

U

"The Application and Interpretation of Old Testament Quotations
In the Synoptic Gospels Compared With Their Application
and Interpretation in the Rabbinic Literature."

Thesis submitted in partial requirement for the
Rabbinical degree.

Cincinnati, Ohio.
April 1, 1927.
3

Samuel Wolk.

Samuel Wolk

2/8/

Table of Contents

	Page.
I. <u>The Status of Jesus and the Gospels</u>	1 - 34
A. The Virgin-Birth	1
B. Jesus as the Messiah	2
C. Defense of the Word in Jesus' Name	19b
D. Rejection of Jesus and the Gospel Teachings by the Jews	26
II. <u>Salvation</u>	35- 48
A. Baptism	35
B. Vicarious Atonement	44
III. <u>The Question of the Trinity</u>	49-60
A. Monotheism and Idol Worship	49
B. Jesus in Relation to the Trinity	52
IV. <u>Jesus in Relation to the Law and the Prophets</u>	61- 75
A. His Attitude Towards Oaths	61
B. The Law of Punishment	63
C. The Law of Love	64
D. Monogamy and Adultery	68
<u>Conclusion</u>	76

Bibliography.

Beth Aharon: Wilna 1881.

Talmud

Mishna

Tosephta: Zuckerman 1880

Midrashim

Rabbah to the Pentateuch and the Megilloth: Wilna 1896

Mechilta: Vienna 1865 (Weiss)

Siphra: Vienna 1864 (Weiss)

Siphre: Wilna 1864 (Friedmann)

Midrash to Samuel: Warsaw 1851 (H. E. Bomberg)

Midrash to Psalms: Warsaw 1865

Tanchuma: Vienna 1863

Pesikta Rabbathi: Vienna 1880

Agadath Bereshith: Warsaw 1876

Aboth de Rabbi Nathan: Vienna 1887

Eleh Eskorah: New York 1915 (Eisenstein)

Abrahams, Israel, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels: Cambridge 1917

Allen, Willoughby C, International Critical Commentary to St. Mathew
New York 1907

Amram, David Werner; The Jewish Law of Divorce: Philadelphia 1896

Ante-Nicene Fathers: Edited by Rev. Alexander Roberts and James
Donaldson), New York, 1903

Buttenweiser, Moses: Prophets of Israel: New York, 1914

Dalman, Gustaf. The Words of Jesus: Edinburgh, 1902

Friedlander, Gerald: The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount:
New York, 1914

Grierson, Charles T.P. Article on Prophet in the Dictionary of Christ
and the Gospels, vol.II: New York 1911

Gould, Ezra P.: International Critical Commentary to St. Mark: New York,
1903.

- Gunthe: Article on Nazareth in the Real Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche: Leipzig, 1896
- Herford, Travers: Christianity in Talmud and Midrash; London, 1903
- Krauss, Samuel: The Jews in the works of the Church Fathers; Jewish Quarterly Review 1893-1894
- Lightfoot, John: Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae (Edition of R. Gandell), Oxford, 1859
- Lippe, Med. K.: Das Evangelium Matthaei: Jassy 1889
- Mann, Jacob: Article on Oaths and Vows in the Synoptic Gospels in the American Journal of Theology- vol. XXI- April 1907
- Montefiore, Claude G.: The Synoptic Gospels II volumes: London, 1909
- Nork, Friedrich: Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen: Leipzig, 1839
- Plummer, Alfred: International Critical Commentary to St. Luke, New York, 1903
- Schechter, Solomon: Article Rabbinic Parallels to the New Testament in the Jewish Quarterly Review- vol. XII- April 1900
- Strack and Billerbeck: Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Munich 1922
- Toy, Crawford Powell: Quotations in the New Testament: New York 1884
- Wünsche, August: Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch: Goettingen, 1878

"The Application and Interpretation of the Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels Compared with Their Application and Interpretation According to Contemporaneous Rabbinic Literature."

To arrive at the most satisfactory appreciation of the contrasts and similarities between early Judaism and Christianity, I have thought it most advisable to consult the Old Testament quotations themselves incorporated into the New Testament, for from a comparative study of the interpretations given such quotations, there becomes evident the points in which the sister religion is in harmony, or at variance, with the mother faith. My treatment must however, be circumscribed for my interest is confined only to quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and to these only in so far as they cross current with quotations themselves in the Rabbinic literature. I have not, for example, concerned myself with parallels to Rabbinic thought in the Gospels when they did not involve an Old Testament quotation employed in the New. The treatment cannot therefore be absolutely conclusive nor even complete.

In the account that follows, the conclusions drawn and the references cited are based almost entirely on the source material. Many have written at length on the Christological traces in the Jewish literature and have shown the dependence of early Christianity on Judaism; but none, so far as I know, has confined himself to Old Testament quotations alone. Gerald Friedlander has undertaken to some extent this work of thought parallels particularly in his "The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount" and Wünsche in his "Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien" has proved to every unbiassed critic that the founder of Christianity based his teachings- even the most lofty- on the Old Testament and Rabbinic interpretation. And so to

avoid repetition, I have omitted, for the greatest part, the discussion of those ethical concepts of the Beatitudes and the Sermon on the Mount which are paralleled in the Bible and Rabbinic literature and which have been discussed by others, except where a difference of interpretation is flagrant.

In the arrangement of my material and my chapter groupings, I have tended to make Jesus the centre of my discussions, since, after all, he forms the pivotal point about which the Synoptic Gospel stories move. His status as reflected in the Gospel-quotations, the specific theological concepts identified with his name, his relation to the question of divinity, and his attitude toward the Law and the Prophets constitute my main divisions.

A severe handicap in my work is the fact that the Midrashic and Talmudic literature is strangely silent on many Old Testament interpretations that have been given Christological import. Whether this was conscious or accidental, on the part of the Rabbis, can only be guessed. In some instances, however, we are prompted to draw conclusions from mere silence; at other times, we can perceive indirect references to the varied interpretations of the Gospel and early patristic writers upon the quotations involved. Even though some of the explanations seized upon in the Gospels and the later Church literature constitute essential elements in later Christianity we have, as I believe my thesis will show, only a very few direct references by the Rabbis to the same.

The bulk of the quotations incorporated into the Synoptic Gospels from the Old Testament are to be found in Mathew. Many of the quotations found in Mathew have likewise been included with very slight modification in Mark and fewer still in Luke. I have relied almost entirely upon Toy in his "Quotations In the New Testament" for the Synoptic Gospel borrowings from the Old Testament. Only in

one or two instances have I treated a quotation to which he did not draw attention in his work. In one or two instances I have omitted consideration of quotations incorporated into the Synoptic Gospels when such quotations could form no fruitful basis of discussion in the two classes of literature I have examined. The Beth Aharon for the most part enabled me to find the Rabbinic parallels and comments on the Old Testament quotations which were used in the Gospel records.

CHAPTER I

THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND JESUS AS THE MESSIAH

A - The Virgin Birth

That the Synoptic Gospels are in content and treatment Jewish is a fact that has been already well established. But in the general treatment of the question of the Messiah where Old Testament quotations are applied to the Messianic character of Jesus and his Virgin birth, there lies the point of departure from Biblical records and interpretation. The very first quotation incorporated into the New Testament, Mathew 1²³, taken from Isaiah 7¹⁴, reflects this peculiar method of the Gospel writers which diverts the meaning of the prophets to their own specific purpose: "Behold the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Emanuel." Now this rendering of the verse from Isaiah has been based on the septuagint reading, save that the singular verb *καλέσει* has been altered into the plural *καλέσουσιν*. About the word *πρῆξ* a young woman sexually mature (cf Proverbs 30¹⁹) which the Septuagint already has rendered *παρθένης* "a virgin" centers the varied interpretations of this verse.

Although the Septuagint contains the mythological meaning of the word in question, it was by no means acceptable to the Scholars of the day. Irenaeus condemns Theodotian the Ephesian (published his version of the Old Testament in 181 C.E.) and Aquila of Pontus (published his version about 129 C.E.) both Jewish proselytes, for rendering *πρῆξ* "a young woman." "The Ebionites following these assert that he was begotten by Joseph, thus destroying as far as in them lies, such a marvellous dispensation of God, and setting aside the testimony of the prophets which proceeded from God " ¹

Tertullian uses another means of establishing the virgin-birth inference contained in the verse "If a virgin shall conceive then

¹. Ante-Nicene Fathers-Irenaeus Against Heresies-vol.1 p 451.

will it be a veritable sign, but what kind of a sign will it be from God if a young woman shall conceive, as the Jewish cavillers say".¹ Surely, there would be nothing extraordinary in that. Of interest might it be to note that the Jewish Fuerst takes העלמה to be Isaiah's wife, following Kimchi's authority, "while the neologian Gesenius interprets the word bride and rejects the Catholic notion of an unspotted virgin."²

A lone Midrash which comments on the verse in Isaiah says that Isaiah had three sons, one of whom was Emanuel; therefore העלמה must represent Isaiah's wife.³ Is it not possible that the Rabbis were aware of the Gospel interpretation of the verse when they made this comment, and meant in this way to object to it?

It may be said in passing with regard to this verse that the importance of establishing the fact that Jesus was of virgin birth relates itself to the question of Salvation which will be discussed in the second chapter. The verse in Isaiah is used to that end, for by identifying Jesus with God, Salvation can be offered to those who acknowledge him to be God. "They shall call his name Emanuel which is interpreted "God-with-us. And being God - with-us, he is even more, but God-in-us, hence deliverance by professing him."⁴

B - Jesus as the Messiah

There are a number of Old Testament quotations which have been employed by the Gospel writers to establish the Messiahship of Jesus. The idea of the Messiah, of course, is not new in Christianity, having had its development also in old Jewish thought but the Christians consistently ascribed the Messiah notion to Jesus. The first of these quotations deals with the question of the birth-place of the Messiah. Mathew 2⁶ quotes Micah 5¹⁻² as predicting

1 Ibid Tertullian Against Marcion vol.III p.331.

2 Ibid Editor's footnote p.331

3 Midrash Rabbah Bo - 18⁵

4 A N.F. Treatise Concerning the Trinity-Novatian Vol.V -p.621.

the birthplace of the Messiah and intending him to be Jesus: "And thou, Bethlehem, Land of Judah, art by no means least among the leaders of Judah, for out of thee shall come forth a leader who shall be shepherd of my people." Since Bethlehem was the birthplace and capital of David, and since the Messiah was thought to be of Davidic descent it can readily be seen why interest of a Messianic character should center about this passage. Furthermore, the Targum to this passage recognized the Messianic possibilities of the verse by interpreting the ~~David~~ Messiah. An interesting reference in the general discussion of this verse as the birthplace of the Messiah is found in the Midrash, ¹ where a Min, who represents a Christian, asks Rabbi Jannai and Jonathan to explain the apparently conflicting birthplace of Rachel as being given in the territories of Benjamin and Judah respectively. (cf. I Samuel 10² and Genesis 35:19 and Micah 5:1-2). Herford points to this discussion as showing that the birthplace of the Messiah was a point of interest to both the Jews and the Christians.² Tertullian attempts to prove that the leader referred to in Micah 5:1 must be Jesus, for from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of Judaea there could be no remnant of the Israelitish stock, and hence the only one referred to in the passage must be Jesus.³ The Talmud⁴ likewise looked upon this passage as referring to the Messiah. It mentions the royal palace of Beth-Lechem-Jehudah as the birthplace of the Messiah, naming Manachem as the anointed one and Hezekiah as his father. By giving this parentage cannot direct opposition to the

1. Midrash Rabbah Breshith -82:10.

2. Christianity in Talmud and Midrash -p.253ff.

3. A.N.F. An Answer to the Jews, Vol. III, p. 169.

4. Talmud Jerushalmi Berachoth 5a.

Gospel record be perceived immediately? The Gospel writers did not pervert the basic meaning of the verse in their identification of it with the Messiah, but they did go afield in naming that Messiah Jesus.

A story that was manufactured to accomodate an Old Testament quotation and which was later given a Messianic interpretation is the verse in Mathew 2:15 borrowed from Hosea 11:1, "Out of Egypt I called my son". In the prophet, the passage clearly refers to Israel, whereas in the Gospel Mathew invents the story of the flight to Egypt and makes the verse of Hosea apply to Jesus "on the general idea that Jesus, the Son of God, the incarnation of the true Israel, must also be called out of Egypt like Israel of old." ¹

That an historic reference is made by the prophet in this verse as applying to the entire nation is seen in each of the various Midrashic comments to Hosea 11:1. These explanations identify Israel the people with 'בן'. "Just as a king gives his youngest son the garden which he cherishes most, so God loved above all peoples Israel his beloved."² Another Midrah commenting on this verse represents Egypt as the abode of the pre-courting days of Israel by God and tells how God spoke to Israel as from a hallway just as a king speaks to his daughter. Before Israel was ready to be courted God spoke in public; while Israel was in Egypt he was only a נער.³ The mention of names and events shows this verse to have an historical setting; it cannot be an invention as was taken by Mathew. Again this verse is used as denoting Israel when Moses intercedes in the people's behalf after the making of the golden calf, for Egypt was a land of idolatry.⁴ Nork tries to establish

1. The Synoptic Gospels - Montefiore, Vol. II, p. 458.

2. Midrah Rabbah Debarim 5.

3. Midrash Rabbah Shir Hashirim 3; also Bamidbar 12.

4. Ibid-Shemoth 43.

the point that the Messiah is referred to by the verse in question, but the cross references to other passages which he cites in which he shows that מָלֵךְ is identical with the Messiah are not convincing.¹

A passage more significant for our purposes is that quoted in Mathew 2:18 from Jeremiah 31:14. "A voice was heard in Rama, weeping and much wailing, Rachel weeping for her children and she would not be comforted because they are not." In the gospels, this quotation really has no place, except that indirectly the birth of Jesus, the Gospel Messiah, is involved; in Herod's order to slay the infants and the subsequent weeping of the mothers the Evangelist sees a parallel to Nebuchadnezzar's siege of 597.² In Jeremiah the passage means that a voice, representing the body-politic Israel, is heard in Rama, where Rachel's grave is, weeping for her children who happen to be in the Babylonian exile. There it has genuine point.

That the Midrashic writers did not mistake the reference to Rachel as personified Israel is clear from various references to the verse. "Israel is called by the name of Rachel" as can be seen from Jeremiah 31:14.³ One of the references identifies Rachel with the prophets in that she wept over the sins of her people.⁴ Rachel is also represented as interceding in behalf of Israel for their idolatrous practices and winning a promise from God to restore Israel to their place.⁵ Here she is the spokesman of all Israel.

There might also be included in my discussion ^{the passage} in Mathew 2:23; "He shall be called a Nazarene", the literal form of which quotation cannot be paralleled in the Old Testament. We look in vain throughout our scripture for Mathew's words. Usually, they are identified with Isaiah 11:1 in which מָלֵךְ as referring to the Messiah by the Targum

1. Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen - p. XLII.

2. Quotations in the New Testament - Toy. p. 11.

3. Midrah Rabbah Bereshith 71:3; also slightly different in Ruth 7:12.

4. Midrah Shocher Tov 119:67.

5. Midrash Rabbah Pesikta Echa 24; also see Rashi to Jeremiah 31:14

bears the closest similarity to the word Nazarene. By the word Ναζωραῖος Nazarene, he (Mathew) hints his (Christ's) separation and estrangement from other men, as a despicable person, and unworthy of the society of men.¹ Other passages given as parallels in the Old Testament are Jeremiah 23⁵, 33¹⁵ and Isaiah 4² where ἡ is referred to as the Messiah. But there can be little doubt, as has been conclusively shown, that the real parallel to the Gospel verse in the Bible is unknown; and that any attempt to identify the words of Mathew with Isaiah 11¹ is only a bold guess.²

In Mathew 4¹⁵⁻¹⁶ and in slightly different form in Luke 1⁷⁹ we have a quotation paralleling Isaiah 8^{23-9¹}: "The land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali, toward the sea, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations (Gentiles) the people which sat in darkness saw a great light, and to them that sat in the region and shadow of death, to them did light spring up." The Gospels have rendered a future event as having already passed, and they have been unaware of the late insertion into the text of the words: וְהָיָה לְנֹחַדִּים. Of course, the great light referred to by the prophet is the spiritual light which will envelop the people. He has in mind a regenerated state of man not a single personage as it is taken by the Gospels. The "light" referred to is by the Rabbinic literature identified with the Messiah that is hidden away under the Heavenly throne for the day when the spiritual brotherhood (Messianic era) will be ushered in.³ As soon as the Church Fathers examine the verse they weave about it their mythological interpretations. "Christ it is who is set as a Light to the Gentiles- to them, that is, 'who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death.'⁴

-
1. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- Lightfoot- p. 44.
 2. Real Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche- Article on "Nazareth" (Guthe).
 3. Pesikta Rabbati 36 (161 a)
 4. A.N.F.-Tertullian Against Marcion-vol. lll-p. 454.
A.N.F. Origin Against Celsus (Book VI-Chap. LXVI)-vol. IV-p.603.

When predicting the advent of Jesus, who was to turn away men from the worship of idols and of images and of demons, Isaiah uses the quotation in question.¹

The Midrash refers the verse to a concrete historical reference when it remarks that the second district to which Sennacherib sent the people captive was the territory comprised by the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali as it is written: כַּמֶּת הָרְגָאוֹן הָקֵץ אֶרֶצָה זְבוּלֹן

וְאֶרֶצָה נַפְתָּלִי.² Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel interprets the passage a little differently as is evident from his comment that, according to our verse, the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali were the first to be exiled.³ An interesting note on this verse is found in the commentary to psalms where "the people who walk in darkness" refers to the generation of Mordecai; "you will find no period of gloom for Israel which equals that which prevailed in Shushan the capitol when it was decreed that Israel be destroyed." People will witness a great light in the form of deliverance and this redeemer will be Mordecai, himself.⁴ This last Midrash is in forceful opposition to the Church Fathers' interpretation of this verse as the people sitting in darkness referring to the unbelieving Jews and the redeemer referring to their Messiah Jesus. Is this striking opposition accidental or is it purposive?

A most interesting quotation bearing on the special theme of Jesus as the Messiah is incorporated in Mathew 12¹⁸⁻²¹ borrowed from Isaiah 42¹⁻⁴ "Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased; I will put my spirit on

1. Ibid-Origen Against Celsus (Book VI- Chap. V)- vol. IV- p.575.

2. Midrash Rabbah- Bemidbar 23⁹

3. Ibid- de Echa 5.

4. Midrash Shocher Tov- 22.

him and he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive nor cry aloud, nor shall anyone hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory; and in his name shall the Gentiles hope." This passage is one of the so-called Ebed-Jahwe songs in which Israel personified is represented as God's servant to lead eventually the nations sunk in idolatry and adultery to the pure and undefiled worship of Jahwe. Deutero-Isaiah pictures this servant accomplishing his task of religious propagation by the Divine Spirit, aiding the broken-hearted and persisting indefatigably until all nations accept His law and rule.

We have a Talmudic reference to this verse which tells that one who beholds a reed in his dream should recite the verse in Isaiah 42:3 "a bruised reed, he will not break," before the verse in 2 Kings 18²¹ occurs to him: "Now, behold, thou trustest upon the staff of this bruised reed, even upon Egypt; whereon, if a man lean, it will go into his hand and pierce it." The more sacred character of the former verse is thus evident by the construction placed upon it.¹

The Evangelist tries here, in another instance, to make the various incidents of Jesus' life a fulfillment of prophecy.² He shows Jesus as reticent and unobtrusive, "without hunting after applause, the noise of boasting, or the loud reports of fame. He shall not make so great a noise as is made from the breaking of a reed now already bruised and half broken, or from the hissing of smoking flax only when water is thrown upon it."³ Surely, Lightfoot misunderstands the figures involved. Tertullian, too, says

1. Berachoth 56b; Yebamoth 93b.

2. The Synoptic Gospels- Montefiore- vol. II- p. 619.

3. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- Lightfoot- p. 202- vol. II.

that the passage in Isaiah and the description of Jesus coincide; hence his coming must be admitted.¹

The Targum again renders 'מָלִיךְ by the equivalent of Messiah, and to this extent the Gospel has its support for the Messianic interpretation it gives this verse.² Justin remarks: God, speaking of Christ in parable, calls Him Jacob and Israel. As, therefore, from the one man Jacob, who was surnamed Israel, all your nation has been called Jacob and Israel; so we from Christ, who begat us unto God, like Jacob and Israel, and Judah, and Joseph, and Jacob are called and are the true sons of God, and keep the commandments of Christ." What a pity it is that such a sublime passage of Isaiah should be given the interpretation that Church Fathers make of it! A quibble by Justin to prove Jesus's election and Messiahship!

The quotation in Mathew 21⁵, taken from Zechariah 9⁹, which next comes under consideration is truly Messianic in character. "Say ye to the daughter of Zion; Behold, thy King comes to thee meek and riding on an ass and on a colt the foal of an ass." Toy remarks that "the realization of the spiritual elements of the prophetic announcement is found in Jesus of Nazareth."³ Strangely enough, the poetical imagery of Zechariah, wherein he ascribes two names to one animal, was misunderstood and taken for two animals by Mathew.⁴ The Church Fathers employ these two names as symbolic of two objects, showing that they likewise, did not read the passage aright. The fact that both an ass and its foal which would be used by Jesus are mentioned in Zechariah and in Genesis 49⁸⁻¹² was a prediction, says Justin, "that you of the synagogue, along with the

-
1. A.N.F.- An Answer to the Jews- vol. III p. 164.
A.N.F.- The Treatises of Cyprian- vol. V, pps. 520-1.
 2. Dialogue With Trypho- vol. I-p. 261. also Ibid.p. 267.
 3. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy p. 51.
 4. The Synoptic Gospels- vol. II- p.707.

Gentiles, would believe in Him. For as the unharnessed colt was a symbol of the Gentiles, even so the harnessed ass was a symbol of your nation.¹ What would be more natural than for Christian writers to use this quotation of Jesus? Without ceremony, Cyprian says that "the passage from Zechariah 9⁹ shows that Jesus Christ will reign as king forever."²

As can readily be seen, it would be natural to have the quotation from Zechariah recur repeatedly in the Rabbinic literature. Indeed, we have an instance here where a conscious comment on Christological interpretation may have been intended. Rabbi Hillel says: "Israel does not have a Messiah for they ceased having a Messiah since the days of Hezekiah." Then parenthetically, Rab Joseph adds that God will pardon Rab Hillel for making such a statement, proceeding to show why Rab Hillel was wrong. Hezekiah, he says, lived at the time of the first Temple, whereas it was in the time of the second Temple that Zechariah prophesied and said: "Rejoice, daughter of Zion Behold, thy King comes to thee..."³ The entire discussion in Talmud Sanhedrin seems to reflect the reaction of the Rabbis toward the interpretation given by Christians to Zechariah 9⁹. The passage likewise indicates that at this time of stress and hardship the Messiah was patiently awaited and expected. Even dates are set for his coming: Rab said: "Ben David will not arrive until Rome shall have dominated over Israel nine months."⁴ Various names likewise are given by the Rabbis to the Messiah, furnishing Biblical verses to prove their contentions. Rabbi Alexander said: Jehoshua ben Levi propounded a contradiction: "A son of

-
1. Dialogue with Trypho- vol. I- p.22.
 2. The treatises of Cyprian- vol. V- p.527.
 3. Sanhedrin 99^a.
 4. Ibid. 98^b.

man will come riding upon the clouds" a quotation, which by the way, has been incorporated in various forms in Mathew 24³⁰, Mark 13²⁶, Luke 21²⁷ and Mathew 26⁶⁴, Mark 14⁶², Luke 22⁶⁹, (Daniel 7¹³) and "lowly, riding upon an ass." The answer was: If they be good, he shall come upon the clouds of Heaven, but if not he shall come "poor and riding upon an ass."¹ The comment which follows immediately upon that just quoted is queer and may represent a joking word between King Shabur and Samuel. Said the former: You say that the Messiah will come upon an ass; I should like to send him the first horse I own. And Samuel answered him: Do you then possess a horse of one hundred colors like that one of the Messiah?"² The conversation which follows in which Jehoshuah ben Levi converses with Elijah at the entrance to the cave of Simeon ben Jochai in which the questions of where the Messiah can be found and how he can be reached, indicate with what interest these various matters were being discussed.

That the passage in Zechariah 9⁹ was interpreted further by the Rabbis as applying to the Messiah is evident by the following comments. In discussing the verse of Genesis where Jacob prepares to meet Esau, his brother, a discussion of the **דבור** shows that the Messiah is meant: **דבור דבור שנתאר עני ורכב על דבור**. Again in saying that the ass is symbolic of peace the Rabbis say: "Whoever sees an ass in his dream can expect salvation as it is said: "Behold thy King cometh. . . meek and riding on an ass."⁴ "Rabbi Berachya said in the name of Rabbi Yitzchak: As was the first redeemer so will be the second; as of the first it says: "And

1. Ibid.-98^a. (Sanhedrin)

2. Ibid.-98^a.

3. Midrash Rabbah Bereshith 75⁷; Tanchuma Yayishlach 38^a.

4. Berachoth 56^b.

Moses took his wife and children and caused them to ride upon an ass so with regard to the second it says "meek and riding on an ass."¹ We read also that "those who set free the foot of the ox" applies to the Messiah, the son of David, as it is written, "poor and riding on an ass."² Finally, I quote the passage which gives other characteristics of the Messiah: "just and having salvation" (Zechariah 9⁹) - this refers to the Messiah who justifies his decree upon Israel when they laugh at him while he sits in prison. Thus he is called righteous. Why is he designated one who has salvation? When he establishes over you his judgment, he says to all 'are you not my children, but you will be saved through God's mercy.' "Poor and riding upon an ass" - this refers to the Messiah. why was he called "poor"; because all those years he was humbled in the prison while the transgressors of Israel laughed over him."³

In Mathew 21¹⁶ occurs a verse taken, through the Septuagint, from psalm 8³: "Out of the mouth of children and sucklings thou hast prepared praise." The verse is found in that particular connection where the salutation of Jesus by the children as the Messiah aroused the indignation of the scribes. Says Toy; "like the Psalmist, God had shown these children a truth that the learned men did not see and had thereby made them instruments of praise and strength."⁴ The Church Father Irenaeus went even further in his condemnation of the scribes. Jesus spoke to the "envious wicked stewards, who circumvented those under them and ruled over those that had no great intelligence, and for this reason were unwilling that the King should come 'Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast

Midrash Rabbah Koheleth 1²⁸; also Midrash Samuel 14 but quoted in the name of Rabbi Levi.
 1. Tanchuma Bereshith 2^a.
 2. Pesikta Rabbati-34 (159b).
 3. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy- p.55.

Thou perfected praise' thus indicating that David's prophecy was fulfilled in Himself; that they were ignorant of the meaning of scripture and that He it was 'who perfects praise to His Father from the mouth of babes and sucklings.'¹ Tertullian interprets the verse as showing the preciousness of children, thereby approaching the real meaning of the passage. Also like the Midrashic writers he differentiates between the babes and the sucklings even though his distinction is forced; the former proved its ability to offer him testimony (cf. Mathew 21¹⁵), while the latter, by being slaughtered for his sake, knew what violence meant (cf. Mathew 11¹⁶⁻¹⁸).²

That the Rabbis, in their characteristically homiletic fashion let the בָּבִים signify one thing and the סוּגְלִים another is seen in the Midrash to the Psalms. "Who are the בָּבִים? Rabbi Jochanan () says these are those who are without as it says, 'the babes ask for bread' (Lamentations 4⁴)- the סוּגְלִים are those still in the womb of the mother; Rabbi Jochanan () says again the

בָּבִים are those within as in Job 3¹⁵ it says: כְּבִלִים זֶה רָאוּ אֶת אֵל and סוּגְלִים are those without.³ The bulk of Rabbinic comments on this verse, however, show how dear to God are His own creation, children who are His handiwork; they prove God's strength and praise by obedience to His law and the study of his commandments. Children, indeed are the only splendor in the world.⁴ When God asked for a pledge of Israel before entrusting His most sacred heritage- the law, to the people, He was satisfied with no offer save that of making the children a pledge,⁵ for in their keeping alone is the Torah

1. Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol. I- p. 475.

2. A Treatise on the Soul- vol. 111- p. 200.

3. Midrash Shocher Tov 8; also quoted in the names of Jose of Galilee and Rabbi in Mechilta Ex. 15¹ (42a) with use of different Biblical quotations; Tanchuma 30b.

4. Midrash Rabbah Bemidbar 9⁴.

5. Midrash Shocher Tov 8; Tanchuma 50b.

safe: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou founded strength. וְיִלְדֵי חָיִל וְיִלְדֵי חָיִל as it is written: וְיִלְדֵי חָיִל וְיִלְדֵי חָיִל ¹ That the children served as praise and strength to God only when they heeded His law is seen further in His threat to dash His children Israel to pieces for destroying the "house which I have built, and by means of which Israel fulfills my law."² They also rendered God's praise when they were delivered from Egypt for upon that occasion "the most delicate children, even the sucklings joined in the song of the sea."³

The question of the real Messiah was itself proposed by Jesus when in the last of his discussions with the Pharisees and Sadducees he quotes in Mathew 22:44 (occurs also in identical form in Mark 12:36 and with variation in Luke 20:42,43) the verse of psalm 110:1: "The Lord said to my lord; sit thou at my right hand till I put thy enemies under thy feet." If, as the Jews believed, the Messiah was to be of the seed of David, how could David call his own son lord? "If the Messiah is David's son, how is it that David, speaking by Divine inspiration ascribes to Him a divine title and divine prerogatives? The solution suggested though not expressed, is that the Messiah is not only the son of David, but son of God."⁴ Dalman suggests that by his question, "Jesus showed that a Davidic descent, according to the flesh, was not an essential attribute of the Messiah."⁵

This passage is most significant. The Rabbis would not have had nearly the trouble in settling a problem such as this seems to present, nor would it have been outstanding enough for their purposes,

1. Midrash Rabbah Shir Hashirim 1:24.

2. Midrash Shocher Tov 17 and 121.

3. Sotah 30b.

4. International Critical Commentary to Mathew- Allen- p. 242.

5. "The Words of Jesus"-Dalman- p. 319.

to call it a great victory for one individual, as is ascribed by the Christians to Jesus. Many verses, with apparently greater contradiction than this verse are thrown up one against the other by the Rabbis and answered with more ease. Jesus approached the Talmudic method in so ^{far} as he was the difficulty and put the question but he did not complete it- harmonization was not attempted. Compare, for example, the Midrashic method of harmonization.¹

The psalm is, according to Toy, addressed to the priest-King of the Maccabaean period; "his coming victories over enemies are announced, and his establishment in the dignity of priest."² The psalm, however, was perhaps written earlier than this period. "The Talmudists apply the psalm to Abraham; the Targumist (as it seems) to David; others (as Justin Martyr tells us) to Hezekiah. His words are in his dialogue with Tryphon. "I am not ignorant," says Justin, "that you venture to explain this psalm as if it were to be understood of King Hezekiah."³

Herford⁴ sees in this passage Christological influence. He points to the Talmudic passage which relates how the Priesthood was taken from Malchizedek and given to Abraham, applying this verse: "The Lord said to my lord, sit thou at my right hand, etc." In the Apostle to the Hebrews, Malchizedek is represented as a type of Christ (Hebrew VII) and so when the priesthood is taken from Malchizedek and given to Abraham who is shown in the Tosafoth^{to} the passage in question to be from the house of Shem (just as was Malchizedek) the influence of the Min is here seen. Furthermore, Rabbi Ishmael who lived at the end of the first and well on into

-
1. Midrash Agadas Bereshith- perek 21.
 2. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 62.
 3. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- Lightfoot- p. 197- vol. III.
 4. Christianity in the Talmud. Travers Herford- pps. 338-340.

the second century, tries to lower the exalted position of Melchizedek.¹ That Abraham was God's messenger is shown by the Midrashic comment to this verse which tells that Abraham 'aroused the nations to come and place their trust under the wings of the Shechinah.² That there was some doubt as to whether Abraham should be named as the Messiah or not is indirectly hinted at in another place.

"Rabbi Judan in the name of Rabbi Chama says; In the time to come God will have the Messiah sit on his right hand, as it is said: 'God said to my lord, sit at my right hand' and Abraham on His left; Abraham's face turned pale and he said, 'my son's son shall sit on the right and I on the left?' Straightway God appeased him and said 'thy son's son shall be on my right and I shall be on thy right, if such an expression be possible, for it says: $\text{אֲנִי וְאַבְרָהָם}.$ ³

We seem to have a definite anti-Christological interpretation in the Midrashic comment on this verse which says that "those who claim that there are two gods will be cut off and will perish;" as for there being a third party, this applies to Israel for Isaiah says 'in that day Israel will be the third' (19:23). "The wicked ones and the Babylonians" claim that He has a son. They certainly must perish." Unmistakably there is contained here a reference to the Christians and a refutation of the Trinity idea.⁴

A final passage from Luke 1:17 taken not formally, but used as a free adoption of Malachi 3:23-24 also bears on our discussion of Jesus as the Messiah: "And he (John) shall go before him (God) in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient (to walk) in the wisdom of the

1. Nedarim 32b; Midrash Rabbah Vayikrah 20; also Sanhedrin 108b.
 2. Midrash Shocher Tov 110.
 3. Midrash Shocher Tov-(122:18)
 4. Midrash Agadas Bereshith- Chapter 27.

just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared." The Jews took Malachi literally and expected the coming of Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah. It should be observed that the Gospel writer borrowed from the first verse of the chapter of Malachi and then from the last verses.

Our Rabbinical comments to the verse tell us first that the power of resurrection is in Elijah's keeping for when it says, I shall send Elijah who "shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the hearts of the children to the fathers" it refers to ^לאֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. In the next place, there is a discussion of just what labor Elijah will perfect by his coming. How are the words of the prophet to be interpreted. Elijah, it is said, "will come to declare clean and unclean, to remove and to bring near. Rabbi Jehudah says to bring near but not to estrange; Rabbi Simeon remarks, to settle disagreements; but the ^אאֲמַרְתָּ עֲלֵיךְ עֵלְיָא יִבְרַח עִמָּם עַד שֶׁיִּשְׁלַח בְּיָדוֹ אֶת הַיָּדָא הַזֶּה לְעַלְמָא דְּבִרְיָא. say Elijah will come neither to estrange nor to bring near, but rather to establish peace throughout the world, as it is said: "And he will turn the hearts of the parents to the children and the hearts of the children to the parents."²

Lightfoot comments on the Gospel passage showing that although the Greek says "Elijah the Tishbite," the Hebrew has "Elijah the prophet" and therefore when it says some one will come "in the spirit of Elijah" it leaves room for Jesus as well as some Jewish heir." As Elijah turned the hearts of the Israelites to God (1 Kings 18) so did John turn the hearts of the fathers to the children. Elias the Baptist will turn the hearts of the Jews towards the Gentiles and of the Gentiles toward the Jews."³

1. Yerushalim 3c, also Midrash Rabbah Shir Hashirim 1⁹.
 2. Midrash Shir Hashirim 428 also Edayoth VII⁷.
 3. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- Lightfoot- vol. III-p.20(Transl. by Rev. E. Gandel.)

A patristic reference, as also our Talmudic comments, make this passage Messianic. It refers it more specifically to the Judgment Day. "The forerunners of Christ must appear before him on the Judgment Day as he says by Malachi and the angel 'I will send to you Elias the Tishbite before the day of the Lord, etc. These then shall come and proclaim the manifestation of Christ that is to be from Heaven.'"¹ The quotation in Malachi is used in the Talmud as reflecting the Messianic time. More than that, not Elijah himself, but the son of David is referred to. The question is asked whether wine will be permitted to the Nazarene on the day of the coming of the son of David, which day is represented to be that understood by the verse of Malachi 3:23: "Behold I send unto you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the day."² Again we see that the of of Malachi 3:23 must refer to the coming of the Messiah when it is identified with the pangs of the Messiah which shall escape him who fulfils the duty of eating the three Sabbath meals.³

Before concluding this section, it is necessary to mention a parallel use of the quotation from Malachi 3:1 in Mathew 11:10; Mark 1:2; Luke 1:76, 7:26: "Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee." In the Gospels, as is evident from the above discussion, the messenger is John the Baptist who represents the Elijah whom the Jews expected to be the forerunner of the Messiah. The minister of God's word is known as an "angel" a not uncommon use of the term for those appointed in God's service, according to Tertullian.⁴ It is unnecessary to

-
1. A. N. F.- Treatise on Christ and Anti-Christ (vol. V) Hippolytus p. 213.
 2. Erubin 43b.
 3. Sabbath 118a.
 4. A. N. F.- An Answer to the Jews (Tertullian) vol. LII-p.163.

adduce further Rabbinic proofs that this passage was given a
Messianic interpretation. That has been/^{shown}sufficiently in the refer-
ence given above. I will only mention the Midrashic comment which
indicates that because the people are mortal they will not be permitted
to enter the promised land in this life, but in the world to come
God will send His messengers to prepare the way."¹

This discussion sums up in brief form the Old Testament quota-
tions which have been variously interpreted by the Gospels and the
Church Fathers' literature, and in some cases by our own sources, as
having Messianic import. It constitutes perhaps more than any other
early theme where difference existed between Jews and Gentiles a
point of departure in the Synoptic Gospels, otherwise a genuine Jewish
product. It was hoped that by this specific identification of
Jesus with the Messiah Christianity would be established and Jesus
recognized. As Lightfoot says, the great work of the Gospels was to
bring mutual embraces of Jew and Gentile through the acknowledgement
of Jesus.²

1. Midrash Rabbah Bemidbar 16:8; Tanchuma 212b.
2. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- vol. III- p.20.

C. Defense of the Word in Jesus' Name.

It is possible to catch a glimpse of the struggle which must have ensued as a result of the promulgation of this New Testament doctrine by the examination of various quotations incorporated into the Synoptic Gospels from Old Testament sources. We can see how the Jews endeavored more and more to reject Jesus and the Gospels in favor of their own word. Indeed, the numerous disputations and dialogues between the proponents of the various Laws are in themselves, on the surface, sufficient evidence of the conflict which must have raged. Many also were those who arose to defend the Word in the name of Jesus. Finally, it was urged by early Christians that the son of man would give proof of himself, "whom they would not before acknowledge: a proof, indeed, not in any visible figure, but in vengeance and judgment so visible, that all the tribes of the earth shall be forced to acknowledge him the avenger."¹ Of course, a treatment of this question, as all questions which I am considering in this thesis must needs be very limited. I am bound in my consideration to merely quotations which reflect the polemics of Judaism and Christianity, and these quotations are, by no means, all inclusive.

To such an extent were these polemics indulged in that martyrdom was pointed to as an ideal and was most highly commended. When, for example Mathew 5:10 quotes: "Happy are they that have been

1. Cf. Daniel 7:13- Mathew 24:34- Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae-
vol. II- Lightfoot p.320.

persecuted for righteousness sake" the historical setting is placed among those conscientious adherents of early Christianity who suffered in Jesus' name. The quotation is a general inference from the Old Testament, possibly with special reference to Daniel 7:25-27 "where the holy people, after having been persecuted, receive the 'Kingdom of Heaven.'"¹ The Kingdom of Heaven was won through martyrdom.² Numerous other references can be cited to show that in the death endured for the sake of that cause representing Jesus, there is only sweetness. "Only by enduring persecutions are ye to be known as his (Jesus') disciples."³

A second beatitude that comes under consideration here is quoted in Mathew 5:9, "Happy are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God." This passage also is a generalization from Old Testament statements, the exact verbal equivalent of which is not immediately evident. That God is the bestower of the supreme blessing of peace is a thought found in psalms 72:3,7; 85:11; "and they that make peace may by excellence be called His sons"- proverbs 12:20⁴ Almost innumerable are the references in Rabbinic and even later literature to the priceless treasure of peace. "Rabbi Simon bar Chalafta said: behold, how beloved is peace. When God wished to bless Israel, He could find no vessel which contains as many blessings as peace."⁵ "Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace, etc."⁶ It is unnecessary for me to go into a

-
1. Quotations in the New Testament-Toy page 28.
 2. A.N.F.-Scorpiace (Tertullian)- vol. III. p. 639.
 3. Ibid.- "The Epistle of Zephyrinus- vol. VIII- p.611; The Treatises of Cyprian- vol. V- p. 538. The Stromata or Miscellanées (Clement)- vol. II- p. 413.
 4. Quotations in the Old Testament- Toy- page 28.
 5. Midrash Rabbah to Debarim 6.
 6. Aboth I:12.

-21.-

discussion of similar passages. I need only give references to a few.¹

It has been hinted that the peacemakers are those who have so gained control over the Law promulgated by Jesus that the disquieted mind has been put to rest, and the passions which war against reason have been subdued. The entire emphasis is placed on bringing peace through the knowledge of the Gospels.² Jesus charges "the believers and the obedient to have peace among themselves, and says to them, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the very sons of God."³ Here is another case where struggle and conflict with a group differently minded from themselves, prevented the early Christians from discussing peace per se as an ideal, but were compelled to look upon peace as peace from strife of religious views- a narrow and limited definition of God's greatest gift to man. How far away was this conception from that nobler view which looked upon peace as the world's all enlarging blessing. (The peace hinted at in the references above. See notes 5 and 6, page 20.)

Accompanying the defense of the Gospel in Jesus' name is the expression of hope and belief that his word would eventually triumph and his disciples, too, would become numerous. True, his followers could not be granted the Divine promise that they would become "as numerous as the stars of Heaven" but yet they built up their own prophetic word which augured for them great strength, Mathew 13:32, Mark 4:32, and Luke 13:19 record the verse: "The birds of Heaven came and lodge in its branches."⁴ It is an adoption of part of the description of the great tree in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, and surely

1. Berachoth 17a; Yebamoth 14b; Rosh Hashana 17a; Midrash Rabbah Veyrikrah 9.

2. A.N.F.- The Stromata or Miscellanies- (Clement)- vol. II. p. 416.

3. Ibid. Ibid.- Recognitions of Clement- vol. VIII- p. 105.

4. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy p. 39.

would seem to imply nothing of the notion of growth of adherents to the faith. But in the Gospel, "the parable of which this sentence is a part, seems to describe the future propagation of the word or doctrine of the Kingdom. Starting from small beginnings in the teaching of Christ; it will spread rapidly and win many adherents."¹ "This great tree" that casts its shadow over plains, and mountains and all the earth, is the law of God that was given to all the world; and this law is the son of God, proclaimed to the ends of the earth; and the people who are under its shadow are they who have heard the proclamation, and have believed in him."²

Nor is this imagery altogether unknown to the Rabbis. In fact, we have a close analogy to it in our Talmudic literature. Raba tells us that the disciples of the rabbis are like the kernels of the mulberry tree; when they begin to spread they spread ever farther.³ The similarity is striking and interesting.

The theme of the superiority of Jesus' word to Jewish contemporary doctrine is further expressed in the passage of Mathew 15:8,9, Mark 7:6,7 which are identical-borrowed from Isaiah 29:13. "This people honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; but in vain do they worship me, teaching as teachings ordinances of men." Although Jesus was attacking the men and opinions which were considered by the people of his time authoritative and right, the Church Fathers turned about the interpretation of his words- they referred it to the controversy which separated them from the Jews. In some cases, be it said to their credit, they excluded the Law of Moses from the consideration of "the commandments of men," but the traditions

1. International Commentary to Mathew- Allen p. 151.

2. A.N.F.- The Pastor of Hermas- vol. II- p. 40.

3. Taanith 4a; Aboth III:22.

of the elders themselves which they had invented, and in upholding which they made the law of God of more effect, and were on this account also not subject to his word.¹

But that the Jewish word was of no avail is seen in Justin's dialogue with Trypho, the Jew: "But they are cisterns broken, and holding no water, which your own teachers have digged, as the scriptures also expressly asserts 'teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.'"² Again, we read how Tertullian rebukes the people for wishing to accept the righteousness of their own law and establish it above the teachings of Jesus, "the end or finisher of the law," "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men".³ Another significant reference to the fact that Jesus was not accepted by the people nor recognized as the promulgator of a new law is found in Tertullian, where the Church Father says that Jesus was destined "to be betrayed with a Kiss, for he was "Honored with the lips" of the people," not with the heart.⁴

The prophet Isaiah meant merely to rebuke the people for their false method of worshipping God. He pled for righteous conduct, for the worship of God in the Spirit, not for adoration which involved bringing of sacrifices in insincerity of heart and purpose. The latter are only man-made institutions which are mechanically performed by people, "learned by rote," not Divinely appointed nor Divinely sanctioned. The Targum to this passage, in stating that the people keep their heart far from the fear of God, refers to worship. "God wishes the heart of man." ⁵

-
1. A.N.F. - Irenaeus Against Heresies, Vol. I, p. 476.
 2. Ibid - Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, Vol. I, p. 269.
 3. Ibid - Tertullian Against Marcion, Vol. III, p. 460; The Epistles of Cyprian, Vol. VI, p. 362, 370, 387.
 4. Ibid - Against Marcion, Vol. III, p. 419.
 5. Sanhedrin 106 b.

Jesus had practically the same idea in mind in his teachings. It is regrettable that the Church Fathers made Christianity worse than Christ!

A quotation which readily lends itself to the discussion of the rejection of Jesus by the Jews and his defense by the Christians is that found in Mathew 21:42, Mark 12:10-11, Luke 20:17 and taken from psalm 118:22-23: "The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner. ^{From} ~~Jahwe~~ is this; "it is wonderful in our eyes." Jesus, of course, uses this quotation "to symbolize his rejection by the scribes, "hypocritical formalists" and the whole nation, and thereby announces to the Gentiles the coming of the Kingdom of God. In the psalm, however, Israel is portrayed rejected by the nations and becoming in God's eyes the foundation of His own eternal kingdom, of His "Temple of truth." An interesting fact is seen in the Targum rendering of this verse. It reads: **ט"ז אבין ארכ"א** "The builders rejected the child." The error probably came about by the rendering of **אבין** with **אבין**, a very probable transposition of vowels.

Only one reference in the patristic literature interprets this verse as applying to any other than to Jesus. The expression stone, says the reference is used of Adam. "The chief corner-stone becomes the head of the corner. For that in the head substance is the formative brain from which the entire family is fashioned.¹ A comment which expresses exactly the interpretation put on the verse by the Christians is given in the following: "by them(the Jews) he(Jesus) was rejected as an unprofitable stone, but by you was he received as the cornerstone." 2.

1. A.N.F. - "The Refutation of All Heresies - Hippolytus, Vol.V,p.51.
2. Ibid - Constitutions of the Holy Apostles - Vol. VII, p. 446.

בְּעֵצָה קְדִינָה נִשְׁכַּח יִשְׂרָאֵל
In this world _____

The comment on this verse in the Talmud deals with the discussion of the Hallel of which this verse is a part and refers the particular sentence under consideration to David.¹ A midrashic comment also refers this passage correctly to Israel: "in the world of judgment" (בְּיָמֵי הַדִּינִים) Israel is comparable to stones, as it reads "the stone which the builders rejected."² Other passages make the quotation apply to David who at first was a shepherd, obscure and unknown but who later became a king, "the cornerstone."³ Interesting are the Targumic insertions in the verses 22-29 of psalm 118. We see that the Messianic interpretations to these verses were then already quite forcible. "From Jahweh is this 'the builders say: "it is wondrous in our eyes" the son of Jesse says. 'This is the day which the Lord hath made' is said by the builders, "let us rejoice and be glad in it' is said by the son of Jesse." And so with the other verses; it is expressly stated by whom the various refrains are uttered and to whom they are applicable.⁴

A final quotation to be considered in this division is found in Mathew 26:31 and Mark 14:27 taken from the description in Zechariah 13:7: "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered." The introductory formula "for it is written" indicates here, as has already been pointed out in various other places, that the prophetic passages were regarded as predictions of the Gospel stories, many of which, indeed, were invented to accomodate prophetic passages. On the surface, there seems to be a similarity in the uses

1. Pesachim 119a.

2. Midrash Rabbah Esther 7:12.

3. Midrash Shocher Tov -118; Rabbah Shemoth 37a.

4. For comment on this passage compare Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch - Strack and Billerbeck, page 876.

made of the quotation by the prophet and the evangelist. Israel's leader gone the people shall stray about without guidance; So Jesus smitten and put to death, his fold, too, will be scattered. Again, the Church Fathers put a different construction on the verse: Jesus was smitten, to be sure, but as a result of it, his sheep are to be scattered to all parts of the world preaching the Gospel in his name. Jesus is represented as arising after his death and bidding his disciples carry on his work: "Smite the shepherd, and his flock shall be scattered."¹

D. The Rejection of Jesus and the Gospel Teachings by the Jews.

A second phase of the struggle between the upholders of the Gospels and the supporters of the Old Covenant centers about the rejection of Jesus and the Gospel Teachings by the Jews.

The first quotation which I shall take up for consideration occurs in Mathew 13:14,15; Mark 4:12, 8:18; Luke 8:10; and is borrowed from Isaiah 6:9,10: "Hearing ye shall hear and shall not at all understand, and seeing ye shall see, and shall not at all perceive, for this people's heart has become gross, and they have heard heavily with their ears, and have closed their eyes, lest perchance they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their heart and turn, and I heal them." "The parallelism between the conditions of Israel in the times of Isaiah and Jesus is plain: at both periods the nation was unspiritual,"² indeed, so spiritually dead that Isaiah, when uttering the word, knew that there could not possibly be any religious awakening. In the time of Isaiah the nation was addicted to idolatry and sacrifice and similarly in Jesus' day the cry is against religious traditions and ordinances; "in both instances there was religious formalism."²

1. A.N.F.-Dialogue with Trypho- vol.I- p.222.
2. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 39.

There are numerous passages in the Church Fathers literature which point to this passage as indicative of the rejection of Jesus by the Jews. The hearing is explained as the hearing not with the ear but with the heart.¹ But the fact that the Jew heard, but yet heeded not shows him to be a transgressor.² In another instance the same Church Father says that the Jews could not see nor hear and for this reason Jesus spoke to them in parables. To his disciples he but rarely spoke in parables for they were able to comprehend his words.³ Some of the passages which comment on these verses tell us that Isaiah addressed these words to the people because when they saw Jesus they did not see who he was- the Messiah "and an offspring beyond reason"-⁴ for they had their senses blunted by "loving God with their lips but keeping far away with their heart." It occurs to me that this question is another very appropriate statement brought into the Gospel narrative merely to account for the fact that Jesus was not accepted by the Jews. In one instance, the quotation is considered by Tertullian as containing an ethical significance. He pleads for simplicity and modesty, for riches bring on and are occasioned by greed. Through riches "the heart of the people is made thick so that they see not with their eyes nor hear with their ears."⁵

The Rabbis do not enter into a discussion of the meaning of the verse from the point of view of its use by Isaiah. Had they taken up verse by verse for theological discussion we might have had interesting comments. In one instance, we get a philosophical statement by Rabbi Jose which may be related to our quotation: "woe to those who see but

-
1. A. N. F.-Tertullian Against Marcion- vol. III- p. 376ff.
 2. Ibid.- Tertullian on Modesty- vol.IV- p. 82.
 3. Ibid.- Tertullian on the Resurrection of the Flesh- p. 568.
 4. Ibid.- Origen Against Celsus- vol. IV- pps. 432-433.
Oration Concerning Simeon and Anna (Methodius)- vol. VI-p.391.
Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III- p.325.
 5. Ibid.- On Fasting- Tertullian- vol.IV- p. 105.

know not what they see; they perceive the world standing, but they do not know on what." Then the Rabbis proceed to show the supports of the universe.¹

The quotation is also used in senses which are far removed from the original meaning. For example there is proved by it the practice of having the prayer for Repentance in the Shemonah Esreh follow the prayer for Knowledge; "this is only logical since our verse reads

וְגָדְלוֹ בְּיָבֵן וְשָׁב וְרָמַע לֵא² We also learn from the passage how powerful is repentance. "Great is תשובה " says Rabbi Jochanan for it annuls decrees passed against man since it is written: "If this people fatten their heart..... then will they be able to repent and return."³

Next in order comes the verses which were strung together from Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11 and used by Mathew 21:13, Mark 11:17, Luke 19:46: "My house shall be called a house of prayer, but you make it a den of robbers." That God's house was meant for worship where not only the prayers of others were offered, but also His own is seen in a Talmudic comment.⁴ In this quotation Jesus does not measure up to the sublime use of the verse in Isaiah; he merely indicated the proper use of the Temple and then showed how far short of its purpose it fell when it countenanced robbery by traders within its walls, parading "under the pretence of care for the convenience of the worshippers."⁵ Isaiah, however, voiced a most majestic hope and prophecy when he said that Jahwe would eventually be supreme, to whom every knee must bend. Even the Rabbis did not interpret his verse in this same spirit when they declared that all Israel would pray towards one

1. Chagigah 12b.

2. Megillah 17b; Yerushalm Berachoth 4d (bottom).

3. Rosh Hashana 17b.

4. Berachoth 7a.

5. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 54.

enter no matter where they might be.¹ How could Christianity have included all peoples in prayer for a central house of worship when they persecuted those who refused to accept their Gospel? They could not attain to Isaiah! Furthermore, Jeremiah had in mind the misappropriation of Temple purposes when he made his prophecy. The people make it a den of robbers by offering within its walls sacrifices with blood-and sin-stained-hands. We have an interesting parallel in the Talmud (reference given by Strack and Billerbeck) to the ^{driving out of the} Temple those of unclean hands and acts. Four voices are heard in the Temple court; two of these are orders to the impure to betake themselves from the Temple, the other two are injunctions to the pure of the Priestly family to enter.²

Irenaeus says that Jesus' rebuke of the scribes and Pharisees, his driving out of the Temple the changers of money, who were buying and selling, occasioned their refusing to receive his word and believe in him. This notion occurs elsewhere.³ So, likewise, the bishops of the Church are called upon to reject any transgressor of the law, for if he be permitted to remain he will convert the Lord's house into a den of thieves."⁴ It stands to reason, however, no matter what may be the causes that the Pharisees accepted not Jesus, that Christianity was too absorbed by its struggle for adherents to the Church, to preach an all-inclusive universalism.

Another interesting quotation reflecting the question of the rejection of Jesus and the Gospels by the Jews is found in Mathew 21:33, Mark 12:2 and Luke 20:9 taken from Isaiah's famous "song of the vineyard" chapter 5:1,2: "There was a householder who planted a vineyard,

1. Yerushalim Berachoth 8c.

3. A.N. P.- Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol.I- p.464.

Ibid. Dialogue with Trypho (Justin)- vol.I- p.203.

4. Ibid.- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol.VII- p. 403.

5. Pesachim 57a.

and surrounded it with a hedge, and hewed a wine-vat in it and built a tower. Isaiah uses this illustration of Israel, God's chosen, whom the Lord tended and guarded with precious care. Various passages in the Midrash show us that it was customary for the Jews to build a tower in their gardens and vineyards with watch-towers for proper guidance;¹ hence this figure readily suggested itself to the prophet.

This quotation in the Bible was borrowed for the sole purpose of showing once again Israel's rejection of Jesus. The story is told of how servant after servant is sent to claim the fruit; each, in turn is killed; then the son- "the heir" is sent, and he, too, is put to death. Let me quote Irenaeus: "God planted the vineyard of the human race when at first He formed Adam and chose the Fathers; then He let it out to husbandmen when He established the Mosaic dispensation: He hedged it round about, that is, He gave particular instruction with regard to their worship: He built a tower (that is) He chose Jerusalem. He digged a winepress that is, prepared a receptacle of the prophetic spirit. Prophets were sent to seek the fruits, exhorting the people to righteousness but the people hearkened not. But last of all, He sent Jesus "whom the wicked husbandmen cast out of the vineyard when they had slain him."²

A Midrashic reference uses the verses from Isaiah in exactly the same sense that the prophet intended them. Israel is compared to the rows of precious things planted in the garden that has been fenced in; in whose midst is a high-tower, over which a guardian is set. At the sight of it, Pharaoh is forced to send Israel out of Egypt.¹ An

1. Midrash Rabbah Shemoth 2; 20:3.

2. A.N.F.-Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol.I-pps. 514-515.

interesting reference in the Talmud tells us that there was a large court in Jerusalem called בית צדוק. What was בית צדוק? The place where they would hold fast to the law, as it says: "he fenced it in and built stones about it."¹ According to the Babli references this spot was used for giving testimony. Another reference also identifies this quotation with the Temple, the altar, and the pit built alongside the altar.² This seems to be an urge to keep their own faith intact. Perhaps the Christian interpretation was known to the Rabbis, although not consciously cross-referenced.

Brief mention might also be made of the verse used variously in Mathew 24:29, Mark 13:24 and Luke 21:25, 26. The ideas expressed in these verses giving the imagery of the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, the shaking of the powers of Heaven are taken from passages in the Old Testament such as Ecclesiastes 12:2; Daniel 8:10, Joel 4:16; Isaiah 13:10; 34:4; Ezekiel 32:7, 8 and others. I mention it because of the interesting comments made by Lightfoot on the quotation. "The sun shall be darkened"- that is, the Jewish heaven shall perish, and the sun and moon of its glory and happiness shall be darkened, and brought to nothing. The sun is the religion of the Church; the moon is the government of the state, and the stars are the judges and doctors of both."³ And further he adds that by the prophecy in Isaiah 8:23 is meant "that the contemners of Emanuel and his testimony" that is those who refuse to accept Jesus and the Gospel are to be driven into eternal darkness. Nothing will be able to save them.⁴

-
1. Talmud Yerushalim- Rosh Hashana 58a; Babli 23b; Tosafoth Succah 59b.
 2. Yerushalim Succah 54a; Babli 49a.
 3. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- p.319.
 4. Ibid. Pages 87-88.

Wunsche¹ calls our attention to Rashi's comment in Sanhedrin of the light of the moon which will be as strong as the light of the sun; this will be in the days of the Messiah.² "In this respect our source parallels the use of the imagery in the Gospel but the interpretation and application by the two groups, respectively, differ in a considerable degree. A reference to the coloring of the Heavenly bodies with attendant trouble is mentioned in another instance. "When the sun will be in appearance like blood then will destruction come upon the world; when it shall be comparable to sackcloth (p^v) then will the pangs of hunger come; when it shall be like both then will destruction and hunger overtake the world."³

Finally, there can be mentioned the verse in Mathew 27:9,10, incorrectly ascribed by the Gospel writer to the prophet Jeremiah, but which comes from Zechariah 11:13: "And they took the thirty pieces of silver- the price of him who was priced, whom they priced on the part of the children of Israel- and gave them for the potter's field as the Lord commanded me." It has been suggested, to confirm the Gospel writer, that Jeremiah 32:7-15 may have been intended but this is hardly possible; there seems to be no points of similarity between the passages. Toy amends the Hebrew $\text{לִּשְׂכָּרָם לְכַלֵּי הַיָּד}$ which seems justifiable in the light of the proof adduced.⁴ The prophet tells how he symbolically takes two staves to represent His relation to the people; one of Favor, the other a brother-hood Staff Bands. Because of the unfaithfulness of Israel toward its Father, God offers to break asunder the staff of Favor if the people be willing to discontinue their covenant with Him, and be paid His hire. The people accept counting

1. Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung- page 311.

2. Sanhedrin 91b; Pesachim 68a.

3. Succah 29a (Reference given by Strack and Billerbeck).

4. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 69.

out thirty-pieces of silver which are given to the potter. Thus God is aware of their rejection of Him. Now in the Gospel, the thirty pieces of silver represent the money which Judas, the betrayer of Jesus accepts for his plot from the priests who hired him, but which in remorse, he returns and which is appropriated to the purchase of a potter's field. In so far, on the surface, does the similarity between Zechariah and the Gospel story lie. The priest's hiring of Judas is meant to represent the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish nation. Just as Israel cared little for God, that is, for his holiness, so "the priests, in taking measures to put Jesus out of the way, showed that they did not understand him."¹

Strange to say the Talmud disregards altogether the sense in which the prophet used the passage. Instead of the note of rebuke which Zechariah intended for the verse, the Rabbis invested it with a commendatory reference. The word יָדָו, they say, is to be identified with the righteous, forty-five of whom support the world. Of this number thirty are in Palestine as is proved by the verse of the prophet: "And I took the thirty-pieces of silver and I cast them into the house of God, to the potter."² Surely there is no hint of derision in this interpretation, no disgust at the people's infidelity to God! Compare, also, in this connection the Targum to verses 11 and 12 of Zechariah 11.

In keeping with this explanation is the comment in the Midrash. "Rab says that the 'thirty pieces of silver mentioned in Zechariah 11:12, 13 refer to the thirty righteous men, while Rabbi Jochanan says they apply to the thirty commandments; some one asked Rabbi Jochanan- 'did not Rab know that the verse applied to the peoples of this

1. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 72.

2. Chulin 92a.

world?' According to the opinion of Rab, his words will be fulfilled when the majority (of the thirty righteous) will be in Palestine and the minority in Babylon.¹

At this point, I bring to a close my discussion of the position which Jesus holds in early Christian and Jewish literature. It must be borne in mind that, after all, the Jewish reactions to these questions are reflected only in the comments on the Old Testament Quotations in the Church Fathers' literature. The verses treated do not, for the most part, contain Rabbinic hints to the questions subsumed under this first chapter. Having determined Jesus' status, I proceed now to a discussion of certain doctrines advocated in his name.

¹ Midrash Pabbah Bereshith 92:14; Jerushalmi Abodah Zarah 40c.

Chapter II. Salvation.A. Baptism

Another strain that runs through the quotations of the Old Testament incorporated into the Gospels and given a peculiarly Christian interpretation is the idea of Jesus' saving power. Both by the ceremony of baptism (common also to Judaism but not with the same saving grace) and also by the profession of Jesus could salvation be won. These two methods of being won through Jesus will constitute the discussion of the present chapter. The significance of this idea was mentioned in the previous chapter in the discussion of the virgin-birth of Jesus, where his in-dwelling self is sufficient to win salvation (cf. Page 2 (note 4)). Some of the passages which amplify this theme were fundamentally not intended, even in the Gospels, to carry that meaning; only Church Father dialecticism attached to them this significance. A study of these quotations may, because of this reason, therefore, be especially interesting.

Mathew 3:3, quoted also in Mark 1:3 and Luke 4:4-6, borrows from Isaiah 40:3-5 the Ebed Jahwe passage: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths." Of course, the Evangelist applies this word to Jesus' forerunner John the Baptist. "Here, as elsewhere, Jesus represents the consummation of God's dealings with Israel and with the world; his person embodies all Israel's religious history."¹ The Gospel writer did not understand correctly the syntax of the verse. Both the accent and parallelism demand that וַיִּבְרָא qualify the verb יִבְרָא - "Clear a way in the wilderness." This alters materially the picture of the Messianic garb in which John is introduced to us as a result of the misinterpretation. The variation misses also the real meaning of the passage in which Cyrus is announced as God's messenger permitting captive

1. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy p.19.

Israel to return to habitable Palestine, "where every valley will be raised and the high places brought low."

Tertullian, in commenting on this verse, says: "The angel the witness of baptism makes the paths straight for the Holy Spirit, who is about to come upon us, by the washing away of sins which faith, sealed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, obtains."¹ In another place he asks, for what end did He send His son? "To redeem them that were under the law (Gal. IV:5) in other words, to make the crooked ways straight, and the rough places smooth."² Clement (circa 153-217) who after Justin and Irenaeus is to be reckoned the founder of Christian literature says that the voice crying in the wilderness invites to salvation. "John is the forerunner, and that voice the precursor of the word; an inviting voice, preparing for salvation."³

As is to be expected, the Rabbinic literature interprets this passage in its typically homiletic fashion applying it at times to Palestine itself, or giving it readily acceptable ethical interpretations. For example, the Talmud says that when one inherits a portion of God he advances to greatness, but if one becomes haughty God humbles one; "if, however, he changes, God will raise him on high as it is said: $\chi\chi\chi' \chi'1 \zeta>$ ⁴. In another instance the voice which calls is a voice of comfort; wherever Jeremiah uttered harsh prophecies we have parallels where Isaiah anticipated him and soothed these predictions; so we find corresponding to Jeremiah's prophecy: "the ways of Zion are mourning, the prophecy of Isaiah: "a voice calls, prepare in the wilderness a way, etc."⁵ Again we have the extreme opinion

-
1. A.N.F.-Tertullian On Baptism- vol.III- p.672.
 2. Ibid.- Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III- p. 436.
 3. Ibid.- Exhortation to the Heathen- Clement of Alexandria-vol.II-p.174.
 4. Erubin 54a; also Nedarim 55a.
 5. Midrash Rabbah- Echa 1.

of Resh Lakish that the passage refers *אל תהיה* for he uses the quotation to prove that not in this world but rather in the world to come will there be public thoroughfares.¹

In one passage of the Midrash this passage is correctly applied to the Promised Land, although given a fanciful interpretation. God, says the passage, has made Israel a most estimable promise when He said that every valley will be raised, the hills lowered, and the rough places made smooth,"for it means that when God dwells there, the land will be broadened and enlarged."² One of the seven clouds of glory which accompanied Israel in the wilderness, says Rabbi Hoshea, raised the low places and made all a plain.³

Certainly, in this instance it would seem that the Rabbis were either unaware or uninterested in the Christian interpretation of this verse. Evidently, they did not believe that any injury was being committed by the use of the verses from Isaiah even as referring to one who later was recognized the founder of a strong religious following. It will always be most interesting to find out, more definitely, why the Rabbis did not purposely cross-reference the Christian interpretations. Much of the early movements of Judaism and Christianity will then be more appreciatively appraised.

It may not be out of place to bring into consideration one of the beatitudes, the next reference reflecting the notion of baptism and hence salvation in Jesus. Mathew 5:6 and differently quoted in Luke 6:21 contain the thought: "Happy are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." This reference is paralleled in Biblical quotations, not in this exact form, but it can be identified with such a description of Isaiah 55: "Ho, every one that

1. Yerushalmi- Erubin 25b.
 2. Midrash Rabbah- Debarim 4.
 3. Ibid.- Debarim 1.

thirsteth.... come, buy and eat, etc." Of course a spiritual hunger and spiritual food are implied in the quotation. Such a broad, wholesome, ethical doctrine is surely narrowed by the constriction placed on it in classing it with baptism and thus confining the inheritance with God only to those upon whom are sprinkled the drops of water. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness" refers to the waters of baptism," for by baptism the Holy Spirit is received, and thus by those who are baptized, and have attained to the Holy Spirit, is attained the drinking of the Lord's cup."¹ Such a limitation is unfair to the doctrine which was intended, and which can be effective, only when it has a universalistic tendency. In keeping with this broad interpretation our rabbis say that the good of the righteous is also the good of one's neighbors² or the righteous are a blessing also for offenders.³ Not only can all attain to righteousness, but it may be infectious. Jesus' Sermon on the Mount is quoted as vindicating the loftiest teachings a religion can espouse. Certainly, it has been made provincial and unacceptable when it excludes, by reason of a mere rite, those who are possessors of the highest spiritual truth.

The Jewish law of legal testimony is included from Deuteronomy 19:15 in Mathew 18;16 in connection with the discussion of baptism: "Take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may stand." In Mathew the quotation is applied to misunderstandings between two men.

How is this quotation employed by early Christian writers?

"By two and three witnesses every word is established"- by Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, by whose witness and help the prescribed

1. A.N.F.-The Epistles of Cyprian- vol.V- p.360.
 2. Succah 56b.
 3. Midrash Rabbah Bemidbar 9.

commandments ought to be kept."¹ Again the passage is used when it is claimed by some that Jesus was resurrected. Those who claim that they were onlookers to the spectacle were summoned and three testified that they saw Jesus on the Mount of Olives and that they saw him ascend to Heaven.² While the women were at the graves of Jesus waiting for his resurrection "two angels, however, appeared there"(Luke 24:4); "for just so many honorary companions were required by the word of God, which usually prescribes two witnesses."³ The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit win baptism for they constitute the witnesses prescribed by law.⁴ When a bishop is ordained God as Judge, and Christ, the Holy Ghost as well as all the holy and ministering spirits must be present to fulfil the verse: "in the mouth of two or three witnesses, etc."⁵ For the same reason a heretic, if he be alone in his testimony, cannot be accepted in a case against a bishop or a Christian.⁶ A correct application of the quotation is found in the same place, where it is used in a legal sense as was intended by Deuteronomy; "When an accuser brings a case against a man, take not only his testimony as final, but bring two or three witnesses in addition."⁷

In the Jewish sources, the passage in question is used only to decide the legal sanctity or falsity of a court question, and in such testimony the decision of the two witnesses must coincide to be valid.⁸ Many misdemeanors are enumerated for which two witnesses in this legal

-
1. A. N. F.- Excerpts of Theodotus- vol. VIII- p.44.
 2. Ibid.- The Gospel of Nicodemus- vol.VIII- p.434.
 3. Ibid.- Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III- p.422.
 4. Ibid.- Tertullian on Baptism- vol. III- p.672.
 5. Ibid.- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol.VII- p.482.
 6. Ibid.-page 504- Decided at Council of Constantinople 381 A.D.
 7. Ibid.- page 418.
 8. Sanhedrin 30a.

sense are necessary: before condemning a woman to the Sotah treatment¹, in the case of ascertaining whether or not a woman has been untrue to her husband² and in every case where the question of death is being considered as a possible punishment.³ The Rabbis also settle the problem of why the scripture seems to be so arbitrary about whether there be two or three witnesses. They say that in case of a get, the testimony stands by the word of two if it be a plain document and by the testimony of three if it be a folded document.⁴ Thus the Rabbis met all the exigencies of the verse and enumerated the specific cases in which such testimony would be required. They used the verse strictly for the purpose it was intended and amplified it only in the directions of its potential interpretations. Foreign matter was, in this case, not introduced and hence Christian commentaries to the verse cannot well meet it on the basis of discussion.

A quotation that is found only in Mark 9:48 and has been borrowed through the Greek from Isaiah 66:24 is also allied to our discussion of salvation: "Their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched." The sentence in Isaiah describes the punishment which shall befall all those who transgress against God; a burning heap of rotted corpses will be the bodies of those who do not join the new covenant of God. In the Gospels the expression is used to represent, figuratively, the fate of unbelievers and sinners in the next world.⁵

This quotation is a classic example of verses used to illustrate the theme that salvation is intended only for those who accept baptism and Jesus; eternal damnation is the only other alternative. The punishment described in Isaiah 66:24 will befall "those who do not preserve the seal unbroken"- the editor of the Ante-Nicene-Fathers adds

1. Sotah 3b.

2. Gittin 89a.

3. Sankhedrin 9b; Mishnah Maccoth 1:7.

4. Baba Bathra 160a; cf. Maccoth 1:7 which identifies the "three" with the "two."

5. A.N.F.- Treatise on Christ and Antichrist-Hippolytus-vol.V. p.219.

here that probably baptism is meant;¹ or it will befall those who are impenitent.² In another connection we learn, according to Justin, that "the Jews hope in vain for salvation if they think it can be obtained except through Christ;" rather the fate which will overtake them shall be that their worm shall not die; and their fire shall not be quenched,"³ Further he says that not merely being of the seed of Abraham will save, if one be a sinner, and faithless and disobedient to God.⁴ On the Judgment-Day an ever-burning Gehenna will burn up the condemned, and a punishment devouring with living flames. He will be a sight for all eyes to behold.⁵ A most interesting comment is made by Lightfoot on this passage in which he adheres to the interpretation given above and attempts to explain the verse. The allusion to the fire is not that of the altar, he says, but to that in the valley of Hinnom where dead bodies were left to waste or be burned. "Carcasses crawl with worms; and instead of salt which secures against worms, they shall be cast into the fire, and shall be seasoned with flames, and yet the worm shall not die. But he that is a true sacrifice to God shall be seasoned with the salt of grace to the incorruption of glory."⁶

In a Talmudic comment to this passage Herford believes he sees direct Christological influence.⁷ He holds that those who show any Christian leaning are consigned, by the Rabbis, to the fire of the next world. He points to the Tosefta passage which says that the Minim, apostates, betrayers of the Torah, those who depart from the ways of the congregation, everyone who sins and causes others to sin, besides

-
1. A.N.F.- The Homily Ascribed to Clement. vol.VII- p.519.
 2. Ibid.- page 223.
 3. Ibid.- Dialogue with Trypho- vol.I- pages 216-7.
 4. Ibid.- page 264; 269.
 5. Ibid.- The Treatises of Cyprian- vol.V- p.404; Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol. VII- p.440.
 6. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- vol.III- pps.425ff.
 7. Christianity in the Talmud- pages 118ff.

many others who are enumerated have Gehinnom shut in their faces and there they are judged for generation upon generation as is attested to by the verse in Isaiah.¹ The Midrash to the psalms, however, has a comment on the tense of the verb involving the punishment of those who transgress against God:

שְׂמַחַת צַדִּיק נֶאֱמָר אֶלֶף וְעוֹשֵׁי רָעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל

showing that the fire consumes those who persist in sinning

"וְעוֹשֵׁי רָעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל"

"וְעוֹשֵׁי רָעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל"

The Rabbinic literature entire identifies this verse with the punishment of the wicked in Gehinnom. The righteous are permitted to look upon the discomfiture of the sinners; "when the righteous leave Gan Eden and see the wicked in Gehinnom, they are glad for their fate, as it is written: "They go out and look upon the corpses of those who transgressed against me"; at such a moment they render thanks to God for the trouble He has brought upon them in this world.³ Again, we read that God showed Moses the land which He swore unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to give them, teaching that He let him behold also Gehinnom. "Moses said who are judged there? God answered 'the wicked and those who transgress against me' for it reads 'their worm shall not die and their fire shall not be quenched.'" ⁴ Another Midrash cautions us to be of those who look upon the corpses of the transgressors and not of those looked upon: for the partition between Gehinnom and Gan Eden is according to some a span, a wall or a very thin division.⁵ That there is a small difference, in actuality, between the two extremes and that both, in fact, have Divine sanction is exemplified by another reference which says that even though

1. Tosefta Sanhedrin 13:4,5- also Talmud Rosh Hashanah 17a.

2. Midrash Shocher Tov-2.

3. Midrash Rabbah Veyikrah-32b.

4. Midrash Rabbah Bemidbar 23:4.

5. Ibid.- Koheleth 7:31.

the fire of Gehenna which was created on the second day shall never be extinguished, yet God by saying on the sixth day that everything which He had made was good, must have included also the fire of Gehenna.¹

I shall mention also the quotation in Luke 4:18,19 taken from Isaiah 61:1, 2: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He has anointed me to announce good news to the poor, He has sent me to proclaim release to captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to release those who are crushed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." The prophet Isaiah, according to Toy, addresses his brethren in the Babylonian exile, declaring that as God's spiritual agent he is coming in His name to announce the people's immediate liberation from captivity and their return to the land of Canaan. Jesus, however, interpreting these words also in a broad spiritual sense applies to himself the mission herein contained- he it is who will bind up the wounds, lead into light those now in darkness, in short, free men from sin and bring them salvation.² Jesus, as the Son of God, is in some instances also identified with the Heavenly Priest and the Most Holy, as in the quotation under consideration. "Whosoever, therefore, believed on the Heavenly Priest, were cleansed by that same Priest, and their sins were blotted out."³ "Those eager in the pursuit of virtue are even in this life delivered from the bondage of evil; for Jesus declared this as was foretold long before his advent by Isaiah when he said that 'the prisoners would go forth, and they that were in darkness will show themselves.'" ⁴

1. Pesachim 54a.

2. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 80.

3. A.N.F.- Fragments from Commentaries (Hippolytus)-vol.V- p.181.

4. Ibid.- Origin Against Celsus- vol.IV- Book VIII- Chap. LIV-p. 660.

The Rabbinic writers gave to this verse its evident interpretations in commenting at greater length upon it. Ethical significance, rather than theological inferences, are to be expected from this quotation and this the Rabbis give us in several instances. For example, in a discussion of the comparative merit of the various attributes attainable by man such as "care, zeal, earnestness, cleanliness, abstinence, fear of sin, piety, etc." humility (ענוה) is placed supreme by Rabbi Joshua ben Levi who quotes the verse from Isaiah 61 showing that ענוה is mentioned: "God hath sent me to announce good tidings to the poor."¹

Other passages comment on the רוח הקדוש, but there is no possible hint of a dual personality as in the explanation of the Christian doctrine. A strict monotheism on which the Rabbis persistently insisted would not present the necessity for refuting such interpretation as given above from the Church Fathers. The Rabbis say simply that in three cases in the Bible is the רוח הקדוש used in conjunction with deliverance; one of these cases occurs in Isaiah: "The Divine Spirit is upon me because God has anointed me to bring good tidings,"² the good tidings, of course, being the deliverance from Babylonian exile. we learn also that the spirit of prophecy issues from God: "The spirit of God is upon me."³ Is it possible that we have here a sly thrust at the usurpation of human divinity- at the right which essays to save, not through the direct power of God?

B. Vicarious Atonement.

A few quotations contain the notion of vicarious atonement as interpreted in the Christian theology. As usual, these quotations have been re-interpreted from Old Testament passages whose sense was

1. Abodah Zarah- 20b.
2. Midrash Rabbah- Echa 3:37.
3. Midrash Rabbah Vayikrah- 10:3.

different from that given them by the New Testament writers, but whose form lent themselves readily to the preachment of the new doctrine. The best example of this fact is the quotation in Mathew 8:17 taken from Isaiah 53:4: "Himself took our weaknesses, and bore our diseases." It can easily be seen how such a passage could be given the notion of bearing hardship and sin for the sake and deliverance of others. In the connection in which this sentence is found there occurs the stories of Jesus as a healer; first the leprous person, then he who is afflicted with paralysis and finally the fevered-individual are cured by Jesus. Hence, Mathew gives a physical sense to Isaiah's words when he adds "himself took our infirmities and bore our diseases," for he finds them fulfilled in Jesus' acts of bodily healing- "that is, he regards the diseases of men as having been transferred to Jesus and borne by him- an idea not intended by the prophet."¹

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah contains another one of the so-called Ebed-Jahwe songs in which the body-politic Israel is referred to as the sufferer in a spiritual sense; it "bore our sufferings and carried our sorrows." It is only because Israel was regarded as God's chosen servant that it was made to suffer as it did. There is no desire to delineate the idea of vicarious atonement in the Christological sense, although some, influenced by Christian doctrine, perhaps, have placed this passage in the same category of Christian doctrines as that given it by the Church Fathers. Strack and Billerbeck have incorporated the entire Targumic passage to Isaiah 52:13-53:12 in their commentary to show the Messianic setting of this verse. They parallel with it Tanchuma (תנ"ך) 35a.

Tertullian quotes the passage merely to show Jesus as a healer,²

-
1. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy-page 30.
 2. A.N.F.-Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III-p.336.

identifying the Greek word for carry in the expression "to carry our sorrows" with the notion of taking away.¹ Later the bishops are instructed to take Jesus for their pattern in their action toward the laity they serve. As Jesus for others at his crucifixion "bore our sins and was afflicted for us" so must the bishops do in like manner.² The sentence is also used by an early Church Father as showing that two comings of Jesus were predicted by the prophets and his becoming a man subject to stripes and knowing what it is to bear infirmity represents his first coming;³ by means of it was he able to save and atone for the sins of others.

It is interesting to note that the Rabbis make this passage Messianic; speculations are rife as to the character and identity of the Messiah intended by the passage. It was clear ^{that} at that time; it was not established who the Ebed Jahwe was. For example, we learn in the Talmud that the Messiah referred to by the passage is none other than a member of the house of Rabbi Judah Hanasi; of him it is said: "He bore our infirmities."⁴ And as if cognizant of the Gospel use of the quotation the Rabbis say that the Messiah will be full of infested ulcers.⁴ A suspicious reference, indeed for having borne the diseases; it will be visible that he suffers for others. Nork suggests similarity here to Christian teaching.⁵

Another passage which perhaps bears treatment at this point is from Isaiah 53:12 found in Luke 22:27 where the texts coincide exactly: "He was reckoned with transgressors." we get in this context, again, a picture of suffering Israel despised and rejected. Toy

-
1. A.N.F.-Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III-p.354.
 2. Ibid.- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles-vol.VII- p.409,
 3. Ibid.- Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol.I- p.506.
 4. Sanhedrin 98b; also Baba Metzia 85a (Given by Strack and Billerbeck).
 5. Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen- F. Nork- page XXIII.

remarks that Jesus, to whom these words are applied in the Gospel, is himself the embodiment of the misunderstood servant of the Lord. He makes the words apply to an incident in his own life; indeed, perhaps another instance of the many recurring examples of stories created to accomodate Biblical texts. Just as above Jesus describes that it was his mission to be a bringer of good tidings, "to proclaim release to captives, recovery of sight to the blind, etc." so here he accepts the account of Israel's record as appropriate to his own case.¹

Later, a further idea was connected with this notion of Jesus' having been "numbered among the transgressors" in behalf of his people, when a Church Father associated the idea of martyrdom to the passage: "Those who deny martyrdom to Jesus and claim that his followers suffer justly place themselves companions of those who accounted Jesus among criminals, fulfilling the scripture which saith 'He was numbered with transgressors.'"² Tertullian suggests that "two malefactors are crucified around him (Jesus) in order that he might be reckoned amongst the transgressors."³

we have a reference in the Talmud which comments on this verse. It identifies this sufferer with Moses. Moses wanted to enter the Promised Land that he might fulfill all the commandments and receive the reward which would accrue to him for so doing. But God assures him that he (Moses) is accounted as one who has already performed them quoting Isaiah 53:12: "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with transgressors" - How? He was numbered with the generation of the wilderness.⁴

-
1. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 81.
 2. A.N.F.- Origen Against Celsus- vol.IV-p.660.
 3. Ibid.- Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III- p.420.
 4. Sotah 14a.

A verse which will be discussed in another connection and which may be mentioned in passing before taking up the next chapter is the verse used in Mathew 27:46 taken from psalm 22² "My God, my God why hast Thou forsaken me?" Interestingly enough, we get here a real case of pilpul when Tertullian interprets the verse as follows: why hast Thou delivered me up as an atonement for the people's offences ?¹ However, further consideration of this verse falls logically under another chapter.

Since the Jews never fixed on a Messiah ~~as~~ finally as the Christians, but regarded him as one yet to come, they could not very well promulgate the doctrine of salvation in the Christian meaning. As long as Jesus is reputed by the Christians to have been the Messiah there must be ascribed to him the power of salvation by belief in him and acceptance of his doctrine; otherwise the heralding of him can have very little practical appeal. And certainly Judaism cannot adopt the teaching of vicarious atonement. History and Fate have compelled it to play that role, it seems, among the nations of the world, but as a doctrine it has always been unacceptable to the Jews in the Christian sense. Our literature scarcely confirms traces of it in the Old Testament quotations.

Chapter III.

The Question of the Trinity.A. Monotheism and Idol Worship.

The doctrine of the Trinity as understood in Christian dogmatic thought cannot be traced back earlier than the end of the second century. Therefore, the constructions put upon it in my discussion must be later than the Gospels themselves, dating from the Church Fathers. The quotations which will be considered fall under the titles which I have decided to name Monotheism and Idol worship, and Jesus in Relation to the Trinity.

First will be considered the quotation from Deuteronomy 6:13 which was incorporated in Mathew 4:10 and Luke 4:8 where the rendering is identical: "The Lord thy God thou shalt worship and Him only shalt thou serve." In the Deuteronomic Code, promulgated to purge the people of false worship and infidelity to Jahwe, the meaning of the verse is apparent without commentary. In the Gospel it is used in connection with Satan's attempt to have Jesus prostrate himself to Satan through the offer of Kingdoms which his eye was permitted to behold on the mountain-top.

The history of the early Church tells how corrupt Roman practices seized hold of the people and when peace was restored for a time in the Christian fold, many of its adherents lapsed; "they were unwilling to bear the afflictions which beset the righteous" and to heed the command of worshipping one God and serving Him alone.¹ The same Church Father urges martyrdom upon the people to the end of worshipping the one God rather than giving oneself over to idolatrous practices.² Such an injunction can be paralleled repeatedly in Jewish records, not only in word but also in practice. The cases of Rabbi

1. A.N.F.-Treatises of Cyprian-vol.V- p.439.

2. Ibid.- vol.V-pps.497ff.

Akiba and the tradition of the Ten Martyrs alone need be cited in proof of this point.¹ In this point of pure worship and the abstention from idolatrous practices it is admitted by the Church Fathers that Jews also deserve mention. The Jews and the Christians, says Origen, "not only avoid temples, altars, and images but are ready to suffer death when it is necessary, rather than debase by any such impiety the conception which they have of the Most High."²

But as long as Christianity taught the Divine Origin of Jesus they could not at the same time adhere, without difficulty, to a pure monotheistic God-conception. True, the Athanasian creed co-ordinated the three Powers into one God-head, but Jesus was declared to be distinct from the Father. Hence, in preaching the worship of One God, the only recourse of the Christians was to use Jesus as an intermed-iator. Of this arrangement we have many illustrations. For example idol-worship is forbidden on the ground that the sun, moon, and stars pray to the Supreme Being through His only-begotten Son; therefore, how full of folly is it to pray to the Heavenly objects themselves.³ The intermediating power is also identified with Wisdom which raises up to the truth those who have fallen prostrate before idols.⁴ Another clear case of Jesus acting as intermediary and through him attaining to a monotheism is found in Clement's invitations to the Gentiles to know Jesus who knows the one God, and thus become freed from the many gods.⁵

Another comment on this verse found in the Church Fathers is interesting and shall be made mention of just because it is paralleled by a Talmudic quotation. It is the serpent which lurks in the heart

1. Midrash Nleh Eskorah

2. A.N.F.- Origen Against Celsus- vol.IV-pps;636-637.

3. Ibid.- p.548.

4. Ibid.- Exhortation to the Heathen-Clement- vol.II-p.195.

5. Ibid.- Recognitions of Clement-vol.VIII- p.146.

that prevents a worshipping of God and the serving of Him alone.¹ Similarly we learn that the **אֱלֹהֵי הָאָדָם** is known as an **אֱלֹהִים** which lodges in human frames.²

Another quotation which must now be considered is that found in Mathew 22:37; Mark 12:29,30, Luke 10:27 and taken from Deuteronomy 6:4, 5: "With all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind." This passage more than any other, perhaps, has produced discussion and pamphlet designed to show Christological influences in the Rabbinic writings. It will not be necessary for me to go into a consideration of how this verse concerns the discussion of the monotheistic and Trinitarian God-ideas. Herford has collected the passages which illumine this consideration and commented on them.³ A thorough study of the Minim cannot be gone into without having to consider at some length the discussion of the daily prayers and the Sh'ma in particular.

Jesus summed up all righteousness and piety in two commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself." These constitute man's duties toward his God and his fellowmen. There are various attempts to explain the significance of the double injunction: "Thou shalt love God" and "Thou shalt fear God," one saying that the first is proposed for the obedient man, the other for the disobedient man.⁴ Another one says that "the Instructor (Jesus) in giving the Old Covenant disciplined the people with fear saying "Thou shalt fear the Lord God" while in giving the New Covenant Jesus said "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God."⁵ Does such an unfair comment need refutation?

1. A.N.F.- The Clementine Homilies- vol.VIII- p.280.

2. Shabbas 105b.

3. Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash-Travers, pps. 307ff.

4. A.N.F.- Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III- p.308.

5. Ibid.- The Instructor- (Clement of Alexandria)- vol.II- p.224.

That in connection with this theme under discussion the Jews exercised a profound influence on the Christians cannot be gainsaid. In the fact that martyrdom on the part of Jews was witnessed by the Christians and then commended to fellow Christians we see direct dependence of the latter on the former. Loving God, to wit, with all its strength (by which in the endurance of martyrdom it maintains the fight), with all its life (which it lays down for God) it makes of man a martyr. For such death man wins the Kingdom of Heaven."¹ Here surely we have Jewish parallels. The Sh'ma was the pass-word on the lips of every dying Jew. A comment in the Talmud was evidently the basis for the above reference from Tertullian.²

An interesting passage to this verse in the Siphre is that which emphasizes love of God rather than fear, for he who loves God will acquire reward in "doubled form." Be as Abraham in this regard, for his love for God was so strong as to have converted to the worship of God all the people of Charan. "With all thy heart" means with thy two inclinations, the good and the bad; "with all thy heart" also means that thy heart be not divided in thy love of God. Then follows a comment showing how precious in God's sight is martyrdom. God applies to the righteous who give their lives in His name the verse in psalm 44:23: "For thy sake have we been murdered the whole day; we are as sheep led to the slaughter."³

B. Jesus in Relation to the Trinity.

I shall proceed now to the second subdivision of my chapter and discuss the references made to Jesus as an element of the Trinity. His relation as son to the Father and his existence as a distinct

1. Ibid.- Scorpiace- (Tertullian)- vol.III- p.639.

2. Berachoth 61b; Yerushalmi Berachoth- Chap.9 (14b)- Yerushalmi Sotah 20c. Midrash Rabbah Debarim 2:26.

3. Siphre 73a.

personality shall come under consideration. Many quotations, which were used as predictions of various incidents in the life of Jesus involve the discussion of Jesus' status as God or son. For example, a quotation which has already been discussed (see page 14) incorporated from psalm 110:1 in Mathew 22:44 treats this matter; when the verse reads, "The Lord said unto my lord, sit thou at my right hand" speculation is rife as to the persons of the God-head speaking. By way of illustration, I shall mention only a few discussions on the verse. Justin says that the psalm proves that some other one is called Lord by the Holy Spirit besides Him who is considered Maker of all things.¹ Most comments refer to this passage as an example of the Father's and Son's distinct personality; the Father is represented addressing the Son.² Again we learn that by the same quotation the Father and the Son are truly proved one and the same.³ Finally, we are told that in this verse the spirit is speaking of the Father and the Son, in the character of a third Person.⁴ And now having presented the problem involved, I shall take up the quotations in the order of their appearance in the Gospels.

I shall consider together the quotations which deal with the second attempt of Satan to entrap Jesus, and the answer which Jesus returns. The tempter conducts Jesus to the holy city and sets him on a pinnacle of the Temple. Then he tells Jesus that if he be the Son of God let him cast himself down for it is written "He shall command his angels concerning thee, and on their hands they shall bear thee up, lest perchance thou strike thy foot against a stone." Jesus answers in Mathew 4:7 and Luke 4:12 from Deuteronomy 6:16, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." The former of the two quotations

-
1. A.N.F.- Justin's Dialogue with Trypho- vol.I-p.224.
 2. Ibid.- Treatise Concerning the Trinity (Novatian)- vol.V-p.637; Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol.I-p.418; The First Apology of Justin- vol.I- p.178.
 3. Ibid.- Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol.I-p.426.
 4. Ibid.- Against Praxeas (Tertullian)- vol.III- p.606.

represents the Father's care over the Son.¹ Satan, however, tells a falsehood when he ^Plies that the verse from psalm 91:11 refers to one who "casts himself down from thence"; these last words are not scriptural, but are invented by Satan. Jesus understands this as is seen in his answer; he means that "he had no right to throw himself into uncommanded danger, and then expect God to deliver him."² It is man's duty not to tempt God, and in this instance Jesus is represented as appearing in human form.³ Compare the Talmudic equivalent: Rab says: "A man should never bring himself into temptation."⁴

The Rabbinic interpretations of the verse show that the angels here referred to are the ministering angels who accompany man, testifying for or against him in the way he should walk.⁵ So precious is the paternal care from above that the "one guarded" is considered more important than the "guard."⁶ The angels in question bless and accompany the man who performs deeds of benevolence; he who performs one Mitzvah has one accompanying angel, and he who performs two Mitzvoth has two accompanying angels as is proved by the verse in psalm 91:11.⁷

The quotation in Deuteronomy which Jesus uses in his answer to Satan is employed in an altogether different setting in the Bible. The people, being unable to get water at Maaseh believed that God would no longer be in their midst. God's patience is tried when they then ask His protection and the answer comes back: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." In the Talmud the verse comes under consideration

-
1. A.N.F.- Against Praxeas- Tertullian- vol.III- p.597.
 2. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 22.
 3. A.N.F.- Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol.1- p.549.
 4. Sanhedrin 107a.
 5. Chagigah 16a; Taanith 11a (quoted by school of Rab Shilah and not Rab Zerekah).
 6. Midrash Rabbah Bereshith 78:2; Shocher Tov 104:17.
 7. Midrash Rabbah Shemoth 32:1; Bereshith 75:8.

in the discussion held between Rabbi Jochanan and a youth as to the significance of the verse: **תַּעֲשֶׂה לַיהוָה תְּשֻׁמָּה** which is interpreted "give a tithe in order that you may become rich." How is this principle proved? and the answer given is that one is not permitted to tempt the Holy One in a case like this.¹ It is listed as the sixty-fourth of the **תְּשֻׁמָּה** commands "not to tempt the Lord thy God;" and the command is explained by saying that one should not tempt God's true prophet more than is necessary. The word of God is uttered by His messenger. In this connection we also learn that the food of the High-Priest on the Eve of the Atonement Day was carefully selected. Not everything which he customarily relished was permitted to him lest he be not pure and able to conduct the forgiveness services of the people on the great Holy Day"- Ye shall not tempt him."²

Mathew 19:26; Mark 10:27; Luke 1:37 have borrowed from Genesis 18:14 the comment "with God all things are possible." (Hebrew: **כִּי אֵלֹהִים הוּא**

וְכָל דָּבָר אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר אֱלֹהִים יֵעָשֶׂה) Tertullian goes into a very detailed discussion to prove that the Son and the Father must be identical; "The Father is not the same as the Son in such a way that both of them should be one, and one or the other should be both." He objects to the Monarchists who try to sever and exclude one from the other, causing neither the Son nor the Father to be held and acknowledged," so that He is not the Father since He has not the Son." But, they (the Monarchists) say, 'with God all things are possible.'" True enough, but this statement, answers Tertullian, must be modified. "For a barren woman to have a child against nature was no difficulty with God; nor was it for a virgin to conceive." But to other things we must apply the principle 'whether God has really done a thing before ascribing indiscriminately the power to God to do all things. Some things he is unwilling

1. Taanith 9a.

2. Jerushalim Joma 39a.

to do.¹ And in this strain he continues his discussion of the relation between the Son and the Father in the Trinity God-head.

In the Hebrew the quotation occurs, as the passage cited from Tertullian already shows, in the discussion of the possibility of Sarah's giving birth to Isaac after she has been barren beyond the age allowed by nature to bear. The Targum renders the Hebrew as follows:

הִי תִכְסֶּה בְּן קֶדֶם יְהוָה בְּתִיגְדָּא "Is anything hidden from God."

The Midrashic comment to this verse tells us of the smith who can join together two parts of one chain and make them whole, for certainly he who made them originally can mend them. So, in the case of Sarah's bearing a child, if God can create human life can he not return human beings to the condition of their youth?²

The next quotation to be considered occurs in Mathew 21:9, 23:38; Mark 11:9; Luke 19:38 and is taken from psalm 118:26: (Hosanna to the son of David) "Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord." (Hosanna on high) This verse could just as conveniently be discussed under the question of Jesus as the Messiah, which the rendering in the Gospels makes it. In the psalm the words express a pious welcome to any servant of God who comes in His name."³ The psalm was meant to carry no trace of a Messianic character.

That Jesus is at once angel and God is seen in this quotation, say the Church Fathers. "Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord" shows that the Son came in the Father's name.⁴ An interesting reference to the cry of the psalm is seen in a celebration described as probably taking place on Palm Sunday, the first day of the Paschal

1. A.N.F.- Against Praxeas- vol.III- pps.604ff.

2. Midrash Rabbah Bereshith-45:22.

3. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 52.

4. A.N.F.- Tertullian Against Praxeas- vol.III p.613; The Treatises of Cyprian- vol. V- p.517.

week. On this day the people are exhorted to festivity and are asked to exclaim unceasingly "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord."¹ Is there not a striking similarity to our celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles when the people, waiving their willows, encircle the altar in procession every day and cry out: "Hosianna, Hosianna"² In the Talmud this verse is commented on in connection with the Hallel discussion, of which psalm 118 is a part. The entire matter of the origin of the Hallel recital and its connection with the celebration of the Passover are discussed in detail. The question of alternate reading by the congregation and the reader is also taken up; to David are ascribed the words: "Blessed be he who comes in the name of the Lord" and Jesse replies "We bless you from the house of the Lord;"³ or the reader says *ברוך ה' אלהינו* and the congregation respond: *יהי שם כבודך לעולם ועד*⁴. There are to be found only the slightest Messianic possibilities in the interpretation of this verse.

Jesus as a personality is represented in Mathew 26:38 and Mark 14:34 which are identical, a quotation borrowed from psalm 42:6: "My soul is very sorrowful." From this verse, say the Church Fathers it is at once evident that Christ had a distinct soul and distinct flesh" that he was truly human and in that respect not different from ourselves.⁵ How these comments are to be understood in the light of the Divinity of Jesus and his identification with the Trinity is difficult to say. "When the Gospels wish to indicate any suffering or perturbation affecting Christ it does so under the name of soul: "My soul is sorrowful, even unto death"- the soul is something intermediate between the weak flesh and the willing spirit."⁶

-
1. A.N.F.- Oration on the Palms (Methodius)- vol.VI-p.394.
 2. Midrash Rabbah Veyikrah 30:5.
 3. Pesachim 119a; Midrash Shocher Tov 118 where men of Judah and Israel are represented as taking part in the responses.
 4. Succah 38b.
 5. A.N.F.- On the Flesh of Christ (Tertullian)- vol.III- p.533; also De Fuga in Persecutione (Tertullian)-vol.IV pps. 120-121; Origen -De Principiis- vol.IV p.378.
 6. Ibid.- Origen- De Principiis- vol.IV- p.289.

The Rabbinic comments interpret the verse not in the sense of pain but unrest of mind, as the psalmist no doubt intended it. "Why fallest thou, trust in God" is the meaning given the verse.¹ The commentary in psalms treating this verse represents Israel as a community disturbed of soul when it beholds the peace of the idolators and apparently no concern shown by God over this condition.²

The famous dying words of Jesus in Mathew 27:46 and Mark 15:34 taken from psalm 22:2: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" bear treatment at this point. Tertullian again says that this quotation is a clear reference to the Son's distinction from the Father; he further says that it was the voice of flesh and soul, that is, of man which cried out, and not the voice of God.³ It was the torments of hell through which he had been passing that made him pour out his soul in this manner.⁴

A number of the Rabbinic traditions refer the verse to Esther who upon coming to the house of idols lost the guidance of the Shechinah, and she cried: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me? Dost Thou judge an unintentional act as if it were intentional and a compulsory act as though it were voluntary?"⁵ The most extensive comments to the verse are to be found in the Midrash to the psalms ad hoc. God never leaves the righteous in trouble more than three days as is evidenced by Jonah's experience in the belly of the fish- long enough to say on the first day *יְהוָה*; on the second to repeat and the third day to call aloud *יְהוָה צוּרִי*. Another explanation of the verse is that one *יְהוָה* refers to the Red Sea experience, another to that of

1. Midrash Rabbah Debarim 1:16.

2. Shocher Tov- 42.

3. A. N. P.- Tertullian Against Praxeas- vol.III- pps.621; 626-627.

4. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- vol.II- Lightfoot- p.369.

5. Megillah 15b; Yoma 29a.

Sinai; *למה לא יצאנו* - why was the natural order changed in my behalf, and also the order of the mothers; Sarah was captured for one night, and God smote Pharoah and his entire household. Esther said: "I have been given to the embrace of that wicked man these many years; why hast Thou not performed wonders for me; why hast Thou forsaken me? Esther says further that she fulfilled the three Mitzvoths *למה לא יצאנו* and *למה לא יצאנו*, why then has God forsaken her? Rabbi Pinechas in the name of Rabbi Hoshaya said: "when our fathers cried unto Thee, Thou didst hear their cry..... we fast, afflict ourselves and pray day and night, but Thou doest for us no wonders. My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me? "If we have no deeds to our credit, deal with us for the sanctification of Thy name."¹ In the Mechilta the verse is used to prove God a merciful God rather than a severe judge: "God acted toward me with mercy, while He acted as a Judge toward my fathers."²

The words in Luke 23:46 "Into thy hands I commend my spirit" seem to represent the last words of Jesus, just as Mathew 27:46 and Mark 15:34 give the verse of psalm 22:2 just quoted above as his parting cry. The words from Luke are taken from psalm 31:6. In the psalm, the words express the general committal of life to God's keeping; there is no reference to death. At times when acts were entered into, the future of which was not certain, such even as nightly sleep the prayer was offered: "Into Thy hands I commit my spirit."³ The Midrash tells how Balaam, called to curse Israel, was forced to bless them when he beheld how diligent was Israel in the observance of their Mitzvoths and the offering of their prayers.⁴

-
1. Midrash Shocher Tov- 22.
 2. Mechilta 44b.
 3. Berachoth 5a.
 4. Midrash Rabbah Bemidbar 20:19.

As is to be expected, Tertullian says this verse represents the Son speaking to the Father thus showing their distinct personalities. This he says on several occasions with regard to this quotation.¹ "Into Thy hands I commit my spirit; he thereby gave up his ghost," says another reference.²

Throughout this discussion, it can be seen that the exact status of the Trinity-idea during the period which we are considering had not yet been determined. There was a fluctuation of opinion as to the relation of the three component figures of the God-head. It was only later- in the days of the Post-Nicene Fathers and thereafter that the Trinity notion took on a more stable and definite form.

1. A.N.F.- Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III- p.421; Against Praxeas- p. 621.
2. Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol.VII- p.445.

Chapter IV.

Jesus in Relation to the Law and the Prophets.

There remain to be considered now a few quotations which I have grouped under the title of "Jesus In Relation to the Law and the Prophets." A number of the verses which have already been discussed might better have lent themselves to this theme; indeed, most of the quotations in the Gospels borrowed from the Old Testament are designed to prove that Jesus was foretold and heralded by prophetic utterances. For convenience sake, however, I have subdivided my subject in such a manner as to include these quotations in earlier divisions. In Jesus the Old Law is supposed to have been fulfilled; he is at once the acme and the consummation of the prophetic word. "Speaking as the world's prophet, he not only revealed the future, but once and forever delivered potentially all truth to the world."¹ Let us examine this claim in the quotations which remain for treatment.

Montefiore calls attention to the fact that in the Gospel of Mathew there are fourteen instances of the phrase "that it might be fulfilled" showing that the life of Jesus becomes a pre-arranged fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy.²

A. His Attitude Towards Oaths.

Mathew 5:33 quotes the verse: "Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths." This quotation is a free citation from Numbers 30:2; Exodus 20:7; Leviticus 19:12; Deuteronomy 23:21. This verse is found in the chapter of the Sermon on the Mount and is introduced by the famous formula "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time... but I say to you." This formula,

-
1. The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels- vol.II- Art. Prophet- p.435 (Charles T. P. Grierson).
 2. The Synoptic Gospels- vol.II- p.455.

itself, seems to indicate that Jesus implied "You have received an old law, but I shall give one now that is better." Dr. Schechter points to the Rabbinic 'You might understand a given passage or law to mean, or to mean only, so and so, therefore there is a teaching to say that' etc. as equivalent to Jesus' formula.¹ In the same chapter Jesus says (Mathew 5:17): "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill." Then he proceeds to give quotations proving that he came to fulfill, and the quotation under consideration is an example of the same. Jesus forbids an oath of any kind; for a Christian disciple 'yes' and 'no' need be sufficient. "He who had made a law for swearing rightly has now charged us not to swear at all." In this sense, Jesus became a fulfiller of the law; he did not take it away.² We have in the Rabbinic writings categorical objections to oaths and swearing, just as decisive as is this one of Jesus: "Everyone who takes an oath, even though he fulfills it is called a sinner."³ Or a quotation which parallels the New Testament version is "Let your yea be in truth and your nay be ⁱⁿ truth."⁴

Some, however, are of the opinion that Jesus did not object to oaths imposed in courts of justices, but that his restriction of swearing was to be applied only to cases of ordinary speech; that furthermore, our Rabbinic parallels to the Gospel statement confirm the fact that it was only in times of ordinary speech that oaths were forbidden.⁵

An interesting parallel to Mathew 5:33-37 we find in the Slavonic Enoch 49:1: "I swear to you, my children, but I swear not to you by

-
1. Rabbinic Parallels to the New Testament-J.Q.R. vol.XII-p.427 (April 1900).
 2. A.N.F.- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol.VII- p.461.
 3. Nedarim 77b.
 4. Sifra to Leviticus 19:36; Baba Metzia 49a; (Yer. Shebiit 39d bottom).
 5. Cf. Oaths and Vows in the Synoptic Gospels- The American Journal of Theology- vol.XXI- April 1917- Mann.

any oath, neither by heaven, nor by earth, nor by any other creature which God created. 'If there is no truth in men, let them swear by the words 'yea, yea' or 'nay, nay.'"

B. The Law of Punishment.

Another quotation to be considered is the famous lex talonis quoted in Mathew 5:38 found in Exodus 21:24; Deuteronomy 19:21: "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." Again Jesus introduces it with the "Ye have heard" formula and follows it up with his doctrine of non-resistance. To have picked out a law amongst so much that is noble, which law was never applied as far as record testifies, and to have set it off as unworthy, does not do one much credit, particularly when the literal application of this law of retaliation had been abolished by the Rabbis and a money fine imposed for damage.¹ In Baba Kama 84a one authority does insist that it means "eye for eye" but he may have been doing so from a legal strictness alone or he may have meant the dictum to mean "measure for measure" without necessarily implying the loss of a corresponding limb. But be that as it may, "the phrase 'eye for eye' with which so much play is made in non-Jewish literature, was not familiar on Rabbinic lips."²

Nevertheless, the Church Fathers disregarded the Rabbinic interpretation of the verse and let it represent the Old Covenant, while Jesus' word was taken as the new. "The saying 'eye for eye and tooth for tooth' has now grown old, ever since 'Let none render evil for evil' grew young."³ Again the same Church Father says that the ideal period of peace described by Isaiah when "men would beat their swords into ploughshares" etc. applies to Jesus' followers for those of the Jewish fold held as their ethics the plucking out of eye for eye

-
1. Midrash Baba Kama VIII:1; Talmud Baba Kama 83b following; Yerusha-
lin Baba Kama 6b.
 2. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels- I. Abrahams- p.154.
 3. A.N.F.- On Exhortation to Chastity (Tertullian)- vol.IV- p.54.

and tooth for tooth.' Hence the dispensation of the latter has become old and has been replaced by the new.¹ Of course, a true understanding of the Jewish religion cannot be grasped by the Church Fathers if they turn to the New Testament as the source book, disregarding altogether the interpretations and practices given in the Talmud by the Rabbis. As Montefiore well remarks it "is like looking for a true account of the Roman Catholic religion in a Protestant tract."²

C. The Law of Love.

A third quotation from the Sermon on the Mount is that in Mathew 5:43: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy," a statement wherein is contained another injustice to the Jewish interpretation. For though Jesus again says "Ye have heard that it was said," we look in vain throughout the Old Testament for the second half of the verse. Toy says that the first clause of the verse is from Leviticus 19:18 but that "the second clause is an interpretation of the spirit of the Israelitish law, not only in Leviticus 19:18 where the restriction of love to the neighbor- that is fellow-countryman- fairly involves its negation in the case of foreigners, but throughout the Old Testament, where the hostile relation of Israel to the other nations makes hostility to them a necessary accompaniment of devotion to the interests of the chosen people."³ The Cambridge Revised Edition of St. Mathew says that b of the sentence was a Rabbinical inference (p.29).

This verse is also used to indicate Jesus as the fulfiller of the law. Here, as in the quotations above in the Sermon on the Mount,

-
1. A.N.F.- An Answer to the Jews (Tertullian)- vol.III- p.514.
 2. The Synoptic Gospels- Montefiore- p.481.
 3. Quotations in the New Testament- Toy page 29.

Jesus is supposed to have exceeded the ethical dicta of the Old Testament prophets. They, indeed, were supplanted by him, according to general interpretation. We read: "He that forbade revenge (commenting on Mathew 5:43) now commands long-suffering, not as if just revenge were an unrighteous thing, but because long-suffering is more excellent."¹

But against the false accusation of the Mathew passage showing that the Jews taught hate of fellowmen, there can be mentioned several passages: Hillel's formulation of the "Golden Rule" in negative form can be mentioned: "What is hateful to thyself, do not to thy fellowmen."² That the Rabbis were agreed that love of fellowmen was fundamental is seen from the famous passage of the Sifra (quoted by Abrahams in "Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels"). Rabbi Akiba says "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is the greatest general principle in the Law. Ben Azzai says that "This is the book of the generations of man" is a greater principle.³ But between these two men, there is no difference basically; both rest their verse on love of fellowmen. Hillel uses a similar expression in Aboth which certainly seems all-inclusive in his use of the term for love of fellowmen, using it not in a negative but in a positive sense⁴: **אֱהָב את הבריות** when Hillel quotes his maxim he terms it the essence of the whole law **(זוהר קא כל התורה כולה)**² In another instance Rabbi Simlai says that the Torah begins with benevolence and ends with benevolence **(גמילות חסדים)**⁵ Is this not, in itself, a refutation of the charge that the Torah

1.A.N.F.- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol.VII- p.460.

2. Sabbath 31b; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan II:26; Jerusalem Nedarim 41c.

3. Sifra 89a (Edition Weiss).

4. Aboth 1:12.

5. Sotah 14a.

teaches hatred of fellowman? Of course, it would be folly to say that the Talmudic literature contains no passage which reflects a difference in status between the Jew and the 'כּוּר but from this fact it does not necessarily mean that there was a law imposed, as Jesus claims, to hate the enemy.

In Mathew 9:13 also Mathew 12:7, Jesus quotes from Hosea 6:6: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." The Pharisees level objections against Jesus for eating with the publicans and sinners and for the violation of the Sabbath by his disciples. Then he answers and says: "Go ye and learn what that means 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice.'" By repeating the words of the prophets, Jesus thereby testifies to the truth of their words.¹ Another reference of the Church Fathers says that God chose a place for sacrifice and it was left to teach the people "that the place chosen of God in which it was suitable that victims should be offered to God, is His wisdom."² Hosea and all the other great literary prophets taught the worship of God in the spirit.³ By their emphasis on man's moral conscience with the consequent spiritual possibilities attendant thereon, the prophets were never surpassed by any, Jesus and his sublime teachings included.

The Rabbinic writings have this same emphasis on "love" which in one instance they identify with Gemiluth Chasodim. In explaining the verse: "God desires love rather than sacrifice" we have the case of Rabbi Joshua's meeting Jochanan ben Zaccai and bemoaning the fact that the Temple, the means of sin-atonement has been destroyed; but Jochanan says this fact should occasion no anxiety for by the doing of charitable deeds a means of atonement has thereby been offered Israel.⁴ We read also that Rabbi Jochanan and Rabbi Eleazar both said: "As long

-
1. A.N.F.- Irenaeus Against Heresies- vol.I- p.484.
 2. Ibid.- Recognitions of Clement- vol.VIII- p.87.
 3. The Prophets of Israel- Battenweiser- pps. 308ff.
 4. Aboth de Rabbi Nathan 1:4 (page 11a). (See also Sukka 49b).

as the Temple stood sacrifice atoned for Israel, now a man's table atones for him (charity)."¹ The Midrash likewise places an emphasis on **חסד** as the sole desire of God: "Thou desirest mercy and with mercy shall I sing thy praise (worship Thee)... and not only with one **חסד** but with **חסד'ים הרבה**.² That God desires good deeds (Mitzvoth) with which **חסד** is also identified is seen in Solomon's zeal to win life by his acts of love.³

The quotations discussed thus far in this chapter have not been added to in any ethical sense by the Gospel interpretation. Old Testament and certainly Rabbinic comments parallel the finest teachings of Jesus, and this is said in no mean chauvinistic sense, but with the consciousness of the facts at hand. I have not entered into as great detail in proving this point as is possible simply because this discussion has been entered into already by others. In my introduction, I mentioned the work of Friedlander: "The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount" as illustrative of this contention. "Die Neue Beiträge" of Wünsche is additional bibliography for this point. For the greater part, the latest book on this theme by Strack and Billerbeck bears out my assertion.

1. Berachoth 55a.
 2. Midrash Shocher Tov-89a.
 3. Ibid.- 9:8.

D. Monogamy and Adultery.

The general question of monogamy and adultery which involves a departure in teaching in the Synoptic Gospels from that in the Old Testament falls rightly under the heading of the relation of Jesus to the law and the prophets. We can introduce this theme with Jesus' sentence from the Sermon on the Mount, Mathew 5:27 taken from Exodus 20:14 and Deuteronomy 5:18: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." This verse is quoted also in Mathew 19:18; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20. Jesus certainly could add nothing new in his interpretation of the passage to the Biblical and Rabbinic comments on the idea contained therein. It is sometimes believed that by his emphasis on the sinfulness of lust-"pluck out the eye that is offensive"- Jesus has gone in advance of his predecessors. Job 31 has surely advanced beyond the mere letter of the law and has equalled the heights attained by the Sermon on the Mount in this particular point. Montefiore remarks that the doctrine of desire being "sinful is quite Rabbinic and can be paralleled in the Talmud."¹ Just one reference need be given from our sources before passing on to a consideration of the quotations which fall under this division: ה' ארוך אפים ורחום God is long-suffering in every matter except adultery."²

A most interesting and important quotation demands consideration. Mathew 5:31 says: "whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorcement;" and Mathew 19:7, Mark 10:4 have: "Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce and put her away?" These verses can be considered together since they both involve the law of divorce from Deuteronomy 24:1. The laws governing the

1. The Synoptic Gospels- vol.II-p.506; Cf. Mechilta 77b.
2. Midrash Rabbah Bereshith 26.

the validity of the bill of divorce, as to the writing materials and inks that are legal, the manner in which it is delivered to the woman, the binding-power of the Get, and the factors which disqualify the bill of divorce are incidental to our discussion and are to be found in Tractate Gittin. In the first of the two quotations, Jesus assumes that the law in Deuteronomy allowed divorce for slight causes, such as the school of Hillel taught and against which Jesus means to declare himself in Mathew 5:32. At this point in his commentaries Montefiore claims that we have "the first really original utterance in the series of contrasts, as compared with the best Rabbinic teaching. It is, also, the first real or apparent conflict with the letter of the Mosaic law."¹ Let us see whether this comment is correct and justifiable.

It is true that the custom among the Israelites in early times probably allowed very great liberty to the husband. The school of Shammai would not allow a man to divorce his wife except for a matter unchaste, for it is said "because he hath found in her a shameful matter." The school of Hillel, however, would allow him to divorce his wife even if she burnt his food, or (and in this Rabbi Akiba joins) even if he has found one more beautiful than she is, for it is said, "If she shall not find favor in thine eyes."² Josephus, too, shares the opinion of the school of Hillel³ and Philo says that the wife could be divorced by the husband at his pleasure.⁴ Jesus sides with the school of Shammai; only in cases of fornication could a man put away his wife.

Though the above seems to be the law, it is instructive to see what was the actual practice both among the Jews and the Gentiles.

1. The Synoptic Gospels- vol. II- p.508.

2. Mishnah Gittin 9:10.

3. Antiquities of the Jews- Bk.IV- Chap.8.

4. "Of Special Laws Relating to Adultery"- Vol.III- Chap.5 pp.310-311- Edition of Yonge.

In Luke Jesus seems to give no reason or justification, whatever, for divorce: "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, also committeth adultery." (Luke 16:18). Moses, however, permits repudiation for one reason or another. But the fact remained that divorce did obtain among the Christians and to explain away the difficulty, Tertullian says that Moses' and Jesus' teachings are not contradictory. What Luke meant was that Jesus forbade putting away a wife for the express purpose of marrying another; but permanent and absolute prohibition of divorce, as Luke seems to imply, could not have been meant. Divorce for fornication is certainly justifiable.¹ Tertullian himself refutes Montefiore; in his disputation with Marcion he expressly states that Jesus confirms Moses. Lightfoot, who was a little further removed from the scene, and not very kindly disposed toward the Jewish sources, says that "Jesus does not abrogate Moses' permission of divorces, but tolerates it, yet keeping it within the Mosaic bounds, that is, in the case of adultery, condemning that liberty in the Jewish canons which allowed it for any cause."²

In Malachi (2:16) we read: "I hate divorce says the Lord God of Israel." The Jerushalim in commenting on this verse says that God sanctioned divorce only to Israel, but to the other nations He did not."³ Divorce then can have divine approval.

It may not be out of place to quote some of the Rabbis, thus reflecting the feeling against divorce popularly. It is a big mistake to pay attention only to strict law; private expression and practice may vary greatly from that law. Rabbi Elazar says: "Over

1. A.N.F.- Tertullian Against Marcion- vol.III- pps.404ff.
 2. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae- pps.119-125.
 3. Yerushalim Kedushin 58c.

him who divorces the wife of his youth even the altar of God sheds tears."¹ Rabbi Jochanan said: He that putteth her away is hated of God."¹ David Werner Amram in the Jewish Law of Divorce² suggests that the Mechilta hints at the state of affairs where the woman could procure the Get, as is not generally taught. "If the husband does not provide for his wife (who has been his bondwoman) in accordance with the law, then shall she go free without money, but not without a bill of divorce." "It is fair to assume that if the bondwoman had this right certainly the free-born had an equal or perhaps better right."³

Closely related to the above discussion are the verses found in Mathew 19:4, Mark 10:6 taken from Genesis 1:27, 5:2: "Made them male and female" and the succeeding passage in Mathew 19:5, Mark 10:7,8 taken from Genesis 2:24: "For this cause shall a man leave the father and the mother, and shall be joined to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh." Because of their close connection with the question of monogamy and adultery these two quotations can be considered together at this point. In the face of these quotations marriage had to be sanctioned and divorce eventually was not so rigorously prohibited.

The twelve disciples- the preachers of the Catholic doctrine- advised marrying "after a lawful manner, for such a marriage is unblameable. God in making them male and female destined that they should become one flesh."⁴ So likewise, Rabbi Eliezar says: "the Israelite who does not marry cannot be called a man for it says: **יִכָּר**

וְנָקָה בְּרֵאשִׁית.⁵ The command "two in one flesh" proves that only

1. Gittin 90b.

2. The Jewish Law of Divorce- page 56.

3. Mechilta- Mishpatim- section 3 (85b).

4. A.N.F.- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol.VII- p.456.

5. Yebamoth 63a.

one marriage is sanctioned; God took from one rib although more were available, in order to teach unity of marriage.¹ It is also explained "they two shall become one flesh" that the husband and wife are one in nature, in consent, in union, in disposition and the conduct of life; but they are separated in sex and number."² A strange reference is found in the statement that for younger women a second marriage may take place; after three marriages there is downright fornication.³

A number of Church Father references make the verse "and the two shall become one flesh" refer to one's union with Jesus or with the Church. The word may enter "him who is a member of Christ; thus being betrothed to him form one flesh."⁴ "What kind of happiness there is," says another reference, "in the union between partners in the faith." Two believers partaking of one hope, one discipline, one and the same service are truly two in one flesh."⁵ Other cross-references to the union of Christ and the Church are given below.⁶

In the discussion of these verses, some Rabbinic comments may be considered. Rabbi Abahu throws up the verses: כִּי יִתְּנֶה בָּרָא
and וְיִתְּנֶה בָּרָא How explain away the apparent contradiction? At first God meant to create two, but then He created only one."⁷ May this answer not be a reflection on the Christian doctrine of duality and a plea for monotheism? It does seem to be significant. Also by the expression "they two shall become one flesh" it is established

-
1. A. W.F.- An Exhortation to Chastity-Tertullian- vol.IV- p.53.
 2. Ibid.- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles- vol.VII- p.466.
 3. Ibid.- 426.
 4. Ibid.- The Banquet of the Ten Virgins (Methodius)-vol.VIII-p.320.
 5. Ibid.- Tertullian to His wife- vol. IV- p.48.
 6. Ibid.- Origen Against Celsus- vol.IV- p.520;595; Origen De Principiis- vol. IV- p.282.
 7. Berachoth 61a; Erubin 18a; Kethuboth 8a (here reported of Rab Jehudah).

that the male and female are equal in every respect; this is tested in the question of whether a woman incurs death when she kills.¹

In connection with this verse we learn that it is one of the passages changed for King Ptolemy: "male and corresponding female organs He created them."² Similar to this passage is the one which says that when God created the first man He created him *ἀνδρόγυνος* -that is the meaning of the verse "male and female He created him."³ God created the first man double, with two faces.³ We also learn that *אָרְבֵּי זָכָר* represent the fulfillment of the command *וְרַב וְרַב*; Beth Shammal says two males are necessary for in the case of Moses, we see that his children were Gershon and Eliezar; Beth Hillel says that it must be a male and female, for the verse reads: *זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה בְּרָאָם* Rabbi Bun confirms Beth Hillel.⁴

The Talmud enters in⁵ a detailed discussion of what is meant by the verse, "And a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh." Rabbi Eliezar is interested in establishing which blood relatives can be involved. He says "*אָבִי* means the sister of his father (the verse is considering a Noachide who embraces Judaism); *אִמִּי* means his mother's sister; Rabbi Akiba says *אִמִּי* is the wife of his father- *אִמִּי* is his actual mother. *וְדָבָר* means 'he should cling not to a male; to his wife not to the wife of his fellow. "And they shall become one flesh"; this excludes cattle and beasts who do not become one flesh." The description of which characters are involved in this verse continues, so that there can be no mistaking who are included and who are excluded.⁵ The Noachides are forbidden incest as are the Israelites for we read "He shall cleave

1. Sanhedrin 57b.
2. Midrash Rabbah Bereshith 8:10; Mechilta 19a.
3. Ibid. 3:1; Megillah 9a.
4. Jerushalim Jebamoth 7c.
5. Sanhedrin 58a; Midrash Rabba Bereshith 18:7.

to his wife' and not to the wife of his fellow;' 'he shall cleave to his wife' and not to a male nor animal." If he lives, not according to the natural custom he will be put to death.¹

Finally, there will be mentioned under this division the quotation in Mathew 22:24; Mark 12:19 and Luke 20:28 taken from Deuteronomy 25:5,6: "Moses said: If a man die without children, his brother shall marry (literally, perform the duty of a husband's brother towards) his wife, and raise up seed to his brother." The reference here, of course, is to the well-known levirate (Yabam) law and is a compressed citation given by the Sadducees. Montefiore says that the quotation is taken from Genesis 38:8 rather than from Deuteronomy 25:5 as given by Toy. This procedure was carried out by the Christians for we know that John reproved Herod for marrying the wife of his deceased brother who had a child by her, thus violating this law of Deuteronomy 25:5,6. For this denunciation John was put in prison and finally put to death by Herod.² That there was a great emphasis placed on chaste marriage relations by the early Church Fathers must be said to their credit. The above quotation from Tertullian seems to indicate the objection expressed against adulterous relations. Indeed, they were so carried away by their zeal for pure marriage relations, that celibacy was urged. Here the Jews drew the line; marriage was urged and certainly emphasis was placed on the proper marital relations. Celibacy was regarded as an attempt to flee temptation, and except for rare cases was frowned upon. Tertullian says in another instance that Christ preferred above all John because he was a celibate and Moses because he was a monogamist.³

1. Jerushalmi Kiddushin 58c.

2. A.N.F.- Tertullian Against Heresies- vol. III- p.405.

3. Ibid.- vol. II- page 65. (On Monogamy)

That the Levirate Law continued to exist is seen in Tertul-
 lian's defense of the same on the grounds that first, the command of
 וְיָרַד אֵלָיו must be satisfied, second, the sins of the fathers must
 be exacted of the children, and finally, that eunuchs and barren per-
 sons were regarded as ignominious.¹

The Siphre to this passage enumerates the cases where the Levirate
 law is fulfilled; a brother of the deceased who did not live in the
 world at the same time as his brother is excluded from the Yaban cer-
 emony; the same applies to the brother on the mother's side. The
 Levirate law, it is established, applies not only in the case of
 two brothers who live together, but in the case of many also.² This
 last statement parallels the instance of the Sadducees who appear
 before Jesus and present the case of the seven brothers marrying each
 in turn the wife of the dead brother before him.

1. A.N.F.- Tertullian Against Marcion- On Monogamy- vol. IV- p.64.
 2. Siphre (Deuteronomy 25:5 (125b)).