, if the records be historical. In his heart, as in the hearts of John of Giscala, Hezekiah the Zealot and similar patriots, a fire of deep loyalty to Israel and his faith, was burning. Jesus felt that he but needed to communicate this to the lost sheep. The stirring events of the last fifty years and the virile part played in them by Galileans who had more than once set the spirit of Jewish patriotism ablaze with their enthusiasm, must have been known to this man who possessed native zeal and deep loyalty, and they must have served as inspiring precedents for him. And thus this young man full of hope and energy and fired by the faith of his fathers, set out to give the message that had come to him in Galilee to the larger Jewish world in Judea. Was he

cognizant of the great difference between the men of his native province and those of Judea? Did he appreciate the great gulf that lay between the untutored Galileans and the more highly cultured Judeans, especially in Jerusalem? Could the youthful champion of Israel's salvation understand the practical difficulties which he would have to encounter before he could popularize his message of repentance in preparation for the kingdom which he thought was about to come?

There is no doubt that the life of Jesus in Nazareth had been altogether too circumscribed to have given him an adequate idea of the conditions of his people as they existed in Judea. He had doubtless heard of them, otherwise he would not have gone there; but he could not have known them intimately. He came to Jerusalem, a son of a small city; he did not seem to understand that the standards of a small town could not well be applied to the life of a great city. Judea was as different from Galilee as was Jerusalem Jewry from the Jewry of Nazareth. And even in his own province the success of Jesus was questionable. The simplicity which Jesus hoped for, he found absent in Jerusalem. He could not brook the extravagance of the aristocracy or the impiety of the priesthood. The rich were abhorrent to him and poverty was almost synonymous with piety. He came from a land where learning was at a

low ebb, while here in Jerusalem, he met with a wealth of argumentation, learning and reasoning. The extravagance of learning seemed as distasteful to him as the extravagance of wealth, and both of these he set about to correct. The result that took place was inevitable. Success was not on his side. Coming with high hopes to regather the lost sheep of the House of Israel, he found that many of these sheep did not consider themselves lost; and many which he thought lost did not want his ministrations. The illustrious were not with him, for he did not possess the power to attach them to himself, as did Bar Cochba, later. The learned were not with him because he did not possess enough learning to inspire them. The ordinarily pious were not with him, for he offered them no new wisdom, no new ethical motive, nothing that they had not had or heard; and those who believed themselves righteous—and because they believed themselves so, does not necessarily make them self-righteous or unrighteous—they were not with him, because he had no new message for them, and their almost daily contact with the scribes, teachers, sages and preachers, reminded them of their shortcomings. The Pharisees certainly found in him little that was unknown before, and could at best look upon him as an enthusiastic preacher; and the Sadducees and the priests were not looking for any new reproofs or

sources of reproofs; they had enough. Nor must it be thought, as it generally is, that Jesus condemned all the Pharisees. He did condemn the hypocritical ones; but for these to attach themselves to him would have been an open admission of guilt. The people to whom Jesus could and did appeal were indeed the lost sheep of the house of Israel, the sinners who were thought to be beyond redemption, the publicans who were thought unworthy of respectable association in this world and unworthy of inheriting the world to come; and the fallen women for whose rescue and salvation none seemed to care. And here Jesus found and accomplished his work—here among the ignorant, the lowly and the outcast. And here it was that Jesus did something original and unique, so far as we are able to ascertain. The originality of Jesus does not lie in his precepts, in his teachings or method of preaching. But it does lie in this attitude towards those whom others chose to neglect. To us, social regeneration of men and women in the lowest depths is a commendable and natural thing for those who are adapted to that kind of work; but in his day, the social sense had not advanced so far and tho there is a rabbinical proverb which says that, "altho one has sinned he is still an Israelite," and therefore entitled to the advantages of Judaism and the community, yet it remained for Jesus to set the

great example of seeking those whom others left to their own miserable fate. And this to our mind is the grandest aspect of the ministry of Jesus. But let us not forget that so far as the popular messianic expectations were concerned, ministering to the sinful as Jesus did, was not one of them.

And thus Jesus went about teaching, preaching, ministering and gathering disciples about him. If he was pre-eminently successful, the records fail to state it. We mean of course the records outside of the New Testament. There is not even historical mention of Jesus himself. But we may cast this aside in the consideration of the messianic fulfilment, on the ground of Jewish partisanship. We may grant that as the Jews did not accept him as their messiah, they left out all mention of him and his messiahship everywhere, which is of course an almost impossible thing. His name does occur in the Talmud.

We have before, during and after the advent of Jesus this situation: The tyranny of Rome has struck terror into the hearts of the Jews. The priesthood has become corrupt, and the Sadduceans have become disloyal. The very air seems to breathe hopelessness and terror. There is not a peaceful moment in the land. Its independence has been lost, and its glory has departed. Even the Temple is not safe from Roman desecration. Every now and then comes news of a

new rebellion, and more disaster and more bloodshed. God seems to have forsaken His people and forgotten His promise to them. On the other hand, Israel cannot believe that his God has abandoned it, and out of the very hopelessness of the situation messianic hopes are born. The messiah must soon appear, for out of the darkness of despair comes the hope of the new light. Not only had he been promised and expected, but the conditions are now about to be fulfilled. It is true that there is no absolute unanimity about the matter. Some mystics say that the redeemer is to appear upon the clouds from heaven, where he has been since a time which antedates the creation of the world. Some rationalists say that he is to be descended from the House of David, and will be born of woman. Some say that he is to be a warrior who will break the power of the nations, forever throw off the yoke of Rome, regather Israel from the four corners of the earth, and re-establish the commonwealth in all its glory. And others say that he is to be a prince of peace who after a great war, will usher in a period of social justice and social love, which will make of this earth, a very Kingdom of Heaven. But whatever the minute differences be, the messianic expectations are rife. Still misfortune after misfortune follows. The real messiah has not appeared though several have announced themselves as sav-

iours, have started rebellions and have lost out. Now there appears one who has come not as an avowed messiah, but as a teacher of ethics and baptism in preparation for the coming of the Kingdom. He teaches those who will be taught, and as he gathers strength, both in purpose and energy, and in number of followers, he develops the messianic consciousness. He hints that he is the messiah, and his disciples wonder. They cannot understand it, for he came to them not as a messiah but as a religious teacher, a fisher for the souls of men. Nor do his conditions of fulfilment seem to be propitious. Israel is not being gathered from the ends of the earth: Rome is still the oppressive tyrant; Jerusalem has no peace; Pilate is still the offensive Roman hater of everything Jewish and yet this messiah does not even exert himself for the political emancipation of his people. In truth, this Jesus cannot be the messiah, for if the messiah idea meant anything at all, it signified the ushering in of a completely changed order. This, of course, did not happen. Jesus attracted the attention of the priesthood, was arrested, tried and found to belong to that same class of pseudo-saviors that had been giving Rome so much trouble. He was asked by Pilate whether he is the king of the Jews, and answered, "thou sayest it." He is, as was to be expected, executed, for the Emperor of Rome alone was at

this time king of the Jews. Still the messianic expectations are not realized. Jesus makes some predictions concerning himself, but they are alleged to have been fulfilled only to a select few, and concerning even these there is a disagreement. Israel's misery continues. Rome is still the murderous master of Judea. In view of this complete failure of the realization of the messianic expectations, the Jews of Jesus's day could not accept his messiahship. They did not, and their descendants cannot, for the same reason that they had, accept him as the messiah.

Aside from his non-fulfilment of the messianic ideals, the later New Testament idea of Jesus as the lamb and blood sacrifice had absolutely no place either in the general teachings of Judaism or the messianic teachings. Nor did this idea play any part in the messianic consciousness of either Jesus or his immediate followers.

According to the thought of his days, and according to the Judaism of today, Jesus does not present one single phase in his life which can be regarded as a unique fulfilment of the messianic expectations. That he was a teacher, no one will dispute. That he was a fine product of ethical Judaism, no one can deny. That he was a self-sacrificing, loyal enthusiast for his people, all will admit; that he holds a unique place in the uplift work for the outcast of society, all will agree; that he was

a striking preacher and preached oftentimes in striking form, all will grant. But that he was the messiah of the immediate expectations, or that he was the messiah of the Bible or the apocalyptic literature, or that he was a necessary sacrifice for the sins of mankind, and thus the spiritual messiah—all this is so far from historical fact, that the Jew will never accept it as truth, even as the liberal Christian has rejected it as truth. And it seems to us that none could accept it as a fact if the messianic-biblical prophecies concerning universal peace, harmony among men and beasts, and the reign of justice and mercy and everlasting peace so fondly dreamt of both in the Bible and the later literature—the very basis and ground of messianic expectations—were known and considered. Whatever else Jesus was, he was not the predicted and expected Messiah of Israel.

Let us consider the attitude of the Jews towards the Jesus, the Son of God, or the ecclesiastical Jesus Christ. This Christological conception is based upon the Pauline speculation, largely, and was developed by the early church until it became the distinguishing mark of Christianity, and still remains such. We need here concern ourselves particularly with the second article of the Apostolic Creed, or that of the Nicene, which is later and more authentic, but which does not differ in essence from the other. For the sake of clear-

ness, we give them both: ¹³“I believe * * * in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried, the third day he rose from the dead, he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, thence he shall come to judge the living and the dead.” The second article of the Nicene Creed runs thus: “We believe * * * in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made of the substance with the Father, by whom all things are made, both those in heaven and those on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, and lived as man among men, suffered and rose the third day, ascended into heaven, is coming to judge the quick and the dead.” The creed of the Apostles is the creed of the evangelical churches, while the Nicene is still used in the Catholic confession.

The creeds are so plain that it is unnecessary to analyze them. But their provisions run absolutely counter to the teachings of Judaism—they are opposed to its very genius. From the time that the second commandment became the theological standard of Judaism until this very day, the Unity of God and His uniqueness, forms the fundamental dogma in

Judaism. It is in fact agreed, that this is the only dogma in Judaism. Among the professing Jews today, the words of Deuteronomy, "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One," has become the distinguishing doctrine as well as belief. We need not here go into the possibilities of the translations of the original Hebrew. The fact is that the current of Judaism has determined the translation of this sentence in accordance with its genius, and Israel today believes as it did at the time of the rise of Paulinism, that there is nothing comparable or equal. The second commandment whose contents the Jews accept today as well as their ancestors did, is the bar that keeps a Jew from being able to conceive anything that is like God; and least of all any human being endowed with the qualities of God. Their understanding of the second commandment, reinforced by the verse quoted above, absolutely precludes any possibility of any phenomenon such as a physical and unique sonship-co-equal with God, very God of very God, etc. Nor can the Jewish mind conceive of its God dividing himself, or incarnating himself in the person of a Jesus Christ, an only son, or anyone else. We reason that if God becomes man, he is human and not God; and we maintain, that while God is omnipotent, He cannot transgress His own laws of nature; He cannot even by a divine fiat beget Himself, or incarnate Him-

self. He is, always was and ever will be a spiritual Being, eternal, invisible, omnipotent and indivisible. He is God, and there is none besides Him nor to be compared with Him. He is the divine energy, the Creator and Ruler of the Universe, whose spirit creates, ordains and gives life; He is the One God, and no one shares His power with Him; He is unchangeable, and will last unto all eternity. He is merciful and gracious, and abundant in goodness and truth, and He judges the world in righteousness. He alone is divine, none shares His divinity with Him, and He alone is to be worshiped. He is the first and He is the last, and there is no God besides Him. He is not a multiplex God, nor is He capable of being divided.

The essence of the Jewish faith from the time of the return from the Babylonian exile to this very day has been ethico-monotheistic, and nothing short of a pure monotheism can be held by Judaism today. The Jewish idea of God is nothing if not monotheistic, and any dogma tending against this is opposed to the thought of Judaism. So far as the belief in Jesus as an incarnation of God is concerned, no professing Jew could proclaim it, either during the life of Paul, or at any time since then. The Jew cannot grasp a God of the Universe and at the same time think of another, a "son of God, that is of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light,

very God of God, begotten, not made, of the substance with the Father." If God is unique there is nothing like Him; if there are two objects, co-substantial, then there are two gods—altogether unthinkable to Jews; if Jesus was part human and part divine, there is the old controversy of two souls, two wills and two natures—one divine and one human, in the same human or divine being—also unthinkable to the Jew. The Jew has not, cannot and will not accept the Christology of the church because it is contrary to the genius and teaching of his faith, his imagination, his reason, and his experience.

If Jesus was not divine, he is not worthy of worship and adoration. Here, too, the second commandment is basic to all Jewish thought on this particular point. God alone is worthy of worship and while human beings are deserving of respect, our prayers are directed to the Almighty. ¹⁴"There was a time when Judaism had developed a rich angelology and demonology. But after all, angels and demons belonged more to the folk-religion, and were easily and resolutely brushed aside, as soon as it became apparent that they might become dangerous to the monotheistic idea." Prof. Schechter has summed the matter up thus: ¹⁵"Amidst all these embarrassments, contradictions, confusions, abberations, however, the great principle of the synagogue that worship is due only to God, remained

untouched. Into the liturgy none of the stranger appellations of God were admitted. 'When a man is in distress,' says R. Judah, 'he does not first call upon his patron, but seeks admittance to him through the medium of his servant or his agent; but it is different with God. Let no man in misfortune cry either unto Michael or Gabriel, but pray unto me (God) and I will answer him at once, as it is said, 'Whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered.' 'Come and see,' says another rabbi, 'that in the portions of the Scriptures treating of sacrifices, no other name of God is ever used than the Tetragrammaton. This is done so as not to give room for heretical interpretations which might claim divine worship for some other being. * * * At a certain period in history, when the heresy of the new sects was threatening to effect larger classes, the rabbis even enforced the utterance of the Tetragrammaton in very benediction, lest there should be some misunderstanding to whom prayer is directed.'

With the incarnation and Christ-worship ideas disposed of, the other Christological dogmas must fall of themselves. Since God is the only saviour and redeemer, none else is necessary. Therefore Jesus cannot be recognized as the divine redeemer. And in the last analysis, according to the best Jewish thought, every man has within him the possi-

bility of his own redemption, and thereby may become his own redeemer. With regard to the idea that Jesus, as the messiah, judges the quick and dead, Judaism teaches that God alone is the supreme judge in this world and the world to come. The virgin birth of Jesus finds no credibility among Jews because the phenomenon of conception by the Holy Spirit without the intervention of a human father is inconceivable and contrary to every record of human experience, and the Jew prefers to be guided by the universal fact of the necessity of the male in procreation. As for the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, promulgated only as late as 1854, and declaring that the doctrine which holds the blessed Virgin Mary from the first instant of her conception to have kept free from all stain of original sin, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, as revealed by God, and therefore firmly and constantly to be believed by all the faithful, this is of course outside of the pale of credibility of Jews and Judaism, as it is without the sphere of belief among the Protestant Christians. The whole fabric of the virginity of Mary and the conception of Jesus, is based upon the misinterpretation of the little Hebrew word which means ¹⁶“young woman” rather than “virgin.” And the matter is simply a theological construction in order to

make the birth of Jesus tally with the misunderstood prophetic text which speaks of a messiah. The conception of the Holy Ghost finds neither any warrant for belief within Judaism, nor any reason for its acceptance outside of Judaism. The Jews do believe in the Spirit of God, or the Schechinah, but their presentation of it makes it impossible of being the means of producing a condition of ¹⁷"being with child."

The Jew then, cannot accept the Christ of the church, because the ecclesiastical conception of Jesus conflicts with the pure monotheism which is the fundamental characteristic of Judaism, and for which Judaism must ever stand so long as its development travels in the path determined by its history and traditions.

We have still to consider the Ideal Man, Jesus, of the liberal Christian theology. Volumes have been written upon this theme by those who have disengaged themselves from the ecclesiastical point of view and from the creeds, and have adjudged Jesus as a historical personage, in accordance with the historical development of the gospels. The newer Christianity has shifted its basis from the dogmas of the Son and the Christology of Paul, to the doctrines of the Ideal Man, a shift which is in line with the historical and scientific judgment of the learning of the last half century. Men have come to recognize that

the theological problems of the church were unsolvable, and that unless a change of emphasis took place, Christianity would have to succumb. And so liberal Christianity has turned, not to the possibilities of the force of old Christian dogmas, but to the possibilities of the influence of the ethics of Jesus and his purported perfect character. And they have judged therefore that in the power of the personality of Jesus lies the salvation of Christianity and the church. He is, according to this newer conception, the son of God, not in the substance, but in his nearness to God, in his understanding of the purposes of God, and in the perfection of his life and character. He is the one perfect man, who is to save mankind not by his death and resurrection, but by his life and precept.

With respect to the perfection of Jesus, the Jew believes with Ecclesiastes, ¹⁸that no man is so righteous upon earth that he should do always good and never sin. As the Jew regards Jesus as a man, human standards must be applied to him. Does Christian perfection as applied to Jesus cover his whole life or only the few years of his public ministry? As a matter of fact do we know enough about the years previous to that to say that he was either perfect or sinful? Is not his whole early life a blank so far as authentic records are concerned? Or are we to judge of his perfection by the legends concerning his

youth which have crept into Christian tradition? Moreover, is it consonant with the spirit of historical criticism, to ascribe perfection to Jesus, on the basis of writings alleged to be his, and whose historicity and authenticity have themselves to be assumed, and which mention only some of the things he said and did, and do not give us a complete and authoritative record of everything that he did? We may say that he was perfect because the records do not mention anything which Christianity deems sinful; but is this argument from silence critically sound? And as a matter of fact, is this statement true?

Again, is Jesus sinless and perfect because the gospels attempt to make him so, or do the gospels picture him just as he was? In other words, does the career of Jesus fit the gospels, or are the gospels made to fit the career of Jesus? To be still more explicit: Is the conception of the sinlessness of Jesus based upon the evidence of the New Testament, or is the evidence of the New Testament made to fit the conception of the sinlessness of Jesus?

Ideas as to just what constitutes sinlessness or perfection may vary. To our minds there are several instances recorded which by no means confirm the Christian conception of the ideal and sinless Jesus. We believe that the driving into the sea of the herd of 2,000¹⁹ pigs which were not the property

of Jesus, was not right. No matter what the motive of Jesus was, the owner's point of view ought to have had some consideration. Or were they ownerless wild boars? The attempted cleansing of the Temple by throwing out the money changers,²⁰ though the money changing stalls were an old established and sanctioned institution in the Temple Court, may have had another aspect to it. The fact that Jesus thought them evil need not have made them so. One may say that these things were proper because Jesus did them, indeed the Christian world accepts them as proper for just this reason. But is this logical or just? The attitude of Jesus towards those who questioned him²¹ and his indignant bitterness, seems to us out of harmony with a gentle sinlessness. The short and unfilial reply at the wedding of Cana seems to us to mark neither an ideal son nor a perfect man. The wanton violation of age long customs dear and sacred to others, is not the mark of a perfect teacher. ²²The cursing of a harmless fig tree—God's creation, comes, we think, dangerously near blasphemy. The passages such as the command to slay the enemies of Jesus who would not have him reign over them; the consignment to hell of those who would not give him meat or drink; and the resentment against adversaries, do not harmonize well with other statements of this teacher with regard to the forgiving of ene-

mies, and the praying for those who despitefully use you. The use of invective, the exercise of wrath, the repaying of evil for evil, and the promise of revenge, are hardly the characteristics of the perfect, sinless or ideal man. It is true that most of these actions are laid to occasions where Jesus rose in righteous indignation. But after all, is it the privilege of a perfect man to permit himself to be unduly aroused even by righteous indignation? We know of one great teacher of whom we have written a good deal, who could not be aroused even by those who desired to torment him. It was the great Hillel, who did not even speak unkindly to those who scoffed at him. He was indeed always considerate and kind, and so gentle was he at all times, that his beauty of character became proverbial in Talmud and Midrash. You may recall that it was this gentle teacher who taught his disciples "not to do unto others what is hateful unto thee;" it was he who taught his people to be "of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing it;" it was he who said "judge not thy neighbor until thou hast come into his place." Although in all that we have of this teacher, not one instance of indignation is recorded, yet no Jew would think for a moment, of calling him a sinless man. "Hillel," says Prof. ²³Graetz, "was particularly distinguished for his winning, dove-like gentleness, his intense love for

humanity which arose from his own humility, and from his deep faith in others, and lastly for that perfect equanimity proceeding from his profound trust in God, that never wavered in the midst of trouble. In later ages he was revered as the ideal of modesty and gentleness." With such a teacher, how can Israel believe that Jesus was the only Ideal Man—the Sinless One?

We prefer to look upon Jesus as a human teacher, subject to the same social and universal laws and human reactions as other human beings. We regard him as the type of man who felt that he had something to say and said it without regard to possible consequences. Certainly he was a man with a mission. And we should regard his mission as that of a teacher in Israel, who performed his duty as he saw it, and who acted like other men would have acted, when brought face to face with opposition and even scorn. We should class Jesus, too, with the other Galileans, who bent upon doing their nation a service, and finding followers to carry out their purpose, began to think of themselves as saviours of their oppressed people, in accordance with the expectations current in their time.

Whether or not Jesus belongs to that class of great men called prophets, is, to some, a question. There are a few Jews who believe that he does, while nearly all believe that he

does not. There might be room for a difference of opinion. But certainly the transcendental greatness of Isaiah or Jeremiah who lived so long before Jesus, and whose teachings are still so vital, can hardly be compared to that of one who lived many centuries after their early teachings had already taken root. We cannot fail to compare the days of Isaiah and his ethical environment, with those of Jesus and his ethical environment; and the comparison brings us to the inevitable result, that for his day, Isaiah was much greater than was Jesus for his. To the Jew, the prophets, especially the greater ones, will always be prophets; while Jesus will at best be one of those honored teachers who labored in the vineyard of God, after the prophetic spirit had left the world.

It seems to us that the view of many Jews regarding the personality of Jesus, that is, the looking upon him as a purely human and upward-striving teacher, does away with many difficulties. The lack of Jesus's political and social insight has caused much embarrassment to those who look to him for a social program. His divine wisdom, according to these, should have been great enough to enable him to set forth a complete program of social emancipation. The Jew does not look for a superhuman document of this sort from any one person. Hence he may look upon Jesus as a social and religious reformer with-

out expecting a complete program of social and economic salvation. The Jew does not look upon Jesus as an ideal man and therefore periods of anger which would not be expected in ideal beings, can be overlooked in Jesus. It is in this human way that the Jew can account for the show of wrath in the ²⁴philippic of Matthew against the Jews. It is at least logical to assume that had Jesus been that ideal man which Christianity regards him to have been, he would have used that same kind of gentleness and forbearance toward his enemies that Hillel used towards the heathen who came to make fun of him and his religion. To the Jew who believes in the humanness of Jesus ²⁵the unfilial renunciation of the mother and brethren of Jesus by him, can be explained on the ground of a temporary human passion for his own ideals and principles; but how can the perfect and ideal man be unfilial under any circumstances? The same is to be said of his remark to the man who desired to bury his father, and received the admonition to ²⁶"leave the dead bury the dead."

A great deal has been said about the idealism of Jesus with regard to the breadth of his attitude towards the Gentiles, while the Jews as a whole were clannish and narrow. Yet his injunction ²⁷"go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," would indicate

the opposite. The reluctance of Jesus to help the Canannitish woman ²⁸and his answer to the disciples that he was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel bears out the statement above.

The attitude of the Jew towards Jesus approximates somewhat that of a scholar like Bousset. The teacher of Nazareth was one of many who gave their lives for the sake of the faith as they knew it, understood it and taught it. We would not say with Bousset that "he was the leader of the ages and the nations to God, for death and the grave could not hold his person and his spirit." But we would rather believe that Jesus, born of human parents, endowed with an extraordinary passion for Jewishness, endeavored to enthrone this where he thought it had been dethroned. It was this passion for his faith that led him to leave his home and to break with his family; it was this passion that brought him to those lowly and outcast whom others did not reach; it was this passion that gave him the courage to face his accusers, and it did not leave him even at the threshold of martyrdom to Roman intrigue and rascality. Prof. Bousset is right to the extent of believing that the grave cannot hold the person and spirit of such a one. But among the flesh and blood of Jesus there have been many such—some before, thousands after, the man of Nazareth. And even today

this spirit of the Jew is daily manifest in the thousands of the persecuted who believed largely as he did, and who carry their faith with them, some through torture and persecution, and many to destruction and death.

The liberal Jew of today regards Jesus not as the Messiah, not as the Son of God and the Redeemer of mankind, and not as the perfect or Ideal Man. But he looks upon him as a Jewish teacher of the first century, human in his passions, devoted to his religion, enthusiastic for its advancement, loyal to its implications and sincere in his admiration for it. For all of these the liberal Jew admires Jesus; further he cannot go. He claims him as one of the many sons of Jacob who have lived and achieved. But he cannot give him a place beside the Creator of the Universe. "Judaism," says Dr. Kohler, ²⁹"ever found its strength in God, the Only One, and will ever find Him anew a source of inspiration and rejuvenation." For to the Jew, ³⁰God will always be One, and His Name will be One.

ABBREVIATIONS

AdRN.—Aboth de Rabbi Nathan

Am.—Amos

Apoc.—Apocalypse

Apoc. and Pseud.—Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Art.—Article

BB.—Baba Bathra

Benj.—Benjamin

Ben Sir.—Ben Sirach

Ber.—Berachoth

Chag.—Chagiga

Chron.—Chronicles

Deut. or Dt.—Deuteronomy

Eccles.—Ecclesiastes

Eccus.—Ecclesiasticus

ERE.—Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics

Ex.—Exodus

Ex. R.—Exodus Rabbah

Ezek.—Ezekiel

Gen.—Genesis

Gen. R.—Genesis Rabbah

Gitt.—Gittin

Hos.—Hosea

Isa.—Isaiah

Iss.—Issachar

Jer.—Jeremiah

JE.—Jewish Encyclopedia

Jos.—Joseph

Jub.—Jubilees

Keth.—Kethuboth

Koh. R.—Koheleth Rabbah

Lev.—Leviticus

Lk.—Luke

LNT.—Introduction to Literature of the New Testament
by James Moffat

Mal.—Malachi

Mk.—Mark

Matt.—Matthew

Mech.—Mechilta

Mic.—Micah

Mid.—Midrash

Mid. R.—Midrash Rabbah

Mid. Ruth R.—Midrash Ruth Rabbah

Mish.—Mishnah

Naph.—Naphtali

N. T.—New Testament

O. T.—Old Testament

PA.—Pirke Aboth

P. B.—Prayer Book

Prov.—Proverbs

Ps.—Psalms

Ps. of Sol.—Psalms of Solomon

RH.—Rosh Hashanah

Sabb.—Sabbath

Sanh.—Sanhedrin

Sib. Bks.—Sibylline Books

Sif.—Sifra

Succ.—Succoth

Tanch.—Tanchuma

Test.—Testament

Theol.—Theology

Tob.—Tobit

Tos.—Tosephtah

Way R.—Wayikrah Rabbah

Wis. of Sol.—Wisdom of Solomon

Yeb.—Yebamoth

Zeb.—Zebulon

Zech.—Zechariah

Zeph.—Zephaniah

NOTES

NOTES ON CHAPTER I.

(1) Page 14, Cf. S. J. Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*. Chap. IV.

(2) Page 14, Article Jesus, JE; W. Bousset, Chap. II.

(3) Page 17, "So far as we know, Jesus left no writings, no notes behind him. We do not read that he ever told any one to take down his words so as to give them to others, in white and black. We are not told that he wrote or dictated even a letter." C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text*, p 44.

(4) Page 17, Cf. G. B. Foster, *Finality of the Christian Religion*, p 325ff.

(5) Page 17, S. J. Case, *Historicity of Jesus*, p 136ff.

(6) Page 17, Cf. P. Wernle, *Sources of Our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus*.

(7) Page 18, James Moffat, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p 1. This work of Moffat is easily the best piece of New Testament scholarship that has been produced in recent years. On account of its masterly treatment of the New Testament writings, and because of the tremendously large field of scholarship which it covers, it has been used as the basis to a large extent, for the summary of the New Testament in this chapter.

(8) Page 18, "Jesus wrote nothing, nor caused anything to be written. He never dreamed of giving a second volume to the Bible of the Jews, still less of creating another sacerdotal order and new ceremonies." L. A. Sabatier, *Religion of Authority*, p 45. "This new inspiration which gave to all preachers of the Gospel the assurance of being, and the right to claim to be, bearers of the Word of God, gave rise to a new collection of sacred books. But in the Apostolic time, no one had gone so far. No one foresaw that a second volume would be added to the Bible. People lived in expectation of the end of the world. Jesus had promised the Church his spirit, not a new book." *Ibid.* p 167; Case, *Historicity*, p 136.

(10) Page 21, Cf. Moffat, p 8, 15ff.

(11) Page 21, Cf. Moffat, p 16.

(12) Page 22, Cf. Moffat, p 23ff.

(13) Page 24, Cf. Moffat, p 38ff.

(14) Page 26, Cf. Moffat, *LNT*. p 185-186. Cf. Wernle, *Sources*, Chap. I.

(15) Page 28, Q for Quelle, which means origin or source.

- (16) Page 29, Moffat, LNT, p 114 ff. Art. New Test., JE.
 (17) Page 34, Cf. Art. Burial, JE.
 (18) Page 37, Cf. Moffat, LNT, p 60 ff. Art. Paul, Enc. Biblica. The so-called Dutch School of Biblical Criticism denies that Paul wrote any of the Epistles attributed to him.
 (19) Page 39, Cf. Moffat, LNT, p 435.
 (20) Page 40, Cf. LNT, p 448.
 (21) Page 46, Cf. G. Friedlander, Sources of the Sermon on the Mount.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II.

- (1) Page 48, Lev. 19:18.
 (2) Page 48, Lev. 19:34.
 (3) Page 49, Sif. to Lev. 19:18.
 (4) Page 49, Matt. 5:43-44.
 (5) Page 50, Prov. 24:29: "Say not I will do so to him, who hath so done to me, I will requite him according to his deed." Prov. 25:21-22: "If thine enemy be hungry, feed him with bread, if he be thirsty, give him water to drink; for thou shalt be heaping coals of fire upon his head, and God will reward thee." Ex. 23:4-5. "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again; if thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under its burden, thou shalt forbear to pass by him; thou shalt surely release it with him."
 (6) Page 51, PA, 1:12.
 (7) Page 51, Mark 2:27.
 (8) Page 51, Mech. to Ex. 31-14.
 (9) Page 51, Mark 1:22; Luke 4:32.
 (10) Page 52, Pirke Aboth, or Chapters of the Fathers. A very valuable treatise of the Mishnah, containing a large number of ethical maxims and sayings of the rabbis. The treatise contains some of the best gems of rabbinical thought, and in such high esteem was it held by the ancient authorities, that it was incorporated as an integral part of the Sabbath afternoon service, in the ritual for the summer months. It was the most popular of the rabbinical writings, and the most widely quoted.
 (11) Page 52, C. Taylor, Ethics of the Fathers. A later edition of this treatise, and also an excellent one, is by Joseph L. Gorfinkle, Ethics of the Fathers, in the Library of Jewish Classics, Bloch Pub. Co., New York.
 (12) Page 53, Cf. W. H. Green, Introduction to Old Testament Canon, p 138, where all the passages concerning the canonicity of the OT books are cited and discussed.
 (13) Page 53. For a full description of these sects, see

articles under sect heads in Jewish Ency. Cf. also R. T. Herford, Pharisaism; and Gerald Friedlander, The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount, especially Chap. VII.

(14) Page 53, See first part of note 13. Cf. also articles under sect heads in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.

(15) Page 54, Essenes, JE.

(16) Page 54, Gen. 1:28.

(17) Page 54, Cf. JE, Vol. 9, p 665.

(18) Page 55, Matt. 23, and similar passages.

(19) Page 57, G. B. Stevens, The Teachings of Jesus, Chap. III.

(20) Page 58, Stevens, p 34.

(21) Page 58, PA, 1:11.

(22) Page 58, PA, 1:9.

(23) Page 59, There are nearly two hundred parables in the Midrash Tanchuma on the Five Books of Moses, and more than half that many stories and anecdotes.

(24) Page 59, Matt. 22:1-15. Cf. Sabb. 153a.

(25) Page 59, Matt. 20:1-16; Cf. JE, Vol. 9, p 514.

(26) Page 60, AdRN, IV.

(27) Page 61, BB 10b.

(28) Page 61, PA, 1:17.

(29) Page 61, The word "Thora" or "Tora" does not mean "law" in our sense of the term. It is best translated by the word "religion," and the phrase "teachings of the faith." Our word "law," is not only a very inadequate translation, but a very misleading one.

(30) Page 61, P. A., 1:2.

(31) Page 61, PA, 1:5.

(32) Page 61, Matt. 7:1.

(33) Page 61, PA, 1:6.

(34) Page 61, PA, 2:5.

(35) Page 61, Sota, 1:7, Cf. Matt. 7:1-2.

(36) Page 63, Yoma, 8:9.

(37) Page 63, The Prophet Hosea tells you, "take with you words and return to the Lord. Hos. 15:3. Words, words of earnest prayer, not sacrifice do I require, and I will pardon all your sins. ExR. 38:4. Cf. Amos, 5:23-24, and similar expressions.

(38) Page 63, Matt. 5:23-24.

(39) Page 63, Yoma, 8:9; 86b.

(40) Page 64, Mark 2:27.

(41) Page 64, Stevens, Teachings of Jesus, p. 52. Cf. Matt. 23:23 and Matt. 5:20.

(42) Page 64, PA, 1:1.

(43) Page 64, PA, 1:18 on Zech. 8:16.

(44) Page 64, PA, 2:5. The passage in Matt. 7:2 and

Luke 6:38, "judge not..with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you," has a parallel as follows: "With whatever measure one measures, with that measure will men measure him." Sota 1:7.

(45) Page 65, PA, 4:9.

(46) Page 65, PA, 4:10.

(47) Page 65, Ex. 18:21 and Mid. R. to Deut. 1:7; to Deut. 1:1: "Said Rabbi Berachya in the name of Rabbi Chanina: It is necessary that those who judge shall possess seven qualifications, and these are: They must be wise men, men of standing, and well known, and the four as mentioned in Ex. 18:21."

(48) Page 65, In the treatise known as Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, we find that it was the opinion of Simon the Just that the knowledge of the Law was more desired by God than sacrifice, for he who knew the Law, would know also the desire of God. And the superiority of the knowledge of God's Law is attested to, according to this authority, by Hos. 6:6: "Mercy I desire more than sacrifices, the knowledge of God more than burn offerings." AdRN 4, on Hos. 6:6. Cf. K. Kohler, Jewish Theology and M. Lazarus, The Ethics of Judaism.

(49) Page 66, Ps. 106:3.

(50) Page 66, Am. 5:24.

(51) Page 66, Hos. 2:21.

(52) Page 66, Isa. 1:17.

(53) Page 66, Jer. 22:3.

(54) Page 66, Ezek. 18:8-9.

(55) Page 66, Zech. 7:9.

(56) Page 66, Mich. 6:8.

(57) Page 67, Sifra to Lev. 18:5.

(58) Page 68, Deut. 13:5.

(59) Page 68, Sota 14a.

(60) Page 68, Midrash Tanchuma 1.

(61) Page 69, Sota 14a.

(62) Page 69, Koh. R. 7:4.

(63) Page 69, Succ. 49b.

(64) Page 69, Derech Eretz Zuta 1.

(65) Page 69, Ex. 15:2.

(66) Page 69, Sabb. 133b.

(67) Page 69, Koh. R. 7:23.

(68) Page 69, Gen. R. 33:3.

(69) Page 70, BB, 9a.

(70) Page 70, Succ. 49b.

"The poor man who receives charity does more for the master of the house than the master does for the poor man." Way. R. 34:10.

(71) Page 70, Keth. 68a.

(72) Page 70, BB, 9b. Cf. Is. 58:8-14.

- (73) Page 70, Way. R. 34:15.
 (74) Page 70, Chag. 5a.
 (75) Page 71, BB, 9b.
 (76) Page 71, Succ. 49b.
 (77) Page 71, Sabb. 10a.
 (78) Page 71, Gitt. 61a.
 (79) Page 72, Tos. Sanh. 13.2.
 (80) Page 74, AdRN, 23.
 (81) Page 74, Adolf Harnack, "What is Christianity?"
 p 38.
 (82) Page 74, PA, 4:3. Cf. Sabb. 77b.
 (83) Page 74, Gen. 5:1; Gen. R. 24; Cf. Sifra to Lev
 19:18.
 (84) Page 74, Sanh. 37a.
 (85) Page 75, Yama, 38b.
 (86) Page 75, There are two Talmudic collections, one
 of which is smaller and of lesser importance, called Tal
 mud Yerushalmi, and the other, the commonly used one
 and the one referred to in this work, Talmud Babli, or
 the Babylonian Talmud. The Midrashim are collections
 of expositions of the Biblical contents by rabbis and teach-
 ers in Israel. There is a large number of Midrashim,
 and they not only contain expositions and explanations of
 the Scriptural verses but they contain stories, anecdotes
 sayings, and in fact, the thoughts and the teachings of
 Israel. The Midrashim referred to here, are Haggadic
 Midrashim, not the Halachic. Cf. JE. Art. Midrash. Cf.
 Also Herford, Pharisaism, Chap. III.
 (87) Page 76, The best English work is that of M. Miel-
 ziner, Introduction to the Talmud.
 (88) Page 78, R. H. Charles, Book of Enoch, Introduc-
 tion XCV.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III.

- (1) Page 79, R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepi-
 graph of the Old Testament.
 (2) Page 80, Book of Enoch 1:1.
 (3) Page 80, Enoch 1:1-5.
 (4) Page 80, Enoch 5:4-7.
 (5) Page 81, Enoch 10:15, 16:18.
 (6) Page 81, Enoch 10:10, 20:22.
 (7) Page 81, Enoch, 10:22, 11:1-2.
 (8) Page 82, Enoch 91:1-4.
 (9) Page 82, Enoch 95:1-7.
 (10) Page 82, Enoch 91:1-3; Cf. Matt. 23:15ff; Luke 11:24ff
 (11) Page 82, Enoch 98:11-16, 99:1-2.
 (12) Page 83, Enoch 99:10-16.
 (13) Page 84, Enoch 94:1-3:4.
 (14) Page 84, See next Chapter.
 (15) Page 84, Cf. Moffat, LNT, p 26.

- (16) Page 84, Cf. JE, Vol. II, p 388.
- (17) Page 85, Ben Sirach 7:31-32.
- (18) Page 86, Ben Sirach 7:1-2.
- (19) Page 86, Ben Sirach 4:25.
- (20) Page 86, Ben Sirach 4:28,29.
- (21) Page 86, Ben Sirach 4:31.
- (22) Page 86, Ben Sirach 7:6, 7:10-13.
- (23) Page 86, Ben Sirach 7:33-35.
- (24) Page 87, Ben Sirach 9:11-12.
- (25) Page 87, Ben Sirach 17:14.
- (26) Page 87, Ben Sirach 17:25-26-29.
- (27) Page 87, Ben Sirach 23:18, 21:22.
- (28) Page 87, Matt. 5:43-44.
- (29) Page 88, Ben Sirach 28:1-17.
- (30) Page 88, Cf. Matt. 5:23ff.
- (31) Page 89, Ben Sirach 29:8-13.
- (32) Page 89, Ben Sirach 34:18-22.
- (33) Page 90, Ben Sirach 35:12-14.
- (34) Page 91, Cf. JE., Vol. 12, p 538; also Charles Apoc. and Pseud. of the OT.
- (35) Page 91, Wis. of Sol. 1:1-11.
- (36) Page 92, Wis. of Sol. 5:14-20.
- (37) Page 93, Wis. of Sol. 6:1-8.
- (38) Page 95, R. H. Charles, Book of Jubilees or Little Genesis; also his Apoc. and Pseud. See also JE. Art. Jubilees.
- (39) Page 96, Jub. 1:19-20.
- (40) Page 96, Jub. 7:20-34.
- (41) Page 97, Jub. 20:2-3.
- (42) Page 97, Jub. 20:9-10.
- (43) Page 98, Jub. 21:22-24.
- (44) Page 99 Jub. 36:3-6.
- (45) Page 99, Jub. 36:16.
- (46) Page 99, R. H. Charles, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; also his Apoc. and Pseud. Cf. JE, Vol. 12, p 113.
- Prof. Charles enumerates no fewer than 91 passages of the New Testament which are directly dependent upon the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. These passages are scattered both through the Gospels and the other books of the New Testament.
- (47) Page 100, Matt. 22:36-40; Mk. 12:28-33; Cf. Test of Dan, 5:3; Test of Benj. 3:3; and Test of Iss. 5:2.
- (48) Page 101, Cf. Lev. 19:18-34; Dt. 6:5; 7:9-10; 30:6; Isa. 58:6ff; Ps. 15, and similar passages.
- (49) Page 102, Test of Reuben 6:1-3.
- (50) Page 102, Reuben 6:9.
- (51) Page 102, Simeon 2:13.
- (52) Page 102, Simeon 3.

- (53) Page 102, Simeon 4:7-8.
- (54) Page 102, Simeon 5:2.
- (55) Page 103, Levi 1:2.
- (56) Page 103, Levi 2:10; Cf. Gen. 34.
- (57) Page 103, Levi 2:3-4.
- (58) Page 103, Levi 8:2.
- (59) Page 104, Levi 13:1.
- (60) Page 104, Levi 13:5-6.
- (61) Page 104, Levi 13:9 Cf.; Matt 5:19.
- (62) Page 104, Levi 14:3.
- (63) Page 104, Levi 14:4.
- (64) Page 105, Levi 19:1. Cf. 2 Cor. 6:14.
- (65) Page 105, Judah 13:2.
- (66) Page 105, Judah 18:1-4.
- (67) Page 105, Judah 23:5.
- (68) Page 106, Judah 24:1-3, 5-6.
- (69) Page 106, Judah 25:1 Cf.; Matt. 19:28.
- (70) Page 107, Cf. Luke 6:20ff.
- (71) Page 107, Judah 26:1.
- (72) Page 107, Iss. 4:1.
- (73) Page 108, Iss. 5:1-2.
- (74) Page 108, Iss. 7:2-7.
- (75) Page 109, Zeb. 5:1.
- (76) Page 109, Zeb. 6:4, 7:1-4.
- (77) Page 110, Zeb. 8:1.
- (78) Page 110, Dan 1:3.
- (79) Page 110, Dan 2:1.
- (80) Page 111, Dan 5:1-3.
- (81) Page 111, Dan 6:10.
- (82) Page 111, Naph. 3:1.
- (83) Page 111, Naph. 8:4-6.
- (84) Page 112, Gad 3:1-3.
- (85) Page 112, Gad 4:1-2.
- (86) Page 112, Gad 4:6-7.
- (87) Page 113, Gad 6:1.
- (88) Page 113, Gad 6:3-4.
- (89) Page 113, Gad 6:7.
- (90) Page 113, Asher 2:6.
- (91) Page 114, Asher 3:1-2.
- (92) Page 114, Asher 6:1-3.
- (93) Page 114, Jos. 6:1-3.
- (94) Page 114, Jos. 17:1-3.
- (95) Page 115, Jos. 18:1-2.
- (96) Page 115, Cf. Matt. 5:43ff.
- (97) Page 115, Benj. 3:1-3.
- (98) Page 115, Benj. 4:1-3.
- (99) Page 116, Benj. 5:4.

- (100) Page 116, Benj. 6:5-7.
 (101) Page 116, Benj. 8:1.
 (102) Page 116, Benj. 10:3.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV.

- (1) Page 119, E. T. Herford, Pharisaism, already referred to.
 (2) Page 119, Ibid. Preface IV, Intro. p 4.
 (3) Page 120, Ibid. p 236.
 (5) Page 122, Cf. J. Eschelbacher, Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums, p 53.
 (6) Page 123, Sota, 10a.
 (7) Page 123, Ex. R. 5:9.
 (8) Page 123, Mal. 2:10.
 (9) Page 124, Sanh. 13:2.
 (10) Page 124, Matt. 10:23-33.
 (11) Page 124, Matt. 7:21.
 (12) Page 124, Matt. 11:25-27; Luke 10:22.
 (13) Page 124, Matt. 18:19-20; Cf. PA 3:3-7.
 (14) Page 125, Matt. 18:35.
 (15) Page 125, Luke 22:29.
 (16) Page 125, Matt. 12:50.
 (17) Page 125, John 14:2.
 (18) Page 125, Matt. 16:17.
 (19) Page 125, Luke 24:49.
 (20) Page 126, Matt. 5:48.
 (21) Page 126, Matt. 5:44-45.
 (22) Page 126, Matt. 10:29; Matt. 23:9.
 (23) Page 126, Matt. 18:14.
 (24) Page 126, Matt. 7:11.
 (25) Page 126, Matt. 5:16.
 (26) Page 126, Mark 25:26.
 (27) Page 126, Luke, 6:35-36.
 (28) Page 127, Deut. 14:1.
 (29) Page 127, Exodus 5:22.
 (30) Page 127, Ex. 4:22.
 (31) Page 127, Isa. 63:15-16.
 (32) Page 127, Isa. 64:7.
 (33) Page 127, Isa. 49:15-18.
 (34) Page 128, Jer. 3:4.
 (35) Page 128, Hos. 11:1.
 (36) Page 128, Jer. 3:14-19.
 (37) Page 128, Ps. 89:27.
 (38) Page 128, Hos. 2:1; Mal. 2:10.
 (39) Page 128, Ps. 68:5.
 (40) Page 128, Ben Sirach 23:1.
 (41) Page 128, Ben Sirach 4:10.
 (42) Page 128, Ben Sirach 23:4.
 (43) Page 129, Wis. of Sol. 14:3-4.
 (44) Page 129, Wis. of Sol. 2:13.

- (45) Page 129, Tobit 13:4.
 (46) Page 129, Test. of Levi 24:1-3.
 (47) Page 129, Test. of Judah 24:1-3.
 (48) Page 129, Ps. of Sol. 17:30.
 (49) Page 130, See Art. Abba and Abinu Malkenu in JE., Vol. I, also G. Friedlander, *The Jewish Sources on the Sermon on the Mount*, Chap. 7; K. Kohler, *Jewish Theol.* Ch. XL.
 (50) Page 130, Ber. 30b.
 (51) Page 130, Yoma, 8:9.
 (52) Page 130 Mid. Tehillim, 121-1.
 (53) Page 130, R. H., 3:8.
 (54) Page 130, Quoted in JE., Vol. I, under Art. Abba.
 (55) Page 130, See note above. Other references are given in this article.
 (56) Page 130, Sota 9:15.
 (57) Page 130, Taanith 23b.
 (58) Page 131, Sota 10a.
 (59) Page 131, Ber. 30a.
 (60) Page 131, PA, 5:23.
 (61) Page 131, Sota 38b.
 (62) Page 131, Succ. 30a.
 (63) Page 132, A. Harnack, *What is Christianity*, p 70.
 (64) Page 132, S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinical Theology*, p 26ff.
 (65) Page 133, Ex. 4:32; 19:5.
 (66) Page 133, Schechter, *Ibid*, p 46.
 (67) Page 133, Cf. Herford, *Pharisaism*, p 120.
 (68) Page 133, Wis. of Sol. 2:14-16.
 (69) Page 135, PA, 2:9.
 (70) Page 135, Cf. *Prayer Book*, Singer's Translation, pp 46, 60-61, and many other passages.
 (71) Page 136, Matt. 10:5-6.
 (72) Page 137, Singer PB., p 77; Union PB. Vol. I, p 48. Einhorn PB, p 35.
 (73) Page 138, Zech. 14:9.
 (74) Page 138, Lev. 19:17.
 (75) Page 139, Lev. 19:23-34.
 (76) Page 140, Deut. 23.8.
 (77) Page 140, Hos. 6:6.
 (78) Page 141, Mic. 6:6-8.
 (79) Page 141, Sota 14a.
 (80) Page 142, Sabb. 31a.
 (81) Page 142, Isa. 68:3; 6:12.
 (82) Page 145, Luke 6:27ff; Matt. 5:38ff.
 (83) Page 147, Luke 6:29; Matt. 5:40.
 (84) Page 148, Ber. 7a; 45b.
 (85) Page 149, Tob. 4:15.
 (86) Page 149, Iss. 5:2.

- (87) Page 149, Iss. 7:5-6.
 (88) Page 149, Dan 5:3.
 (89) Page 149, Benj. 3:3.
 (90) Page 150, Sota 14a.
 (91) Page 150, Gen. R. 33:3.
 (92) Page 150, Gen. R. 33:4.
 (93) Page 150, Deut. 13:5.
 (94) Page 150, Nahum 1:3.
 (95) Page 150, Ps. 77:20.
 (96) Page 150, Sota 14a.
 (97) Page 151, Gen. 2:4.
 (98) Page 151, Gen. R. 24:7; Cf. Sifra to Lev. 19:18.
 (99) Page 151 Tana d'be Eljah.
 (100) Page 151, Sanh. 58b, Cf. Matt. 5:28.
 (101) Page 151, Arachin 16b.
 (102) Page 152, Koh. R. 7:5.
 (103) Page 152, PA., 1:12.
 (104) Page 152, Succ. 49b.
 (105) Page 152, Yeb. 62b.
 (106) Page 152, Isa. 58:7.
 (107) Page 154, AdRN, 4.
 (108) Page 154, Hos. 6:6.
 (109) Page 154, Sabb. 133b.
 (110) Page 154, M. Lazarus, Ethics of Judaism, Part 1, p 207.
 (111) Page 155, H. H. Wendt, Teachings of Jesus, Vol. 1, p 44.
 (112) Page 156, F. Weber, Die Altsynagogale Theologie. For a just criticism of this unreliable work see Herford, Pharisaism, p 77ff.
 (113) Page 156, Lazarus, Ibid. p 237.
 (114) Page 161, Cf. G. A. Smith, The Twelve Minor Prophets; W. R. Smith, Prophets of Israel; W. R. Harper, Hosea and Amos.
 (115) Page 162, J. F. McCurdy, History, Prophecy and the Monuments.
 (116) Page 162, Lev. 25:39; Jer. 34:9-11ff.
 (117) Page 163, Isa. 9:16-28; 7:30; 10-11; Jer. 5:31; 6:13, Mic. 3:2-9; Zeph. 3:3; Cf. Moses Bottenweiser, The Prophets of Israel.
 (118) Page 164, Isa. 1:4; 9:17; 3:14; 5:11; Jer. 5:25; 8:10; 6:13; Hos. 10:13; 12:8; Am. 4:1-5; 10:11; 6:4-6, and many other passages.
 (119) Page 168, Isa. 2:6; 10:3; 25:26; 28:5-6; Jer. 6:2-7; 5:9-24; 33:15; Hos. 6:6-12; Am. 4:4-6; 10:5-12; Mic. 6:1, Zech. 8:16-17, etc.
 (120) Page 168, Isa. 30:18-32; 20:33; 35:8; Jer. 6:16; 28:5-6; Hos. 12:6; Amos 5:13, etc.
 (121) Page 169, Jer. 5:1 Cf. Mic. 7:2.

- (122) Page 169, Jer. 3:13; 13:27; 23:10-14; Hos. 4:16-18; Am. 2:7; Mic. 3:1-4, etc.
- (123) Page 169, Am. 5:10-11.
- (124) Page 169, Isa. 5:20-23.
- (125) Page 170, Am. 2:4-7.
- (126) Page 170, Am. 8:4ff; Mic. 3:2-7-2.
- (127) Page 170, Am. 3:15.
- (128) Page 170, Am. 4:1; 6:4; Isa. 5:11-28; Hos. 7:5; Hos. 7:5.
- (129) Page 171, Am. 4:1; 5:11; Isa. 1, and others.
- (130) Page 171, Mic. 6:8.
- (131) Page 172, Am. 5:21-24.
- (132) Page 173, Jer. 4:14.
- (133) Page 173, Jer. 6:19-20.
- (134) Page 173, Jer. 7:4-7 Cf.; Zech. 7:9-10.
- (135) Page 173, Isa. 1:11-17.
- (136) Page 174, Jer. 9:23-24.
- (137) Page 175, Isa. 1:27ff and other passages.
- (138) Page 176, Jer. 22:1ff; Hos. 7; Am. 1:3-11; 13:2-4.
- (139) Page 176, Isa. 30:1-2; Hos. 12:6-7; and a large number of similar passages.
- (140) Page 177, Hos. 10:12.
- (141) Page 177, Isa. 1:27.
- (142) Page 177, Jer. 22:1-6.
- (143) Page 178, Isa. 22:8; Jer. 4:1ff; Ez. 16:1ff; Hos. 4:1ff; Amos 3; Micah. 6:3ff.
- (144) Page 178, Zech. 8:16.
- (145) Page 178, Isa. 32:16-17.
- (146) Page 179, Jer. 7:5.
- (147) Page 182, Deut. 13:5.
- (148) Page 182, Ex. 34:6-7.
- (149) Page 183, Jer. 31:29.
- (150) Page 183, Deut. 24:16.
- (151) Page 183, Ezek. 18:2-4; 17:18-20.
- (152) Page 186, Ps. 7:9-11.
- (153) Page 186, Ps. 24:3-5.
- (154) Page 186, Ps. 25.
- (155) Page 187, Ps. 34:12-17.
- (156) Page 188, Ps. 18:21ff.
- (157) Page 189, Ps. 19:8-10.
- (158) Page 192, Tob. 4:5-6.
- (159) Page 192, Tob. 12:8-10.
- (160) Page 193, Enoch 10:20.
- (161) Page 193, Enoch 94:1-4.
- (162) Page 193, Enoch 10:4-9.
- (163) Page 194, Enoch 96:7-8 Cf. Form of Matt. 23:13ff.
- (164) Page 194, Ben Sir. 7:1-2.
- (165) Page 194, Ben Sir. 28.2.
- (166) Page 194, Ben Sir. 29:2-3.

- (167) Page 195, Ben Sir 35:3.
- (168) Page 195, Jub. 1:20.
- (169) Page 195, Jub. 1:22-25.
- (170) Page 195, Jub. 21:21-23.
- (171) Page 196, Test. of Gad, 6:1.
- (172) Page 196, Gad 7:1.
- (173) Page 196, Iss. 3:1.
- (174) Page 197, Iss. 4:1-2; 5:1-2.
- (175) Page 197, R. H. Charles, Apoc. of Baruch, p 46.
- (176) Page 201, Yoma, 8:9; Cf. Sifra to Lev. 16:30.
- (177) Page 201, Tanch. Pekuday 2.
- (178) Page 201, Tanch. Wayikrah 1.
- (179) Page 201, Succ. 49b.
- (180) Page 201, A. Harnack, What is Christianity, Lect.

IV.

- (181) Page 202, Deut. R. 5:1.
- (182) Page 202, Prov. 21:3.
- (183) Page 202, Deut. R. 1:5.
- (184) Page 202, Deut. R. 21:3.
- (185) Page 202, Deut. R. 5:3.
- (186) Page 202, Mid. Koh. R. 9:2.
- (187) Page 202, Mid. Ruth R. 7:5.
- (188) Page 203, Ex. R. 26:2.
- (189) Page 203, Sabb. 31a.
- (190) Page 204, Ezek. 18:9.
- (191) Page 205, Prov. 10:2; Tob. 4:10; 12:9.
- (192) Page 206, Ben Sir. 7:32-33.
- (193) Page 206, Ben Sir. 29:1-2.
- (194) Page 206, Tob. 2:2.
- (195) Page 207, Tob. 4:10; 12:9.
- (196) Page 207, Zeb. 5:1; 6:4-6.
- (197) Page 207, Zeb. 7:1-4.
- (198) Page 208, Gen. R. 33:4.
- (199) Page 208, Succ. 49b.
- (200) Page Gen. R. 24:9.
- (201) Page 208, B. B. 9b.
- (202) Page 208, Succ. 49b.
- (203) Page 208, B. B. 19a.
- (204) Page 209, Keth. 68b.
- (205) Page 209, Derech Eretz Zuta 9.
- (206) Page 209, Tana d'be Elijah 26.
- (207) Page 210, Tob. 4:5; 7:9.
- (208) Page 211, Peah 1:1.
- (209) Page 211, Ex. 20:22, Cf. Mechilta to passage.
- (210) Page 212, Mic. 4:1-4; Cf. Isa. 2:2-4.
- (211) Page 213, Mic. 4:4.
- (212) Page 213, Matt. 10:34ff; Luke 12:49ff; Luke 23:36.
- (213) Page 215, Isa. 32:16-18.
- (214) Page 216, Isa. 11:1-7.

- (215) Page 217, Ben Sir. 1:18.
 (216) Page 217, Ben Sir. 47:14-18.
 (217) Page 217, Ben Sir. 50:23-24.
 (218) Page 217, Enoch 11:2.
 (219) Page 218, Enoch 5:9.
 (220) Page 218, Test. Levi, 18:4.
 (221) Page 218, Dan, 5:13.
 (222) Page 219, Dan, 5:13.
 (223) Page 219, Jub. 31:20.
 (224) Page 220, Luke 19:17.
 (225) Page 220, Mark 16:16.
 (226) Page 220, John 14:27.
 (227) Page 220, Luke 1:19.
 (228) Page 220, Luke 2:14.
 (229) Page 221, PA., 1:12.
 (230) Page 221, Sanh. 6b.
 (231) Page 221, Sabb. 10b.
 (232) Page 221, Ber. 39b.
 (233) Page 221, Gitt. 59b.
 (234) Page 221, PA., 1:18.
 (235) Page 221, Peah. 1:1.
 (236) Page 222, Ber. 74.
 (237) Page 222, Uktsin 3a.
 (238) Page 222, Yoma 9b.
 (239) Page 222, Ber. 17a.
 (240) Page 222, AdRN., 33.
 (241) Page 223, Yeb. 65b.
 (242) Page 223, Gitt. 61a. The literal translation of this remarkable passage is as follows: The rabbis taught: We should assist the non-Jewish poor with the Jewish poor; we should visit the sick of the non-Jews with the sick of Israel; we should bury the non-Jewish dead with the Jewish dead, because of the ways of (for the sake of) peace.
 (243) Page 223, Ber. 16a.
 (244) Page 223, Singer's P. B., p 76 and other places; Union P. B. p 50 and other places.
 (245) Page 223, Einhorn's P. B. Dr. E. G. Hirsch, translator, p 34, and other places.

NOTES ON CHAPTER V.

(1) Page 226, A number of papers and essays about Jesus have been written by Jews. The best of these is "Crucifixion of Jesus from the Jewish Point of View," by Dr. Emil G. Hirsch of Chicago. Another writer who has dealt with this subject is Mr. Claude Montefiore, in his "Religious Teachings of Jesus;" and also Joseph Krauskopf, "Jesus, God or Man."

- (2) Page 226, Art. Jesus, JE, Vol. 8.
- (3) Page 227, PA., 1:12.
- (4) Page 228, Cf. R. H. Charles, *Estchatology*, Chap. 5, p 211ff; also J. H. Greenstone, *The Messiah Idea in Jewish History*, p 67.
- (5) Page 228, Psalms of Sol. 17:23-25.
- (6) Page 229, Sib. Bks. Book iii:1: 702-10.
- (7) Page 230, Cf. Charles, *Apoc. & Pseud.*; also his *Estchatology*, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian; James Drummond, *the Jewish Messiah*; J. H. Greenstone, *The Messiah Idea in Jewish History*; H. Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Vol. II; Art. Messiah, JE., Vol. 8.
- (8) Page 231, The Article *Messias*, in *Hamburger Real Encyclopedia for Bible and Talmud* is a splendid summary of the Jewish thought and belief on this subject.
- (9) Page 232, Cf. Josephus' *Jewish Wars*, Book II; H. Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Vol. II, Chap. 1:4; E. Schurer, *History of the Jewish People*, First Div. Vol. II.
- (10) Page 236, *First Chron.* 22:6.
- (11) Page 238, Cf. Art. *Pseudo. Messiah*, JE.
- (12) Page 239, See W. Bousset, *Jesus*, Chap. 1; P. Wernle, *Sources of Our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus*.
- (13) Page 249, *ERE*, Vol. III, p 838; W. A. Curtis, *History of Creeds and Confessions*, pp 64, 70, 109-134.
- (14) Page 252, Prof. Max Margolis, *Theological Aspects of Reform Judaism*, p 36.
- (15) Page 252, Prof. Schechter, *Aspects*, p 45.
- (16) Page 254, Cf. *Isa.* 7:14.
- (17) Page 255, *Matt.* 1:18; *Luke* 2:5.
- (18) Page 256, *Eccles.* 7:20.
- (19) Page 257, *Matt.* 8:30ff; *Mark* 5:11ff.
- (20) Page 258, *Matt.* 21:12; *Mark* 11:15.
- (21) Page 258, *Matt.* 10:14ff; 25:41ff; *Mark* 16:16; *Luke* 19:27; and the various anti-Pharisaic passages. Also *John* 2:1 and *Matt.* 12:46ff.
- (22) Page 258, *Matt.* 21:18-19; *Mark* 11:12ff.
- (23) Page 259, H. Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Vol. II, p 97ff.
- (24) Page 262, *Matt.* 23; and similar passages in other Gospels.
- (25) Page 262, *Matt.* 8:22; *Matt.* 10:35ff.
- (26) Page 262, *Matt.* 8:22; *Luke* 9:60.
- (27) Page 262, *Matt.* 10:5-6.
- (28) Page 263, *Matt.* 15:21ff; *Mark* 7:26ff.
- (29) Page 264, Dr. K. Kohler, *Jewish Theology*, p 90.

INDEX

A

Abba Shaul, 69.
Abraham Lincoln, 15, 27.
Abtalyon, 58.
Acts, 36 ff.
Ahikar, 23.
Akiba, 49ff, 130, 151.
Akiba ben Mahalel, 55.
Alexander, 232.
Amos, 66, 169.
Antiochus Epiphanes, 228.
Antigonus, 234.
Apollon, 40.
Apocalyptic Literature, 77.
Apocalypse of Baruch, 197.
Apocalypse of John, 42ff.
Apocrypha, 15, literature of, 77.
Apostolic Creed, 248.
Apostles, 18.
Archelaus, 236.
Aristion, 40.
Aristobulus, 232ff.
Asher, Testament of, 113.
Ascension of Isaiah, 23.
Assumption of Moses, 77.

B

Bar Cochba, 243.
Barnabas, 40.
Ben Azzai, 151.
Ben Sirach, 194, 206, 217.
Ben Zoma, 74.
Benjamin, Testament of, 115.
Bible, text altered by early Christians, 23.
Bousset, Prof., 263.
Brotherhood of Man, 138.
Brotherly Love, 138; a Jewish characteristic, 152.

C

Canaan, early life, 59.
Caesar, Julius, 233.
Central Powers, violate every rule of civilized warfare, 147.
Charity, 204ff.
Charles, Prof. R. H., 198.
Christian, sources dealt with carelessly by later writers, 26.
Christianity, 14; built on sandy foundation, 45; misjudges Pharisaic rabbis, 57; could not influence Jews, 134.
Christians, have a duty of eradicating prejudice, 147.
Clement of Rome, 40.
Colossians, 39.
Corinthians, 38.

D

Dan, Testament of, 100.
Daniel, 228ff.
Day of Atonement, 63.
Drews, A., 407.

E

Ecclesiasticus, Book of, 84.
Eldad and Medad, Book of, 23.
Eli, Rav, 222.
Eliezer, 70, 71, 208, 222.
Elozer, 152, 208.
Enoch, Book of, 22, 77, 193, 217.
Ephesians, 38.
Essenes, 54.
Eusebius, 206.
Ezekiel, 66, 182, 183, 204.

F

Fatherhood of God, 122ff; universality of, 125; in later literature, 129; in Talmud and Midrash, 131ff; in Jewish Prayer Book, 137.
Flakes of Ecclesiasticus, 23.

G

Gad, Testament of, 112, 196.
Galileans, 240ff.
Galatians, 38.
Gamaliel, the Elder, 55.
Gamaliel, Simon ben, 55, 61, 64, 221.
Gettysburg, address, 15.
God, as Father, 132; as merciful and compassionate, 133; His universality, 125; cannot become man nor be compared to anyone, 250ff; a God of Holiness, 189; under various names among pious, 134; Jewish conception of Fatherhood of, 122ff; true worship of, 174.
Golden Rule, 203.
Gospel of John, 33ff.
Gospel of Luke, 32ff.
Gospel of Mark, 28, 30ff.
Gospel of Matthew, 29ff.
Gospels, Synoptic, 21; conflicts in, 29.
Graetz, Prof. F., 259.

H

Harnack, Prof. A., 133, 201.
Hebrews, Epistles to, 39.
Herford, E. T., 119f.
Herod, 234ff.
Hezekiah, the Zealot, 240.

- Hillel, 48, 50, 55, 64, 142, 259.
 Hirsch, Dr. E. G., note to, p. 226.
 Hiyya, 59.
 Holy Land, to be the seat of a
 holy nation, 231.
 Honi, 130.
 Hosea, 63, 66.
 Hyrcanus, John, 100.
 Hyrcanus, 232ff.
- I**
- Ideal Man, 255ff.
 Immaculate Conception, 254.
 Individual Righteousness, 177ff.
 Isaiah, 66, 173, 212, 215.
 Ishmael, 64.
 Israel, sonship of God, 129, 135;
 its early history, 161ff.
 Issachar, Testament of, 107, 149,
 196.
- J**
- James, 40.
 Jamnia, 52.
 Jannai, 70.
 Jeremiah, 66, 169, 177, 183.
 Jerusalem, 25, 33.
 Jesus, as alleged source of modern
 ideals, 13ff; never wrote
 New Testament, 15ff, 17, 18,
 19; not antagonistic to Jews,
 30; sources of his life ques-
 tionable, 44ff; lives and dies
 a Jew, 46; method of teaching,
 57, 62ff; on righteousness, 73;
 influence of Old Testament on
 him, 118; his conception of
 Fatherhood made narrow,
 124ff, 134; attitude of liberal
 Jews towards, 227; as the
 Messiah, 227; as the Son of
 God, 227; as Perfect and Sin-
 less man, 227; his work,
 239ff; messianic pretensions
 not fulfilled, 246; not perfect,
 256; as a human teacher, 258;
 not a prophet, 260; a purely
 upstriving human teacher, 261;
 lack of political insight, 261;
 attitude towards Gentiles, 262.
 Jewish sources, difficult to get
 at, 119.
 Jews, life larger than Bible, 53;
 ought to be charitable, 153;
 contributions prove value of
 their teachings, 154; their po-
 litical condition in Judea, 231;
 cannot accept the Christ of
 the Church, 255; attitude to-
 wards Jesus, 263.
 Jochai, 131.
 Jochanan, 131.
- Jochanan ben Zakkai, 55, 60,
 63, 130, 135, 154, 222.
 John I, 42.
 John II, 42.
 John, the Apostle, 42.
 John, of Giscala, 240.
 John, the Presbyter, 26, 35, 43.
 Joseph, Testament of, 114.
 Jose ben Jochanan, 62.
 Josephus, 23.
 Joshua, 208.
 Joshua ben Levi, 131.
 Joshua ben Korcho, 70.
 Jubilees, 23, 48, 77, 95, 129, 195,
 218.
 Judah, Testament of, 105.
 Judah ben Temah, 131.
 Judah, rabbi, 253.
 Judaism, 14; authoritative source
 for religion, 19; sources not
 studied by non-Jews, 50ff; a
 progressive religion and does
 not cease with O. T., 54; pro-
 tests against unethical civili-
 zation, 175; ignored by Chris-
 tian scholars, 191; righteous-
 ness and spirituality its true
 basis, 199; takes no official
 notice of Jesus, 226; a pure
 ethical monotheism, 251ff.
 Jude, 42.
 Judea, political condition of, 232.
 Judgment, Jewish idea of, 64, 67.
 Judith, 23, 75.
 Justice, social, 157.
- K**
- Karaites, 54.
 Kohler, Prof. K., 264.
- L**
- Lazarus, Prof. M., 156.
 Levi, Testament of, 103.
 Leviticus, 49, 138.
 Lincoln, A., 15, 27.
 Logia, 27.
 Logos, 33.
 Love, commandment, 48, 138;
 universality of law, 139; in
 N. T., 142.
 Luke, 25, 26, 220.
- M**
- Maccabees, Second, 23.
 Man, Brotherhood of, 138.
 Man of Nazareth, 13.
 Marcion, falsifies gospel, 24.
 Mary, 255.
 Mark, 25, 26, 220.
 Mathean Logia, 28.
 Matthew, 25, 26, 49.
 Men of the Great Synagogue, 64.
 Mercy, 70.

Messianic Ideals, among the Jews, 228; not fulfilled by Jesus, 247.
 Micah, 66, 140, 171, 212.
 Midrashic sources, 119.
 Midrash, 15, 65, 76; on righteousness, 200.
 Mishnah, 15, 94, 119.
 Midrash Rabbah, 60.
 Moffatt, Prof., 26.
 Monotheism, 250.
 Moses, 68, 71, 150.
 Moses, Assumption of, 23, 77.

N

Napthali, Testament of, 111.
 Nain, 34.
 New Testament, 13ff, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 44; influence of other books on it, 78; on love, 141; on peace and war, 220.
 Nicene Creed, 248.
 Non-Jews, held in high esteem if righteous, 137.

O

Old Testament, 19, 20; Fatherhood of God in, 125ff; on brotherly love, 138ff.

P

Papias, 26, 27.
 Parables, in common use among rabbis, 59.
 Paul, 17, 24; correspondence, 37, 137.
 Peace, 211.
 Peter, 27.
 Peter, Epistles of, 41.
 Pharisees, 30, 50, 53ff, 64ff, 67, 119, 152.
 Philemon, 39.
 Philip of Caesarea, 40.
 Philo, 23.
 Pontius Pilate, 237ff, 246.
 Pompey, 232.
 Prayer Book, 223.
 Prophets, protest against materialism and unrighteousness, 168ff; their ideals, 174ff.
 Proverbs, 50, 202.
 Prince, of peace, 213.
 Psalms, 66, 185ff.
 Pumbaditha, 52.

R

Rabbis, decisions, 53, 61, 68, 75; their finer characteristics, 148ff.
 Rav Assi, 70, 201.
 Rav Eli, 222.
 Rav Safo, 223.

Renan, E., 47.
 Resh Lakesh, 70, 151.
 Reuben, Testament of, 101.
 Righteousness, 72ff, 171ff, 179, 200ff.
 Romans, 38.
 Rome, 232, 244ff.

S

Sabbath, 51, 64.
 Sadducees, 53.
 Samuel bar Nehemiah, 150.
 Samuel ben Nechemia, 208.
 Schechter, Prof. S., 121, 134, 252.
 Scribes, 50.
 Shammai, 55.
 Shamaiah ben Abtalyon, 222.
 Silas, 40.
 Sylvanus, 40.
 Simon ben Shetach, 58.
 Simon ben Gamaliel, 55, 61, 64, 221.
 Simon ben Lakish, 69.
 Simon the Just, 62.
 Simlai, 69.
 Simeon, Testament of, 102.
 Simon ben Chalafta, 222.
 Smith, W. B., 47.
 Strauss, D. F., 47.
 Social Justice, 157.
 Sura, 52.
 Sybilline Books, 230.
 Synoptic Gospels, compiled from other sources, 25.

T

Talmud, 15, 63, 76, 119, 200ff, 221ff.
 Talmudic, references on love, 150ff.
 Taylor, Prof. C., 52.
 Testament of Job, 23, 77.
 Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 23, 48, 77, 101, 149, 196, 218.
 Thessalonians, 38.
 Timothy, 39.
 Titus, 39.
 Tobit, Book of, 23, 77, 149, 192, 210.
 The Torah, 67.
 The Law, 62.
 The Lawgiver, 67.

U

Ur-Marcus, 28, 32, 37.
 Universality of Jewish commandment of love, 139ff.
 Unity of God, 248ff.

W

- Washington, George, 15.
Weber, M., 120.
Wendt, Prof. H., 155.
Wisdom of Solomon, 23, 77, 90,
194.
Worship, meaning of, 171.

Y

- Yahveh, meaning of worship of,
171.
Yehudah, 152.
Yitschak, 70.

Z

- Zebulun, Testament of, 109, 207.
Zechariah, 66, 217.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

9 Oct '52 G D

MAR 19 1969 35

SEP 25 1952 LU

8 Jan 54 JB

RECEIVED
MAR 18 '69 - 9 PM
LOAN DEPT.

JAN 8 1954 LU

25 Mar '65 VRF

MAR 13 '65 - 2 PM

