

THE CONCEPTION OF THE RESURRECTION
IN
THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA.

Hugh Anderson.

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY
OF GLASGOW UNIVERSITY FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D.

GLASGOW,

JANUARY, 1950.

ProQuest Number: 13870185

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13870185

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

καὶ οὕτω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα . οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν
φανερωθῶ , ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα , ὅτι ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν
καθὼς ἐστε .

I John 3 : 2.

PREFACE.

The name "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha", by which the intertestamental, non-canonical Jewish literature is commonly designated is somewhat forbidding and even ugly. Yet there can be no easy short-cut to a more congenial title. C.C.Torrey has recently proposed that "Pseudepigrapha" is a fallacious and quite misleading nomenclature, that it should be banished, and the whole group called simply the "Apocrypha". But that way would be lost a distinction between the books known as "Apocrypha", traditionally included in our English Bibles, and the "Pseudepigrapha" which never occupied any such place. Nor is the new terminology of E.Stauffer in his *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (1947), where he includes the Old Testament and the Pseudepigrapha jointly under the title of 'the Old Biblical Literature', really very helpful, for there are many occasions when one wishes to speak of both Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha quite separately from or in contrast to the Old Testament.

It seems there is nothing for it but to retain the old name of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha to describe this literature, but throughout this work it will be abbreviated to Ap. and Ps., at once easier to write and gentler to the eye of the reader. Quotations of passages from the Ap. and Ps. are given for the most part in full for the sake of convenience - R.H. Charles' two volume Edition of the works of the Ap. and Ps. (Oxford, 1913), from which

these citations are made, is rather unwieldy. Bible passages quoted are, unless where another source is expressly mentioned, from the Authorised Version.

Footnotes and References are on pp.349 to 395 at the end, and are numbered consecutively from the beginning to the end of each separate chapter. Finally on pp.396 to 411 there is a list of works consulted.

I have to add that, like all students of the inter-testamental literature who have come after his time, I owe a vast debt of gratitude, for his productive labours in this field, to Dr.R.H. Charles, "the great connoisseur of Jewish and Christian apocryphal Scriptures", as Robert Eisler called him.

Also I feel constrained to risk an accusation of plagiarism in stealing from R.H. Pfeiffer that shrewd remark of Wilson Mizner's, with which he prefaces his recent book, "History of New Testament Times": "If you steal from one author, it's plagiarism; if you steal from many, it's research".

CHAPTER I	ANTECEDENTS.	Page 1.
" II.	SOME CRITICAL PROBLEMS - LITERARY AND HISTORICAL.	Page 38.
" III	THE EARTHLY MESSIANIC HOPE AND THE RESURRECTION.	Page 53.
" IV	RESURRECTION, A FAITH AND A CONSOLATION.	Page 96.
" V	TRANSCENDENTALISM.	Page 120.
" VI	TRANSCENDENTALISM AND EARTHLY MESSIANISM - A DEEPENING TENSION.	Page 138.
" VII	EARTH AND HEAVEN.	Page 181.
" VIII	THE TWO AGES.	Page 204.
" IX	IN DIASPORA JUDAISM.	Page 268.
" X	RETROSPECT.	Page 307.
" XI	THE NEW TESTAMENT.	Page 337.

CHAPTER I.ANTECEDENTS.

Religion is an organic whole and not a series of disparate beliefs. Jewish Eschatology is but one aspect of a people's religion, and one feature of a WHOLE view of God and the world. Again in turn the resurrection idea, when it appears in Judaism, is no isolated phenomenon, but a particular facet of the wider, fuller sweep of Jewish Eschatology. The Jewish religion was always characterised by a profound sense of Purpose in history, so that the Jews always had the 'forward look'. To Graeco-Roman society the world process was but "a vain eternal recurrence, leading nowhere"¹, but to the Hebrew-Jewish mind history was never a confusion, but a march of the divine purpose across the fields of Time; for the Jews the world's End would reveal God's great eventual triumph. The Jews in fact were always more concerned about WORLD fulfilment than about individual fulfilment hereafter; their endless and deepest concern was the place that Israel would occupy in the Great Consummation. It was an abiding interest, marked not by anxiety, but by a glowing certainty that at the last Israel would be gloriously vindicated, her pristine grandeur all restored - was she not her God's 'peculiar treasure', the people of His Covenant?.

Nothing is more striking in this intense Jewish 'forward look' than that it was a nation's faith in a national salvation at the End. Israel indeed owed her profound conviction of a marvellous rebirth of the nation in the day when God would

come to judge the peoples, to the same basic fact, her covenant relationship with God, to which she really owed her creation as a nation. Post-exilic Judaism for all her enlightenments, inherited from the older Hebrew prophecy that deep sense of the priority of the nation to the individual, so that when the Jews of this later age turned their thoughts to the future, the NATION staked first claim. Thus the traditional Jewish Messianism ('nationalism' and 'Messianism' are here nearly synonymous terms²), which awaited a restoration for Israel to a Messianic Kingdom of splendid felicity upon this present earth, persisted stubbornly at the heart of Judaism all the long way through: newer Jewish preoccupations with more exalted and more spiritual ideas of the End, issuing from an individualist rather than the prevalent Messianic, nationalist line of thought, did not and could not oust the primitive terrestrial ideal. If the Jewish Eschatology of the inter-testamental period, as represented in the literature of the Ap. and Ps. is to be understood, it must be correctly viewed as the meeting place of these two quite opposite currents, which by their clashing stir it into something of a whirlpool of contradictions and inconsistencies.

In this unstable setting the only considerable stability belongs to the nation's earthly Messianic hope. The idea of resurrection, owing its birth to this same hope - the dead of Israel will rise for the sake of the unity of the nation in the restored earthly Kingdom - retains throughout something of its original character, it does not readily shake off its intimate

connection with Jewish Messianism, even in the face of an advancing spiritualisation and universalisation of the notion, as broader eschatological perspectives were opened up. Thus the encounter between opposing tendencies, which is the feature of Jewish Eschatology in general, is also inevitably the feature of the ideas of resurrection in particular. Or to express it otherwise, the resurrection belief is immersed in that larger confusion between the temporal and material on the one hand, and the universal and spiritual on the other, which characterises the whole Jewish eschatological speculation, a confusion produced by the continual recrudescence of primitive Messianism by the side of loftier ideals. Consequently the resurrection doctrine in intertestamental Judaism is marked by antinomies and a certain vacillation, standing out the more clearly when they are seen as a foil to that abounding resurrection-CERTAINTY of the early Christian community which, while it inherited some of the stock-in-trade of Jewish contemplation on the subject, ceased to regard the resurrection as a wavering and unsteady point on a far horizon, and made it absolutely central in the light and through the pledge of its risen Lord and Master.

The atmosphere of the intertestamental period of Judaism is infinitely more likely to be captured, if the figure be permitted, by the landscape painter, than by the artist who would be intent on focussing brilliantly the many details, for the landscape portrait conveys the impression of fluidity and mobility that are inherent in the thinking and the speculation of these

times. It is for this reason that the present work, avoiding the temptation to set its documentary sources into too neat and watertight compartments, is content to give an over-all picture of the fluctuations in the various eschatological schemas, and of some occasionally scarcely recognisable tendencies to move from the lower stage to the higher. Certainly the attempt at a concise CHRONOLOGICAL exposition of the development of Jewish Eschatology, and more specifically of the conception of the resurrection, on the basis of the Ap. and Ps., has to be abandoned. That favoured method has here been eschewed and another adopted in its stead, one fraught possibly with fewer pitfalls, and certainly calculated to exhibit more clearly that clash of opposite ideals which by their continual mutual interaction made unilateral upward development in any one particular idea regarding the Eschata impossible.

The documents of the Ap. and Ps. are examined here in order first, as they exhibit a strong front of allegiance to the primitive Messianism, and secondly as they incline to reveal a growing devotion to the spiritual and universalist ideals of Things to Come - but from this it does not follow that those representations in the Ap. and Ps. whose tenor is most spiritual and universal will necessarily contain the fewest traces of the secularist, nationalist expectation, for such is the staying power of the early type of Messianism that the old ideals survive even at the highest level of the new. This enquiry sets out with the avowed object of letting the resultant anomalies

in the Eschatology of the Ap. and Ps. speak for themselves, and of steering clear from the desire to impart orderliness and consistency to materials whose chief trait is in fact DISorder. An investigation of the resurrection concept in the Ap. and Ps. may profitably be likened to the scrutiny of a palimpsest manuscript in which the heavy outer lettering has to be penetrated before the earlier writing can be recognised and read. While the metaphor is only very partially applicable, it helps to bring home the truth that, when we turn to these documents to study their resurrection doctrine, what first meets our glance is the bold print of the whole eschatological schema, and only underneath, as it were, lies the resurrection idea. $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau\alpha$ εἰν $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau\alpha$.

Messianism and Eschatology occupy us first, and only through a study of them can we attain to some view of what resurrection meant to the writers of this literature. Without too much anticipating the sequel, it might be intrusively remarked here that those writers who will be our concern followed in fact the self-same order - Messianism and Israel's Future first, or Eschatology and the world's destiny, and only secondarily resurrection from the dead.

The literary products of the Ap. and Ps., generally regarded as the representatives of Alexandrian Judaism, are in these pages consigned to the last place for consideration, NOT because the Eschatology for which they stand is remote and exotic and "but a little" revelatory of trends in normal Judaism, but on the contrary because they serve well to throw into high relief the characteristic incongruities native to the main course and

stream of Jewish Eschatology.

First a preliminary clearing of the way has to be undertaken, and that is done in Chapters I and II, the present Chapter I concerning 'Antecedents' and Chapter II dealing with some critical problems, literary and historical.

The early Hebrews were little interested in man's existence after death: this much is clear from the absence of reference to it in the Pentateuch. They were dominated by thought of Sheol, the gloomy underworld of departed shades, where 'life' was No-life, in truth a complete denial of all that they knew earthly existence to be: their purely negative Sheol belief constituted neither moral deterrent nor hope - for long centuries these were rooted in the things of this present earth. The lack of any positive belief in a future life among the Hebrews is the more remarkable since from their earliest history they must have been acquainted with the fact that such a belief existed and was elsewhere firmly held and cherished. No systematic presentation of Egyptian eschatological beliefs is possible from the native Egyptian documents, the Book of the Dead³, the Book of Am-Tuat, and the Book of Gates, but we can gather from them that the religious thought of Egypt was ruled by the life beyond the grave. And Israel was for long a nation of inferior culture living in Egypt's midst! Might she not have learned from her superior?

E.Sellin⁴ and H.Gressmann⁵, dating Proverbs 10-29 in the pre-Exilic period of Hebrew history, discover clear evidence

there of familiarity with the Egyptian ideas of the Judgment, and of a transference to Jahweh of Thoth's activity of weighing the hearts (Proverbs 16 : 2, etc.): they maintain also that certain sections are in their maxims everywhere paralleled by the Egyptian Wisdom book known as 'The Teaching of Amen - em - ope'⁶. But the Egyptian doctrine of the Hereafter and its lofty conception of the Judgment find no real echo in Hebrew thought. "The absence of Egyptian ideas", writes D.F.Salmond, "is one of the most notable characteristics of the Old Testament"⁷. A.Lods expresses the same view with regard to the question of possible traces of Egyptian influence on early Hebrew religion; "It does not appear that the cults of Egypt had any deep influence on the half-nomad Hebrew tribes of Goshen at the time when their national religion took shape: the divergence between the two peoples was too great."⁸

Babylon presents striking contrast to Egypt; thence could come no incentive to Israel to project their faith into a life beyond the present. For occupation with the claims of this world, as Jeremias⁹ and others have shown, absorbed all the Babylonian religious interest, and so they had no time for prolonged reflection on the Whence and Whither of the soul, which marked the Egyptian people. Babylonians and Israelites thought kindred thoughts of a shadowy realm in the nether world, and in this negative view of a Hereafter they were followed by most other ancient peoples, Phoenicians, and Aryans such as Greeks and Romans. In Babylon alone of these the nearer interest of the moment centres, for we are here thinking particularly of the

foreign systems of religion with which Israel early came into contact, and which might have stimulated her to extend her hope to a TRUE life beyond death. The Babylonians, however, thought of a huge subterranean cavern called Arali (by the Sumerians) and Arallu (by the Babylonians), an abode of darkness and inactivity, "the place of no return" for the dead, "a dark and gloomy prison with Nergal and a goddess, Allatu, as the merciless overseers to prevent the escape of any of the prisoners back to the upper world"¹⁰. It is small wonder that they were immersed in this life. There are some lines of the Gilgamesh epic:

"As for thee, Gilgamesh, fill thy belly,
Rejoice day and night,
Every day make a feast
Day and night be joyful and content"¹¹,

which afford a close comparison with Ecclesiastes 9:7 ff. (dating probably from as late as the 4th or even the 3rd century B.C.)

"Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy,
And drink thy wine with a merry heart,
.....
For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge,
nor wisdom
In the grave whither thou goest."

That is a degree less staggering in the cynical Qoheleth, than is the powerful survival of the ancient notions of Sheol in the early books of the Apocrypha, most notably in the Wisdom of Ben Sira (or Ecclesiasticus)¹², about the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. The persistence of the old nihilistic Sheol ideas¹³ cannot easily be explained on any but the most general terms, but there has been no lack of endeavours to account for them in more specific fashion. Kautzsch¹⁴ for instance suggested that

the Sheol doctrine was prolonged through man's inability to accept the complete annihilation of a living personality. Yet Sheol for the Hebrew was so little better than annihilation that this cannot be received as a valid reason.

O.S. Rankin¹⁵, in manner quite typical of the comparative religionist school which for so long held the field in the study of Hebrew religious development, proposed quite other reasons for the late rise of the positive hope of an after-life in Israel. He claims that the primary cause was the endurance of the conception of Jahweh as a heaven-God, for thus He had the power to absorb the Baalim or fertility deities. Jahweh is compared to the Hellenic Zeus, called ἑπικρόιος, and also 'the highest', and acting consequently as a check upon the cult-practices through which was introduced the belief in a personal existence after death, an existence vouchsafed through communion with the fertility God. As in Greece the teaching of a rebirth and immortality through adoption by the deities of fertility was given by the mystery religions, and met with the opposition of the Heaven-Gods, so Jahweh in Israel countered the belief in immortality. Rankin's view, however, is quite the reverse of that of R.H.Charles¹⁶, who sees in the progress towards monotheism and the universalising of Jahweh's rule an incentive to belief in an after life, since now Jahweh is invested with sufficient power to have dominion over Sheol and bring back the soul therefrom.

Secondly, to return to Rankin, there is the relation

of Jahweh to Nature. The God of post-Exilic Hebrew monotheism transcends Nature, and the pathway to the belief in immortality through the drama of Nature's decay and growth, regarded as representing the death and rising of a God, is thus blocked for Israel. Nevertheless when this is said, there still remains the crucial problem of the long continuance of the vast hiatus between the growing monotheistic conception of Jahweh as Creator and Lord of the world, and on the other side the heathen Sheol conception. To that problem Rankin has not really spoken. A recent attempt has been made to bridge the gap, however, by mitigating the mutual exclusiveness of these ideas of God and Sheol. The attempt features unhappily a forced exegesis of Psalm 88:5, "Like the slain that lie in the grave, whom thou rememberest no more: and they are cut off from thy hand". It is suggested that God's hand here is the instrument of His Providence, and that the Psalmist does not mean that God has no knowledge of, or has allowed the dead to pass entirely out of His remembrance, (Job 26:6 is cited for comparison: "Naked in Sheol before Thee and there is no concealment for Abaddon".) The Psalmist simply means, so it is held, that the dead being no longer subject to the vicissitudes of life, do not so much need the providential guidance of God, and Charles' assertion that when a man died Israel believed he was removed from the moral jurisdiction of Jahweh, is dismissed.¹⁷ But although, as Charles¹⁸ himself admits, certain texts do show life, knowledge, movement and power in Sheol, the substance of most is its utter remoteness and separateness.

We are forced simply to the confession that in the earlier stages of the Apocryphal literature the transcendentalist idea of an all-powerful God exists side by side with the pagan notion of an underworld of the dead over which He is felt to have no power. Reason may baffle us here and the course that Israel's thought actually took may be beyond our comprehension, but this much can be said: God reveals what He will to men when the time is ripe! Moreover there was always at the heart of Israel the most earnest longing for a vigorous life on earth, the desire to "walk before the Lord in the land of the living" (Psalm 116:9, cf. Isaiah 38:11), which must have been, at the least, part inducement to her to abide content with Sheol. Lastly it is a universal axiom of all religious growth that primitivist survivals have often a singular vitality and power to persist even at the advanced stages of development.

These general considerations weigh more than the particular arguments adduced by such as Rankin, and there is possibly no need to go beyond them. But Rankin is perhaps on firmer ground when he observes finally the age-long persistence of the Deuteronomist ideas of the this-worldly requital of good and evil, of reward and retribution in this present life, as a counteractive to the belief in future existence. From the orthodox Deuteronomist teaching Judaism certainly could hardly wean itself away: Ben Sira forcibly upheld it, and it survives in its crudest form in II Maccabees (9:5 f., etc.), and in the Wisdom of Solomon (3:10, 16 f.). The Jewish rabbis also put

great stress on "the cheap doctrine of tit for tat and measure for measure They had the wrong-headedness to declare that such and such earthly ills were the divine punishment for such and such earthly sins."¹⁹ The prevalence of the idea of a perfectly adequate retribution in this life is thus abundantly attested. While it held an almost complete sway a true solution of the problem could not be found, nor could there be any departure from the prevailing notions of Sheol. The whole theory had to be taken up, examined critically and rejected, before a road was cleared for the widening of the stage of the present life into the life beyond.

It is unfortunate that these last few paragraphs with their emphasis on the tardiness of the growth of belief in an after life in Israel may have conveyed the impression that everything in the Hebrew religious traditions militated against this development, and that when the notion of a Hereafter did arise, it would require to be impinged upon Israel from outside the boundaries of her own thought and culture. Such is not the fact, and in the next Chapter a defence will be offered of the inwardness which marked Hebrew thinking along the line of progression towards a doctrine of a future existence. For the moment the possible false impression, that the Hebrew religion did not contain within itself the gems for future growth of this fair flowering of faith in the Beyond, must be rectified. The closing words of the preceding paragraph are fruitful in their suggestion that only a new and profounder insight in Israel,

venturing to reject the Deuteronomist doctrine of placid satisfaction with the idea of a just redress for men in accordance with their deserts within the limits of the present life, could hasten the blossoming of the new faith in another world than this. That insight was forthcoming in Israel. Yet this bold criticism of orthodoxy with its basis in a deepening sense of the individual's close personal relationship with his God, is only one side of the preparation of the soil, and it has probably been unduly emphasised as the predominant factor which opened up new horizons to Israel's vision.

"It was, under God's providence", states E.F.Sutcliffe, "the growth of this sense of individual responsibility and the appreciation of the inadequacy of temporal rewards and punishments that gradually prepared the Israelites for the doctrine of the just and adequate redressing of the moral balance by rewards and punishments after death."²⁰ In the same vein Louis Finkelstein has written: "The doctrine of the resurrection offered a full solution to the difficulty (that is, regarding just retribution) and WAS ALTOGETHER IN THE SPIRIT OF THE INDIVIDUALISM WHICH PROMPTED IT."²¹ R.H. Charles, while far less unaware of quite other latent possibilities at the heart of the Hebrew religion, also lays particular stress upon the post-Exilic growth of individualism as a potent stimulus to the belief in an after life. 'Job' is itself sufficient, Charles records, to prove that the hopes of the individual were in view of their goal, the future life of the righteous. And even if such evidence as that of 'Job'

were completely wanting, "we should be obliged to postulate the existence of this doctrine from the logical necessities of thought."²²

The fons et origo of that individualism which views each man as the unit of relationship with God, and which has generally been conceived as opening a new chapter in Israel's religious history, lie of course further back even than 'Job'. The course of early Hebrew history is decided by individuals of tremendous genius, and their greatness must have given their lesser fellow mortals some thought. The later legends of the translation of men like Enoch and Elijah offer clear evidence of Israelite reverence for outstanding individuals. Moreover the individualism which came to open expression in post-Exilic Judaism was implicit much earlier in the Isaianic doctrine of the nucleus or Remnant: "Membership in the nation came by accident of birth; in the Remnant it is a matter of deliberate choice by the individual the vitally important thing is no longer to be a son of Abraham, but to be a disciple of Isaiah WITH ALL THAT THAT IMPLIES."²³ But these seeds sown early reach fruition only in the post-Exilic age. Jeremiah had greatly assisted the process by his preaching of the 'new covenant', writ large in the heart of each individual (Jeremiah 31:31), which if thoroughly grasped would have ⁿuplulled the old corporate interdependence. Ezekiel also openly denied the ancient principle of corporate responsibility before God (Ezekiel 18:2 and 3), but his doctrine reveals a quaint mingling of truth and error, for the notion of individual moral responsibility so seared his mind that he was

prone to treat men as isolated units.

With 'Job' we reach a higher plane. His is a longing cry out of the night for an answer to the vexatious problems of individual suffering: and he all but attains to the secret, since in a moment of acute insight he knows that his God will not leave him comfortless: "For I know that my redeemer liveth and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." (Job 19:25). The poets of the 37th and 73rd Psalms are very close to the thought of the individual's unbroken communion with God in the beyond. "In spirit", says Kittel of the author of the 73rd Psalm, "he looks round him at the golden steps of the heavenly throne: he sees the bright forms of the angels of God: he hears the song of the angelic choir. But to him all that is as nothing if he cannot find God there."²⁴ Such are the whispering heralds in post-Exilic Judaism of a life far furth of the present world. Their logical culmination should have been a doctrine of individual immortality immediately upon death, the guaranteed outcome of an inviolably close fellowship with God here and now. Yet significantly enough, there is hardly the slightest trace in the intertestamental Jewish literature of that truly sincere and pure individualist accent, the passionate desire for a life hid with God which death can do nothing to destroy.²⁵ There are, however, intimations everywhere that the authors of that literature were not left untouched by the noble individualism of Job and the Psalmists of the 37th and 73rd, and clear indications that it was precisely that strain in post-Exilic Judaism which produced in them the formulated hope for a spiritual life hereafter, eternal in the heavens. Those signposts

of the centuries after the Exile did not point along the way of the idea of a resurrection of the body at the End of the times: nevertheless this latter was the form which the Jewish belief assumed when it was extended to the Hereafter. Whence came it?

Again the story has to be pursued far back. The Covenant established at Sinai between Jahweh and Israel was pregnant with vast potentialities: it might make Israel instrument of salvation for all the world, it might drive her back and further back within herself. In fact it did both. Her prophets and saints caught the great universal vision of Israel's mission - and sometimes lapsed from it. Her people for the most part could merely not see past Israel - and rarely rose above their narrowness. So the masses with their proclivity for the comforting, delectable view of the Covenant relationship nourished themselves upon the thought that the God who had chosen them must **NECESSARILY** guide, keep and cherish them; and when they looked forward they felt convinced that at the last he **MUST** make them the first of all the nations in the future time of His reckoning. Amos, the prophet, came from his rustic home to shatter their complacency and their comfortable delusion with his dire pronouncement: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." (Amos 3:2). Similarly Micah sought to stir his people to the sense that Jahweh's Covenant offering means for Israel a vast responsibility and not an inviolable privilege: "Is not the Lord among us? None evil can come upon us", (Israel declares). And a dread judgment follows: "Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field." (Micah 3:11 and 12).

In spite of these higher reaches of the prophetic preaching, inveighing against the popular mechanical conception of the Covenant whereby Israel thought of itself as automatically God's firstling favourite, even in the prophets a narrower nationalism is not quite transcended by universalism. "The prophets were the first to be sure that the sins of their own people must meet with a just and terrible retribution. They were equally sure that God's love for them and his peculiar care would never let them go. They were sure that the old idea was wrong, whereby God must save them, whatever they do, and yet when they thought of the love they themselves bore to their own they knew that there was something in the old idea, however strict the demands of Righteousness were."²⁶ Thus even Jeremiah thought of the Kingdom of God as in some sense a restoration of the Israelite nationality (Jeremiah 31:2-6, 18-20, 21-22, 25, 26). In Ezekiel the restoration of Israel is assured because Jahweh's name must be upheld among the nations (39:25 f). In Deutero-Isaiah the true 'Israel' is to be missionary to the Gentiles, but its first task before it turns to them is to seek the lost sheep of the house of Israel. So congenial indeed was the nationalist fervour in Israel, and so much did the peculiar historical circumstances of the post-Exilic age drive Judaism inward upon itself that the people of the Torah were already becoming a 'fenced' community - "the work of Israel in the world is to disseminate the knowledge of God, and to mediate the truths that have been communicated to them. This can only be done by a stringent adherence to the conception of Israel as a people

distinct from other peoples with a mission to the rest of mankind."²⁷

These words of a modern Jewish writer about Israel exhibit well the tension always felt in Israel between a rigidly particularist outlook and a superb universalism. But the more straitened nationalism prevailed; its continual recrudescence was not retarded even by the generous universalism of the author of the Book of Ruth, or of the Book of Jonah with its veiled appeal for loving kindness toward all men, or, perhaps most remarkable of all, even by the Book of Proverbs, which seems to have gone far towards reconciling nationalism and universalism. The nationalist viewpoint pervades the Ap. and Ps. (but that will appear later!). And this in spite of some goodly expressions of universalism, for instance in the Sibylline Oracles 3:772,773: "And from every land they shall bring frankincense and gifts to the house of the great God"; in I Enoch 10:21 and 48:4; and also in Testament Dan 6:7.

Against the background of the perennial particularist attitude, the nationalist nature of the Jewish Messianic dream can be appreciated. Whenever the Jew turned to contemplate the Future, as his innate religious aspirations always compelled him, his whole mind was preoccupied with the nation, with the people. His primary concern with the nation's destiny issued not only from a particular acceptance of the Covenant 'cut' between God and Israel, but from that powerful sense of community and national solidarity which was always strong among Semitic peoples. "The Hebrews were Semites and did not, as we do, think of a community as the sum total of the individuals comprising it, thus creating an 'abstract unity' out of

a mass of individuals. To them unity is prior to diversity, the community prior to the individual: the real entity is the community and the individuals belonging to it have their origin therein."²⁸ The community consciousness of Israel had such astonishing vitality and roots so deep that it could not be displaced by the rising individualism of the post-Exilic era, but remained beside it almost always as the stronger partner. Jewish Messianism was inevitably a nation's hope of a nation's glory at the End, when God would bring the Consummation. But the prophets must not be misrepresented - their loftiest thought was never merely of a chauvinistic Jewish sovereignty over the whole world, but rather of a Kingdom in which God would be supreme, and everything founded upon righteousness. Nevertheless it was of the essence of the nationalist hope that it should find the locus of the Kingdom of its expectation in the dear earth of Palestine. And in any case Judaism, it has been finely stated, "always wanted to believe that this world as well as the other was the creation of God, and that there should be, there would be, there ought to be a kingdom of God upon earth."²⁹

The temporalist expectation of a Messianic Kingdom upon earth and the idea of the indissoluble solidarity of Israel constitute the 'Grundwerk' of the concept of resurrection in its earliest appearance. There was already apparent in the prophets the assurance of the essential oneness of past and present Israelites. Thus Isaiah had addressed his Judæan contemporaries, "Ye rulers of Sodom..... Ye people of Gomorrah" (Isaiah 1:10). Jeremiah spoke as though his hearers had committed the sins of

their ancestors, "Your fathers went far from me and I brought you into a land of plenty." (Jeremiah 2:5)³⁰ In the days of crisis and stern challenge that fell upon the Jewish nation in the mid-course of the post-Exilic age it was perfectly natural that by an extension of that notion of communal solidarity, some among the people, when they contemplated out of the dismal present the happier time to come, arrived at the belief that at the end of the days not only the national body then in existence, but the Israel of all history, of the generations past as well as of those yet unborn, would participate in the great Reign of God. To ensure the triumphant unity of Israel in the day of consummation the dead of Israel must therefore be resurrected - that is the least boon that God in His justice might bestow upon the loyal departed, the sufferers in the nation's cause. And these dead will rise to the only kind of life that most Jews could consider to be worthwhile, the felicitous existence of the Messianic Kingdom upon this earth.

That this is the rationale of the resurrection idea in Israel is corroborated by a glance at its considerably earlier prototypes. There is in the first instance Hosea's allegorical representation of a resurrection or restoration of the NATION as a whole: "Come and let us return unto the Lord: for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us: in the third day he will raise us up." (Hosea 6:1 and 2). Ezekiel's vision of the Valley of Dry Bones only helps to give more definite shape to the picture (Ezekiel 37:1-14), and is undoubtedly a symbol which contributes to the growth of the resurrection hope. True to type, therefore,

the resurrectionism of the later post-Exilic centuries displays but small interest in individual destiny and little perception of an individual election, for concentration upon the fate of the nation as a unit eliminated to a large extent the possibility of individual providence.

Schürer³¹ therefore was more than justified in his early dismissal of Stahelin's contention that the resurrection hope and the expectation of a Messianic Age had originally no connection, and consequently should be kept as far apart as possible. They are on the contrary at the first integrally related. In the face of the possible protestation that some of the earliest declarations of the resurrection reserve the prize only for the righteous, and therefore are revealing a concern for the ultimate fortunes of the individual, the rejoinder can be made that first and foremost the righteousness of the saints of the Jewish nation constitutes them the TRUE ISRAEL, and that the master-thought is still the preservation at the last of the unity of the True Israel. Such is the primitive nuance. Whatever shades of difference will be imparted to the resurrection idea in the intertestamental period, and they are not a few, it cannot escape the atmosphere of its original environment. It is vitally important to seize this point if we are to understand the confusions which permeate the Ap. and Ps.

Hebrew religious development then gave birth eventually to a double lineage of thoughts on the Hereafter, the purer individualist tradition of the post-Exilic era pointing the way to belief in an individual immortality, in eternal life, and on

the other hand the popular and pervasive Messianist (nationalist) expectation, producing by the inner logic of its own impulse the notion of a resurrection from the dead to a renewed earthly life in the Messianic Kingdom. The most marked feature of interest^{al} Jewish Eschatology is the complex interplay of the two strands and the manner in which the old Messianism holds the fort even when the other more spiritual ideals are storming the gates. In proportion as the expositor essays to impose coherence and system upon these conflicts and complexities, so is he failing to delineate justly and accurately the Eschatology of that time. Accounts distinguished by the neat precision and logical conciseness of their presentation are immediately suspect. Schürer suggested correctly that the hope of a Messianic Kingdom and the idea of resurrection are related as cause and effect, and less correctly that it was only afterwards at some subsequent date that life hereafter in the Messianic Kingdom and the 'aeonian' or eternal life to which the individual stood in direct relation, were separated. They were in fact separate at their sources, and the notion of each possessed a potentiality and dynamism of its own, so that, in their later numerous interrelationships seer and saint combined or separated them, less through a conscious process than through the almost inevitability with which each forced itself upon him according to his condition and situation.

For the similar reason that it suggests an active intent and a finely regulated process of discarding of the old and adoption of the new, R.H. Charles' perlucid presentation of the growth of Hebrew-Jewish Eschatology elicits caution and may merit

rebuke. Down to the time of the Exile, Charles³² tells us, the Eschatology of the individual (Sheol) and the Eschatology of the nation (Messianism) each pursued its separate course. But with the deepening individualisation of religion stimulated by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the Eschatology of the individual became a necessary constituent of the national Eschatology: from the Exile they exercise a mutual influence upon each other, and the two are eventually synthesised in the resurrection hope about the close of the fourth century. Now the righteous individual no less than the righteous nation will participate in the Messianic Kingdom, for the righteous dead of Israel will rise to share therein. The idea of individual immortality now having accomplished its work as a guide to the truth again falls into the background for almost two centuries, and then once again the growing dualism of the period disintegrates the elements of the resurrection hope, and they are separated, until their ultimate and final union in Christianity. Thus Charles! The terms of his description (the criticism is not harsh) are too absolute, and hardly do justice to the great variety and diversity of the many connections between those two different outlooks (the individualist and nationalist) in the Eschatology, particularly of the later post-Exilic Age. Moreover if we embarked upon the study of the Ap. and Ps. with Charles' introductory analysis uppermost in our mind, it would tend to obscure for us the distressing ease with which the visionaries of that age combined the particular and the universal, the national and the spiritual, the temporal and the eternal in their Eschatology.

Charles has hinged much on his own interpretation of the famous controversial passage in Isaiah 26:19 and those verses which are commonly accepted as its companion in Daniel 12:2 and 3. The two must now be investigated in the following section.

Isaiah 26:19

"Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

E.F.Sutcliffe³³ includes Isaiah 26:19 among the passages believed to bear upon the resurrection, which he has examined with negative results. He cites Polychromius, a member of the Antiochene school as using this passage as an illustration of how Scripture is accustomed to use the word 'dead' for those in captivity, and understanding it of national restoration. Sutcliffe maintains that this is the only sense the context allows in view of verses 16-18, describing the tribulations of the land, and verses 20 ff., addressing the people. He concludes that there is no justification for believing that Isaiah "long outdistanced his fellow-Israelites in rising to the idea of the personal resurrection." There are beside several others who see in the verse merely the promise of a national restitution, parallel to the Vision of the Valley of Dry Bones in Ezekiel. G.W.Wade³⁴, E.J.Kissane³⁵ and notably G.F.Moore³⁶ take this view. Sutcliffe, however, is almost alone in his apparently uncritical assumption that the passage is from the hand of Isaiah of Jerusalem, since there is general agreement that the prophecy is not Isaiah's, but

of a much later date. Thus Chapters 24-27 are accepted as a single separate prophecy. Sellin³⁷ calls it a 'Book of the Last Things', Cheyne³⁸ 'a Liturgical Meditation'. It has been very variously dated: in the early post-Exilic Age (Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Driver³⁹); in the fourth century B.C. (Smend and Kuenen, and by Cheyne about 334 B.C.); in the late Maccabaeian era (Duhm and Marti, followed by Oesterley and Robinson⁴⁰).

The particular verse 26:19 has been interpreted as a promise of national restoration, but there exists also quite another opinion of it. It has been understood as "teaching for the first time clearly and definitely a personal resurrection of the just."⁴¹ G. Buchanan Gray considers it "a remarkable expression of what must have been an already well defined and clear belief in a bodily resurrection of Jews who died before the New Age began."⁴² In the sum it would be temerarious to dogmatise about this passage; the difficulties are enormously increased by textual uncertainties. The Hebrew text of 19a and b reads:

יחיו מתוך ובלתי יקומו הקיצו ורננו שכבי עפר

and Septuagint: ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται οἱ ἐν τῇ γῆ. ⁴³

That is, the Hebrew (יחיו (= live) is not represented in the Greek. Whereas the Hebrew shows a sudden transition from the future יקומו to the imperatives הקיצו and ורננו

(thus making the clause an apostrophe to the dead between clauses addressed to Jahweh), the Greek has two futures. Consequently the emendation of the Hebrew to futures has been proposed

19c also presents problems: the rendering of A.V. is doubtful. Hebrew רפאים is represented in LXX by πεσεῖται ἡ γῆ τοῦ רפאים the land of Rephaim will fall. רפאים in the sense of 'producing' or 'giving birth to' is rare.⁴⁴ The meaning is in fact quite uncertain. Further the pronominal suffixes are problematic: for מתיך Greek simply has οἱ νεκροί ; and the following 'my' in נבלתי is awkward. Finally it is possible to regard יתיך and יקומוך not as emphatic futures, but as jussives expressing a hope or a prayer.⁴⁵

Yet this is the verse on which Charles⁴⁶ has raised a considerable edifice, discovering here a synthesis of the eschatologies of the individual and the nation. According to Isaiah 26:19, as Charles sees it, the righteous individual is to be restored at some period after death to communion with God and with the righteous community: and this double restoration constitutes the resurrection in its essential aspects. The verse therefore presents us with not only a truly spiritual, but a purely indigenous Jewish conception of the resurrection. H.H. Rowley, without the elaborate building up of details, appears to favour Charles' larger proposition: "This passage", Rowley writes, "would appear to contain the earliest reference to the idea of resurrection, in the sense of the restoration of the individual to life after death, in the Old Testament in its richness it would seem to be in line with the most profoundly religious thought of the Bible."⁴⁷

Isaiah 26:19 on the contrary is dim and obscure; nothing seems to be certain here, nothing dogmatic. Restoration is here

tentatively expressed as the somewhat shadowy object of a prayer. Moreover it is difficult to escape the feeling that the oracle retains the purely NATIONALIST outlook throughout. - "We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks", we read in 26:1. And again in 26:15: "Thou hast increased the nation, O Lord, thou hast increased the nation: thou art glorified: thou hadst removed it far unto all the ends of the earth." The most natural conclusion is that the subject of the poetic prophecy of 26:19 is the nation, and that the nation here supersedes the individual.

The Relation of Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:2 and 3.

A.A.Bevan holds that the Danielic verses are "the earliest passage where the belief (in resurrection) is unambiguously set forth." Skinner believes that Daniel 12:2 is "slightly in advance" of⁴⁹ the Isaianic verse. On the other hand Charles expresses the opposite opinion: "in Daniel 12:2 and 3 (together with some other books of the Pseudepigrapha) there are declensions from the original conception (that is, of Isaiah 26:19) The spiritual essence of the resurrection has been lost sight of, and the resurrection - instead of being regarded as at once a Divine gift and a personal achievement - came to be used as a sort of vehicle for bringing certain classes of the righteous and of the wicked before the Final Judgment, and last stage of all, for bringing all men before the Judgment Seat for the General Resurrection."⁵⁰ Charles is followed again by Rowley⁵¹, and also by Montgomery who says of these verses in Daniel: "Here is the usual biblical nationalistic and secular eschatology without further development."⁵² It is

strange that this important passage in Daniel has suffered such denigration in comparison to the treatment of Isaiah 26:19, and yet more strange that scant regard seems to have been paid to the highly significant verse 3 in the 12th Chapter of Daniel. An examination of Daniel 12:2 and 3 exhibits a two-fold contrast with Isaiah, and should successfully abolish any theory of an absolute deterioration in Daniel's idea of resurrection.

Daniel 12:2 and 3.

"(2) And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. (3) And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

The 'everlasting life' of verse 2 is the life of the earthly Messianic Kingdom prophesied in 7:27: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Despite the somewhat fanciful explanation E.F. Sutcliffe offers of Daniel's conception of those privileged to enjoy the resurrection - "by the word 'many' all are designated and the choice of the word was dictated by the desire to emphasize the multitude of those who should wake from the sleep of death"⁵³ - the more mundane interpretation that the resurrection here is for the élite of Israel is much the more convincing. The true Israel is upon his heart, he seems to move still in the

messianic (nationalist) thought environment. Presumably those who are to enjoy 'everlasting life' are the martyrs killed in the persecutions of Antiochus: they will be raised by God in order that His honour might be vindicated, to participate in the earthly Messianic Kingdom, that thus the unity of the REAL Isreal may be preserved at the last. The militant Messianist note of 'Daniel's' resurrection belief is strengthened, not diminished, by the extension of the resurrection to the wicked who have in store only shame and contempt, dire antithesis to the blessed felicity of the faithful in Israel, for these wicked are the arch-enemies of Israel. The language of verse 2 is general and comparatively inexact, as 'Daniel' was not yet bold enough carefully to define his doctrine, yet it is probable that he has in view the tremendous contrast in the imminent destinies of the faithful Nucleus of Israel and her heathen persecutors. The proclamation of the preceding verse, "At that time THY PEOPLE shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book", assists the view that his chiefest interest is still the nation.

The remarkable third verse has been greatly and surprisingly neglected. Charles⁵⁴ finds the first attested instance of the rising of the righteous to immortality in heaven in Jubilees 23:31. But Daniel 12:3 may already refer to a celestial existence. Max Haller has suggested that 'Daniel' is thinking here of the Hebrew translation myths of Enoch and Elijah.⁵⁵ But these were BODILY translations, and in Daniel it would seem to be the souls or spirits that are to enjoy the new existence. Verse 3 can scarcely be taken as merely parallel to verse 2, a more

messianic (nationalist) thought environment. Presumably those who are to enjoy 'everlasting life' are the martyrs killed in the persecutions of Antiochus: they will be raised by God in order that His honour might be vindicated, to participate in the earthly Messianic Kingdom, that thus the unity of the REAL Isreal may be preserved at the last. The militant Messianist note of 'Daniel's' resurrection belief is strengthened, not diminished, by the extension of the resurrection to the wicked who have in store only shame and contempt, dire antithesis to the blessed felicity of the faithful in Israel, for these wicked are the arch-enemies of Israel. The language of verse 2 is general and comparatively inexact, as 'Daniel' was not yet bold enough carefully to define his doctrine, yet it is probable that he has in view the tremendous contrast in the imminent destinies of the faithful Nucleus of Israel and her heathen persecutors. The proclamation of the preceding verse, "At that time THY PEOPLE shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book", assists the view that his chiefest interest is still the nation.

The remarkable third verse has been greatly and surprisingly neglected. Charles⁵⁴ finds the first attested instance of the rising of the righteous to immortality in heaven in Jubilees 23:31. But Daniel 12:3 may already refer to a celestial existence. Max Haller has suggested that 'Daniel' is thinking here of the Hebrew translation myths of Enoch and Elijah.⁵⁵ But these were BODILY translations, and in Daniel it would seem to be the souls or spirits that are to enjoy the new existence. Verse 3 can scarcely be taken as merely parallel to verse 2, a more

expansive description of the secular existence of the earthly Messianic Kingdom, for although it is true that frequently enough in the intertestamental literature 'Light' is a particular blessing of the Messianic Age, it is much more natural to take verse 3 as a contrast with the preceding, and as referring to a new and different order of existence, preserved for a special category of the 'wise', "the pious loyalists" of the Antiochene persecutions, they have been called. How far these 'wise' are to be identified with or distinguished from the merely 'righteous' who are to "awake to everlasting life", or how far the author's thought is merely confused and inconsistent it is impossible to say - it is safer far, however, to think of him as quite uncertain and indefinite himself.

At all events the 'wise' are to 'shine' like the firmament and like the stars for ever. May not 'Daniel's' thought be that it is only as 'children of light' that they are fit to have communion with God in a blessed heavenly existence? God "created the light" (Genesis 1:2-3): He wraps Himself "with light as with a garment" (Psalm 104:2). Hertzberg, in his commentary on Ecclesiastes,⁵⁶ considers that Daniel 12:3 does in fact announce the teaching of an immediate passing to heaven to a blessed immortality - in a state of light to match that light of God. If that were a trustworthy appraisal of this difficult verse, there would then be envisaged in close proximity here two quite different destinies, a share in the Messianic Kingdom made possible for ALL the true Israel by the resurrection (verse 2, where the absorbing

interest is still the nation), and a quite other order of existence vouchsafed immediately after death, eternal in the heavens with God (verse 3, which would in that case be at least to some extent indebted to the purer Old Testament individualist tradition). But on the contrary the two verses taken together convey the impression that the higher life visualised in verse 3 is attained only after a 'sleep in the earth', after an intermediate period of rest: indeed the words of Daniel 11:33 almost demand that, "And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, many days." What 'Daniel' has done then is to introduce into an uncomfortable and ill-blended combination two divergent ideals of the life to come, without any apparent sense of their incoherence. Thus early 'Daniel' furnishes an excellent reminder that although the two great strands of the tradition, the Messianist and the individualist, issued from different sources, they are quickly engaged in mutual interplay, and that the description of their roots, by its very telling, leaves room for an accusation of guiltiness in making an abstraction that was alien to the Jewish mind itself. Nevertheless the respective potencies of both families of thought have had to be stressed.

Great value attaches to the full appreciation of all that is involved in these verses of Daniel because they anticipate quite typical mannerisms of the Ap. and Ps. Daniel dates from the early Maccabaeian age, and is almost certainly the parent Apocalypse. Quite recently, however, the work has once again been assigned to

its traditional place in the sixth century B.C., and the fact that 'Daniel's' prophecy of the resurrection had apparently no effect on his successors for centuries explained by the postulate of 'compenetration'. "On account of the compenetration in the Angel's words in the Book of Daniel their sublimer, eschatological meaning was at first not understood, and they were taken only in the historical sense, without an understanding of its figurative character, of a revival of the people after the end of the persecutions inflicted on it by Antiochus."⁵⁷ The reasoning cannot be accepted, but the point is interesting in the light of the suggestion made previously that in Daniel 12:2 the NATION is still the corner-stone of the writer's thoughts, while the individual occupies only a secondary position. Upon a much sounder critical foundation Rowley argues for that dating in the early second century B.C. mentioned above - it is anchored in the second century by the accuracy of the knowledge of that age which appears in its pages.⁵⁸

Nor is it at all likely that certain sections of the non-canonical book of Enoch (Ethiopic Enoch or I Enoch) precede Daniel. It has, however, lately been argued that I Enoch 6-36 "is an important source of the Book of Daniel which came later, a source which some commentators ignore, or alternatively they imply that the dependence was in the other direction."⁵⁹ But that the dependence was in the other direction is surpassingly likely for a variety of reasons: 1) Daniel's eventual attainment of a place in the canon shows its early authority; 2) the pseudonymous

entitlement of the work to 'Daniel' was no mere subterfuge, but the result of an actual historical process, as Rowley⁶⁰ has convincingly shown. Having arisen thus in Daniel, it was borrowed by the other Apocalypses, and only became a wooden and artificial practice as applied by them; 3) the various sections of Ethiopic Enoch may be considerably later in date than was previously recognised. C.C.Torrey,⁶¹ for instance, dates no part of I Enoch earlier than 95 B.C.

It is, therefore, sufficiently well established that 'Daniel' is the father of the Apocalyptists, and by reason of his status the progenitor of a great deal that is contained in later works of the same genre. In particular the mingling of different perspectives of the Hereafter in Daniel 12:2 and 3 shows what to expect in subsequent books.

The Influence of Foreign Religious Systems.

The preceding pages have presumed that the roots of the eventual Jewish belief in a future life were embedded in the soil of the Hebrew-Jewish religion itself : there has hitherto been no hint that Judaism may on this score have owed much to extraneous religions. But the Danielic passage raises the specific problem of the extent of Jewish indebtedness to alien sources for the resurrection idea, and makes essential a brief prior treatment of the whole subject of Jewish borrowings in religion. Until comparatively recently scholarship in the main eagerly insisted that the Jewish religious tradition was submitted to a long and steady transformation from foreign influences. Gustav Hölscher⁶²

emphasised the westward movement of Babylonian-Iranian religious ideas and Ed. Meyer⁶³ paid much regard to the development of dualism within Judaism, and the importance of such particular concepts as Satan, demons, and resurrection. Indeed this was a thesis plied with special vigour by the devotees of the Babylonian side of the prolonged 'Babel - und - Bibel' controversy - everything in the religion of Israel was Babylonian in origin, and so almost all religious creativity was denied to Israel itself. The tremendous influx of new knowledge of the Babylonian life and culture some decades ago, in a manner made that emphasis inevitable. More recently the same tendencies have been in evidence with the acquisition of much fresh information on the Canaan culture.⁶⁴

In the arena of controversy the question of the extent of Hellenistic influence also played a very prominent rôle - how far was the Palestinian Jewish religious development transfigured by Iranian influence, how far by Hellenism! S. Rosenblatt and Rudolf Meyer think of Judaism as 'assimilating' Hellenist ideas, and are inclined to reject the syncretistic views of Weber, Schürer, Bousset, Gressmann, and later Reitzenstein, all of them under the spell of the whole oriental syncretistic culture.

The whole method stifled and choked any possible impression that Israel may have possessed any originality at all in things religious. Almost nothing was left to Israel: special concepts were considered to be of foreign origin. Hugo Gressmann⁶⁵ derived the Messiah idea from Egypt; Rudolf Otto⁶⁶ finds in the Enochic 'Son of Man' the Parsee idea of the fravashi (heavenly counterpart) of the exemplary and uniquely righteous man, whereas

Bousset and Reitzenstein discover there the Iranian myth of the archetype man Gayomart - and there is a bewildering variety of other theories. Again the Suffering Servant was considered to have traits drawn from the Nature Gods of the Tammuz variety. That contention, however, has been met by C.R.North⁶⁷ with the argument that close parallels between the Servant Songs and mythological texts do not mean that the Servant is a mythological figure - the Hebrew emphasis is always upon the concrete and historical; they developed their Eschatology on the basis of the belief that God is working out His purpose in history, so that their 'forward look' is rooted in their own religious tradition. It is good to call to mind here also the salutary warning once issued by Moulton to beware of the temptation to discover "parallels made plausible by selective description."

It is a happy circumstance that the once potent influence of the comparative religionists has now largely faded away, before new stirrings of desire to defend the integrity of the Jewish religious tradition and its creative genius, to assess the INNER meaning and psychology of Israel's religion. The recuperation was much wanted. Foreign borrowings in religion are never in any case lock-stock-and-barrel appropriations of external religious ideas; what was true of Israel was that the impact of concepts already established in the foreign religions with which she came into contact, may merely have given a certain thrust and impetus to what Israel had discovered for itself.

The Iranian religion then may long have had a

resurrection doctrine as part of its faith. But the Jews did not filch it away complete, their minds were already prepared for the adoption of the idea of resurrection by their own native, inward religious development. We are able now therefore to approach with a far greater complacency and equanimity the great and sometimes scholastic debate on Daniel 12:2 and 3.

Regarding the rise of the resurrection idea in Judaism, Hölscher⁶⁸ argued the influence of Iranian religion from the time of Chapter 37 of Ezekiel (the work of a post-Exilic redactor, in his view); Meyer⁶⁹ and Reitzenstein⁷⁰ thought that the Iranian influence becomes manifest in the Book of Daniel and the Apocalyptic writings which follow. Moulton on the other hand contended that Judaism influenced the Iranian religion, and Söderblom⁷¹ argued for the independence of Jewish ideas. Daniel 12:3 excited much ardent speculation - the source of the idea of the ascent of the soul to heaven here was thought to be the Babylonian-Iranian astral religion (Gressmann, cf. Anz, Bousset, Reitzenstein and Cumont), or again the notion was considered to be essentially Greek (Dieterich and Kroll)⁷². The following summary is perhaps a little amusing: "The point at issue is whether in respect of the idea of the ascent of the soul the probability of this being derived from Greek thought fructifying Chaldaean religion is greater than the latter being fructified by contact with Iran."⁷³

R.H. Charles' brief discussion⁷⁴ of Iranian (Mazdean) influence on Daniel 12:2 is much less grotesque. Charles, finding

no possible traces of Mazdeism in what he considers to be the spiritually conceived doctrine of Isaiah 26:19, discovers points of comparison with Daniel 12:2: both teach a resurrection of the righteous and the wicked and both combine it with the final Judgment. But there are differences: the resurrection is universal in Mazdeism, limited in Daniel; in Mazdeism the final Judgment is at the close of the Messianic Kingdom, in Daniel at its beginning. The most that can be said, in Charles' view, then is that Mazdeism may have "exercised a formative influence in shaping the Jewish doctrine." Whether even that much can be said discreetly is, however, doubtful. The words 'formative' and 'shaping' bespeak a fairly definitive ~~EXTERNAL~~ impulse towards creation of the new idea, whereas on the contrary that impulse came from the inherent tendencies of the Hebrew-Jewish religion, and may merely have been fortified by the knowledge that foreign peoples had already arrived at the concept along their own peculiar way.

The inwardness of the Jewish traditions on the
 Hereafter is a sound working principle to apply to the study
 of the Eschatology of the Ap. and Ps.⁷⁵

CHAPTER II.SOME CRITICAL PROBLEMS - LITERARY AND HISTORICAL.1. The value of the Ap. and Ps. as evidence for intertestamental Judaism.

Students of the intertestamental period of Jewish history have in the main devoted their time and energy to the production of synthetic pictures of the whole scene of Jewish life and culture and thought in that epoch, and they have drawn their materials not only from the Ap. and Ps., but very largely from the rabbinical sources. Something in the nature of a preliminary apologia is consequently demanded for an attempt to trace a particular tenet of the Jewish religion ONLY through the Ap. and Ps. For a multitude of objectors come rushing into view with an indignant protest that such a pursuit can at the best construct a mutilated and fragmentary portrait, academic only in its interest, of what men thought and felt on such a subject as the resurrection in that age of history. Not that any would now subscribe completely to Jost's obiter dictum that the Ap. and Ps. "are without importance for the history of the Jew's religion!" yet the non-canonical Jewish literature, while it has long since become a focus of attention, has rarely been widely used as documentary evidence for intertestamental Judaism. G.F. Moore, for example, H. Strack and C. Montefiore depended almost entirely on the rabbinic literature. Moore insists in his exposition of 'normative Judaism' that only the sources recognised by the religion itself as authentic should be employed; since therefore

the Tannaitic literature and the Talmud ignore the Ap. and Ps., Moore himself has neglected them, and concluded concerning the Apocalypses in particular: "Inasmuch as these writings have never been recognised by Judaism, it is a fallacy of method for the historian to make them a primary source for the Eschatology of Judaism, much more to contaminate its theology with them."¹

Weber² left the Apocrypha entirely out of account. Montefiore³ in his sketch of the Palestinian Judaism of the first century employed only the rabbinic sources. J. Klausner, M. Elbogen, Travers Herford and J. J. Bonsirven⁴ all accept the Ap. and Ps. as only secondary sources. But not all betray an equal prejudice against them, for whereas Herford makes a violent denunciation of the Apocalyptic literature as a sorry excrescence, Bonsirven uses the group quite extensively, and finds in fact a certain community of doctrine in the Apocryphal and rabbinic literature.

When one comes to the examination of specific aspects of Jewish life or thought or religious belief in the intertestamental period, AS THE AP. AND PS. PRESENT THEM, one is acutely conscious of the vastly inferior position commonly assigned to them. Maldwyn Hughes, in his study of the Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal literature betrays this awareness. His words are worth quoting in full: "The study upon which we are entering does not of course involve a complete survey of the whole range of Jewish ethics during this period. Such a task would necessitate the investigation of the Mishna (the depository of the contents of the oral law) which began to

be composed before 30 A.D. and also of the writings of the Alexandrian Jew; Philo, who was born about 20 B.C. But the literature before us represents very important tendencies in Jewish thought, and therefore throws much light upon the development of moral ideas."⁵

A wider claim even than that may be made for the Ap. and Ps., and they may also be more solidly rehabilitated. Not only do they shed light backward upon the Old Testament, and forward upon the New. It is regrettable that too frequently they have been accredited with only this much worth. For they stand in their own right as reliable witnesses too of that vital epoch of Jewish history which gave them birth. "There shone out in that tense moment", writes E.R.Bevan, having in mind particularly the Maccabaeian era, "the sterner and sublimer qualities uncompromising fidelity to an ideal, endurance raised to the pitch of utter self-devotion, a passionate clinging to purity.... It was an epoch in history. The agony created new human types and new forms of literature."⁶ That literature is nearer than anything could be to its time. In endeavouring to form a picture therefore of intertestamental thought, the literature of the age ought to be of greater value than the later works of an authoritative nature issuing from rabbinic circles. For this reason the novels, shall we say, of Charles Dickens may convey a far more powerful (and even more accurate) impression of the conditions of the England of his day, desperately in need of social reform, than the carefully compiled rubrics of a latter-day historian.

In contrast to the Ap. and Ps. the Tannaitic literary materials and the rabbinic sources date from a later time. During the lengthy interval Judaism had made much history. These later evidences are inevitably tinged with the colours of their own age, so that to employ them as sources for intertestamental Judaism has its perils. They contain certainly much earlier material, reaching as far back, it may be, as the 2nd century B.C. Herbert Danby characterises the Mishnah, dating from the close of the second century A.D. as the "deposit of four centuries of Jewish religious and cultural activity in Palestine beginning at some uncertain date possibly during the earlier half of the 2nd century B.C. and ending with the close of the 2nd century A.D." ⁷ Nevertheless it is unfortunate that the collection was not made till so late a date, since although much of the material may be contemporary with considerably earlier ages, it cannot be used with certainty as evidence for the Judaism of that time. ⁸

There must have been many changes during the long and eventful interval down to 200 A.D. J.J. Bonsirven ⁹ seems to be not unconscious of this difficulty, for while he claims that the Tannaitic texts preserve ancient matter and Jewish beliefs evolved but little, he confesses that at least the catastrophes of 70 and 135 A.D. must have produced modifications. Danby's term 'deposit' in reference to the Mishnah affords a clue to an understanding of the essential difference between the Ap. and Ps. and the productions of the rabbis. In the latter beliefs and speculations have crystallised and settled, and over all there is stability: the former are marked by the fluidity and movement

of religious ideas. The Ap. and Ps. present the different stages of a doctrine 'en plein évolution', the rabbinic works express this same doctrine in terms of its development. Religious history can be more or less closely marked into periods of uncertainty and groping and leaps in the dark, and then again times of formulation and dogmatism. Between intertestamental Judaism and the later rabbinic Judaism that line can be drawn. The literature of speculation is the most trustworthy guide to the age of speculation. Pardon may be craved for going far back to V.H. Stanton for wise words spoken of the Ap. and Ps., that will form suitable conclusion here: "The phenomenon of a whole literature marked by strong and peculiar characteristics, and yet standing in no relation to the general condition of the thought of the age and peoples where it flourished, would be unexampled."¹⁰

The notions of the resurrection presented by the Ap. and Ps. may be accepted with a fair degree of assurance as the notions that were stalking through the minds of Jews in the intertestamental period.

The Apocalyptic Literature.

The words just cited from Stanton refer especially to the Apocalyptic writings, and it is necessary to include a brief excursus on their scope, their ways and manners, that when they come up each individually for inspection, they may not be total strangers. Guignebert holds that, although many ephemeral works of the apocalyptic type must have vanished away with the passions they had for a fleeting moment succeeded

in arousing, there is enough surviving to show "evidence of a religious movement of great intensity and importance."¹¹ His description is misleading. The Apocalyptists did not constitute a school with a stable format and a homogeneous body of doctrines. They form a group rather by reason of their common allegiance to a peculiar literary genre which they regarded as the best vehicle for their message to their contemporaries. But each one in eclectic fashion picks his hand from the multitude of eschatological traditions that lies before him, and plays it how he will. First a glimpse at that 'crux interpretum', the relation of the Apocalyptic GROUP to the common stock of Judaism, and secondly at the Apocalyptists' devoted traditionalism.

Lagrange¹² says quite blandly that Apocalyptic has nowhere deviated from orthodox Judaism; and C.C.Torrey¹³ supports this view when he writes that its standpoint "was that of Palestinian orthodoxy of which the Pharisees were the best representatives." Charles¹⁴ lends the weight of his authority with the assertion that apocalyptic Judaism and legalistic Judaism were not in pre-Christian times essentially antagonistic. Apocalyptic assuredly had that in it which must have appealed to the Pharisaean party, for we have knowledge of their deep interest in the Messiah and the thoughts of Final Consummation. It is indeed hard to imagine that Apocalyptic was divorced from the affections and aspirations common to the age¹⁵ : the generality of men were no doubt concerned with its speculations: it was the temper of the times that the masses should take up

these ideas and barter them in the naive popular fashion. The Sadducean opposition and ridicule neither proves a minimum acceptance of the apocalyptic ideas nor denies their widespread popular appeal: the very controversy would have given them the greater prominence among the Jews. At all events it is a precarious procedure, as we have seen, to base judgment of that intertestamental age upon rabbinic materials collated only after the Jewish nation had suffered many vicissitudes of fortune, as Herford and Moore¹⁶ and others do, and further, on the ground that these later sources have nothing of the apocalyptic paraphernalia, to suppose mere exoticism for the great bulk of the intertestamental literature. There were perfectly adequate reasons why later rabbinic Judaism should drop Apocalyptic - it had become the nursling child of Christianity, the rabbis were more formulators than speculators, and the days were now less climacteric.

When the apocalypists are considered retrospectively in their relations to the Hebrew prophets, there is need for a reorientation of that common emphasis which sees a harsh antithesis between them. There are obvious differences in style, the poetry of the prophet and the journalese of the apocalypticist; in faith and conviction, the invincible certainty of the prophet that the all-important PRESENT begets the future, the insatiable curiosity of the apocalypticist to detect the mysteries of the future; God in control of all history for the prophet, God intervening suddenly at the End for the

apocalyptist. Nevertheless it was prophecy which supplied a great proportion of the material that was worked over and interpreted by apocalyptic. Apocalyptic is not a totally new system, appearing, so to say, from the blue. "Ces visionnaires sont les plus livresques des hommes."¹⁷ On every occasion they hasten to consult the traditions. It is fatally easy to generalise about apocalyptic and to describe it simply as the logical culmination of prophetic Messianism, or on the other hand simply as the great declension from the prophetic ideals. In a sense it is both. For on the one side apocalyptic sets for the Consummation a new stage which far transcends the earth and no longer partakes of history, but is beyond, eternal: but on the other, far from renouncing the temporal ideal of Israel, apocalyptic has, as Lagrange puts it, "exaggerated it almost to exasperation".¹⁸ It cannot therefore be just to quit ourselves by saying that the main interest of the one is mundane, of the other supramundane.¹⁹ It is not that prophecy had as its theme earthly Messianism and the salvation of Israel, and apocalyptic had as its theme man, elevated to the highest rank, in relation to the eternal world.²⁰ For in fact apocalyptic is often engrossed with the salvation of Israel, and breathes a nationalism which marks a sharp falling away from the noblest teaching of the prophets. These then are other important factors which help us to comprehend the clashes and tensions and imperfect combinations of opposite ideals in intertestamental Jewish Eschatology - and in all these the growing idea of resurrection is involved.

Some Expositions of Jewish Eschatology - and Critical Difficulties.

a/ The exponent of the leading ideas of the intertestamental literature (whether in Eschatology, Ethics or Theology) cannot but approach his sources with an acute awareness of the inchoateness and intract^gibility of the materials presented, inherent in the very 'occasional nature' of the writings themselves. A glance at the Old Testament field of study reveals that the Old Testament presents problems of a vastly different degree and kind and yet nevertheless remotely analogous to those of this literature. Old Testament students have followed broadly two main lines, that of Historismus or purely historical investigation, or on the other hand that of a systematic presentation of the ideas. Eichrodt²¹ comparatively recently adopted the latter method with great advantages: not neglecting entirely historical progress in Israel's religion, he yet rather systematically describes the different elements in her religion, showing them in their interrelationship, and discovering a set of constants in which over all her existence and the vagaries of her fortune, Israel remains true to type. The corner-stone of his treatment is that bedrock principle of all Jewish religion, the Covenant Idea.

Now these things are suggestive for a study of the ideas of the Ap. and Ps. The Covenant Idea, or at any rate certain ramifications from it are still constants in Israel's thought in the intertestamental period, and most profoundly affect

Jewish Eschatology. A particular interpretation of the idea of the Covenant relationship has led to the persistence of the Messianist-nationalist ideals, and these constitute the basic stratum of thought against which the other elements of Jewish Eschatology can be viewed and examined.

On the contrary a rigidly historical method of investigation has been the one generally employed. It has been usual by way of introduction to establish approximately the dates of the sources, and to expound therewith in the order thus discovered. Thus Maldwyn Hughes in "The Ethics of Apocryphal Literature". Thus also R.H. Charles in his account of the Eschatology of the era. The debt of all students of inter-testamental literature to Charles is incalculable; he was a true pioneer; pioneers require to make rough places plain for the feet of more laggard travellers to walk. But the question may in fairness be posed, has Charles made the path of eschatological development too smooth by his manner of telling the story of its growth? He was certainly by no means unaware of the flux, the inconsistencies and incongruities in all Jewish thought of the Future. Nevertheless it may be doubted whether his procedure of drawing dividing lines at the end of the 2nd century B.C. and the 1st, and again the 1st century A.D. is best calculated to bring these out. It bears rather the impression of a clear-cut centennial progression in eschatological concepts - earthly Messianism, heavenly Messianism, transcendentalism - that is the growth of three centennial summers! The source-books of the Ap. and Ps. are categorised in one or other of these century divisions

according to their dates. The hazards involved become clear when it is remembered that G.F.Moore²² for instance has not ventured beyond a division of the Apocalypses into TWO groups, before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. and after it. With regard to the resurrection idea, Charles' investigation of it is brief; it is considered together with other special conceptions at the end of each of his 'centennial' sections.

E.de Faye²³ adopted a different type of classification of the Apocalyptic Literature in particular. He divided them into three classes: 1) Popular apocalypses.²⁴ These emanate with one exception from the period of the Roman domination and are bitter and even fanatical in their nationalism: it is (sic de Faye!) the national and religious sentiment that leads to the notion of a resurrection of the dead. 2) Rabbinic or Theological apocalypses²⁵ issuing apparently from the same milieu as the Talmud and Mishnah. De Faye is, however, forced to admit that even they preserve the gross materialism which characterises the popular Eschatology. 3) Transcendent Apocalyptic, distinguished by this fundamental trait that in it the invisible world plays a predominant rôle. Again de Faye is forced to admit the survival by the side of newer ideas of pre-existence and celestial light, of crass material conceptions.²⁶

De Faye of course is not involved in the establishing of a strict chronology. All the same his categorisation is hedged about with many difficulties: it is probably too concise, and barely leaves room for a recognition of the comparative freedom with which each individual Apocalypticist takes up the many

traditions that appeal to him, and builds them most frequently into a very 'ersatz' house.²⁷ In any case de Faye's analysis not only of each apocalypse, but of the group, was quickly superseded and dropped out of the picture.

M.J.Lagrange and J.J.Bonsirven, following a lead set by Paul Volz²⁸, at least as far as they are concerned with giving some description of Jewish Eschatology, are little interested to classify the documents of the Ap. and Ps. according to their date (not that they are otherwise unconcerned about the problems of dating!) or their authorship and provenance. By them their sources are considered as tending to fall within certain categories by virtue of the particular type of Eschatological schema or Messianic outlook to which they owe allegiance. That is analogous to the method favoured in these pages.

A glance at some of the critical problems surrounding the Ap. and Ps. exhibits the impossibility finally of drawing dividing lines chronologically and some other kindred difficulties. Students of the Ap. and Ps. still labour under the serious handicap of an incomplete textual criticism of the documents. Moreover the pressing questions of date and authorship of ALMOST EVERY BOOK are by no means even approximately settled. Whereas Charles dates I Enoch 1-36 probably before 170 B.C., I Enoch 83-90 in 166-161 B.C. and I Enoch 91-104 in 134-95 B.C. or more nearly 104-95 B.C.²⁹, C.C.Torrey, as has previously been remarked, maintains with caution the while that no part of I Enoch appears to be earlier than 95 B.C.³⁰ The Book of

Jubilees has been commonly assigned to the 2nd century B.C., but Charles puts it in the 1st century A.D. (before 10 A.D.), Torrey in the latter half of the last pre-Christian century, Albright at the end of the 4th or beginning of the 3rd century B.C. and Zeitlin in the early post-Exilic period, and finally Rowley in the Maccabaeen era.³¹ So also with the authorship of many works - Tellinek attributes Jubilees to an Essene, Beer to a Samaritan, Frankel to a Hellenist, Singer to a Jewish Christian.³²

More important here is the authorship of I Enoch, the Apocalypse of Baruch and IV Ezra. For long their composite authorship was upheld without let or hindrance; there had been undertaken much chiselling and carving to hew out separate sources as the work of different hands. Kabisch, de Faye and then Charles set to work on the Apocalypse of Baruch, and there ensued Charles' extremely complex division of the book.³³ He discovered six different documents behind the text, four presenting an optimistic view of Israel's future and proclaiming a coming Messianic Kingdom, labelled A¹, A², A³, B¹, and B² and B³, entirely pessimistic about this world and directing the hopes of the righteous to the spiritual world - a final editor imposed upon the whole collation a fixed scheme, dividing seven sections by six fests. Torrey, however, says quite briefly and emphatically, "Baruch makes the impression of a continuous composition, homogeneous throughout. No good reason has appeared for questioning its unity."³⁴

With regard to I Enoch Charles remarks that the accepted criticism of his day took Chapters 1-36 and 72-104 as being the

groundwork and proceeding from one author. Subsequently this "impossible hypothesis" (Charles) vanished from the field, and he was able to proceed with the investigation of the extent, character and date of the "various independent writings embodied in this work". He found scattered through the different sections of Enoch fragments from an ancient Book of Noah and adduced five independent hands in 1-36, 37-71, 72-82, 83-90, 91-104: they have suffered grievously from interpolation (83-90 least of all!), have been edited and re-edited.³⁵ There is general agreement that I Enoch does consist of these five sections, and that 37-71 (the 'Discourses' or 'Similitudes' or 'Parables') is a clearly marked division, but that all are from different authors is greatly disputed. Thus Torrey again: "While mainly the work of one author it has received accretions of its own type." And Torrey maintains also that there is no clear evidence of any such work as a lost Apocalypse of Noah.³⁶

G.H.Box's³⁷ analysis of IV Ezra is also complex, but wins common acceptance: the Apocalypse as we have it is the work of a Redactor using several sources, 1) S, a Salathiel Apocalypse, 2) E, an Ezra Apocalypse, 3) A, the Eagle Vision, 4) M, a Son of Man Vision, 5) E², an Ezra-piece. The Redactor by many adjustments has fused the whole together. There will be occasion to revert to the narrower problem in a later chapter. It is here rather a question of general issues. If we could accept without misgiving the composite authorship of these books, the separate authors of each section would in the expression of their ideas on the Last Things be much more largely inwardly consistent. If on the

other hand the whole document is the work of one author, there is a more amazing combination than ever of incompatibles and a plethora of inconsistencies. Where, however, the mistake has lain with most critics of the Ap. and Ps. has been in their constant readiness to mistrust the strange conglomeration of different notions in a whole work and to endeavour to resolve the illogicalities by postulating that many minds and hands are engaged. H.H. Rowley's reminder is opportune and timely: "Within a single work we continually find a variety of detail that has led to theories of composite authorship, instead of to the recognition that the author has no desire to pin himself down to details."³⁸ And the words of F.C. Porter, bearing as they do on several of the stresses of these introductory Chapters, are worth quoting in full: "Each of them (i.e. the Apocalypse of Baruch and IV Ezra) contains a variety of eschatological material, derived certainly in large part from various traditional sources, and not worked together into a consistent or orderly whole. It is because of such diversities that some regard these books as composite, but it is probably better to say that they have each a proper author and a real unity, but that the authors, like others of their class, are very dependent on traditions, and are not anxious, perhaps are not able, to harmonize them."³⁹

In view of all this, stringency of attitude either in classification of sources, or in demands of consistency and systematization in this literature, is illegitimate.

CHAPTER III.THE EARTHLY MESSIANIC HOPE AND THE RESURRECTION.

The distinguishing trait of the intertestamental writings is the mercurial quality of their ideas, resulting in an elusive indefiniteness of conception. "The wild horses of apocalypse were never meant to be yoked to the heavy chariot of dogma." Their age was an age of confusion regarding the destiny of the world and the destiny of man. At the back of the confusion, however, there stands almost still and unwavering Israel's hope of an earthly Messianic Kingdom, never quite routed by the advancing legions of higher and less temporalist ideals. Expectation of a Consummation on the purely historical level had its greatest fillip from a fervent Jewish nationalism with its hope rooted in the soil of Palestine, which however transformed at the End, remained still EARTH. There is no need churlishly to condemn Judaism for its continuous nationalist or particularist standpoint as though it were always bogged down in the stagnancy of its own narrowness. There was that other side, the consciousness of a mission to the world and the craving to preserve at all costs Israel's integrity which were clearly not unmixed with great good. Yet a real comprehension of the strength of Jewish nationalism is tremendously revealing, not least so for the centuries between the Testaments.

The fundamental historical dogma of Judaism is, as was observed in different terms above, that God has willed to choose Himself a people, and to prepare it by a long and slow

selection and education to make it the worthy repository of His revelation. The idea of the Covenant is primary in all Jewish thought, it is "the central point of Jewish theology and the key to an understanding of the nature of Judaism."¹ There can be traced in the Ap. and Ps., even quite apart from specifically eschatological contexts, an ever increasing faithfulness to the letter and spirit of the Old Testament regarding this primordial conception of the unique relation of Israel to her God. As Israel's consciousness of HERSELF is determinative of several aspects of her thought about the Hereafter, it is important to collate here some of the evidence from the Ap. and Ps. that men were still absorbed before all else with ISRAEL.

The Covenant is synonymous with the Torah of God (Jubilees 1:5, 30:21 "Break the covenant which has been ordained for them"; Psalms of Solomon 10:5 "The testimony is in the Law of the eternal covenant"; IV Ezra 4:23, 5:29 etc., II Baruch 19:1, 41:3 "For lo! I see many of Thy people who have withdrawn from Thy Covenant, and cast from them the yoke of Thy Law.") The Lord is the God of Israel (Jubilees 1:18, 2:19, 19:28, etc., Psalms of Solomon 16:3). He is the Lord of the sheep (I Enoch 89 and 90), the God of the Fathers (Assumption of Moses 9:6 "Let me die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of Lords, the God of our fathers."). 'God of our fathers' indeed must have been a current (liturgical) phrase, (cf. Tobit 8:5; Wisdom 9:1, etc.) The Lord is the King of Israel (Psalms of Solomon 17:1 "O Lord Thou art our King for ever and ever"). Israelites are the sons of God, (Enoch 72:11; Jubilees 22:11

"Blessed be my son Jacob and all the sons of God most High"), and Israel is the first-born of God (IV Ezra 6:5 "But we, thy people, whom Thou hast called thy first-born"). Also Israel is the servant of God (Psalms of Solomon 12:7).

A series of passages showing God's special interest in and care of His people.

God resides in the Temple (II Baruch 7:2; Jubilees 8:19; Psalms of Solomon 7:5 "While Thy name dwelleth in our midst, we shall find mercy."), in Palestine (I Enoch 25:5 and especially 77:1 is here quite illuminating: "And the second quarter, the south, because the Most High will descend there, yea there in a quite special sense will He who is blessed forever descend."). God takes especial care of His people (Jubilees 1:28; Psalms of Solomon 10:9). He entrusts His people to the guardianship of angels (Assumption of Moses 10:2 "Then the hands of the angel shall be filled who has been appointed chief, and he shall forthwith avenge them of their enemies").

God's preservation of Israel.

Israel's history is directed by God (the whole allegory of I Enoch 89 and 90). Israel will be indestructible (IV Ezra 3:15, 12:47). Particularly noteworthy are some passages proclaiming that God is magnified by His people's victories and diminished by her reverses. (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test.Nathan 8:4; II Baruch 5:1 and 2; II Maccabees 1:27 "Gather together our dispersion, set at liberty them that are in bondage among the heathen, look upon them that are despised and

abhorred, and let the heathen know that Thou art our God").

Israel and the nations.

Israel is the holy nation (Jubilees 22:12), separated from the rest of the nations that she might be holy and sacred. (II Baruch 48:23 "For we are all one celebrated people who have received one law from One.") The other nations are filled with sins and abominations (Test.Dan. 5:5; several passages in Psalms of Solomon; IV Ezra 3:34 and 35 "Now therefore weigh thou our iniquities, and those of the inhabitants of the world, in the balance and so shall be found which way the turn of the scale inclines.")

Israel pre-destined and elected.

The pre-destination of Israel was a commonly accepted dogma (as in the classic verse in the Assumption of Moses 1:12 "For He hath created the world on behalf of His people"), the election of Israel by God also (Jubilees 15:30 etc., IV Ezra 5:23 to 27, etc.) God has united His name with Israel alone (Psalms of Solomon 9:17 "Thou didst choose the seed of Abraham before all the nations, and didst set Thy name upon us, O Lord.")

As to the fate of the nations at the End there is a great variety of detail in the pronouncements made in the Ap. and Ps., but this much is salient - they will be subordinate to Israel. The fate assigned to the nations is relatively compassionate in Test.Judah 23:5; Jubilees 23:26-29; and IV Ezra 7:27,28. But most frequently they will be severely punished or completely destroyed: (Psalms of Solomon 17:27 "He shall destroy

the godless nations with the word of His mouth". cf. Enoch 27:2,3; Assumption of Moses 10:7; IV Ezra 6:27 and 28; II Baruch 14:1 "Thou hast said unto me that the retribution which has been spoken of by Thee, shall come upon the nations.")

One striking feature about the expectations of national fulfilment is that, although there are many passages attesting a yearning for the return of the Exiles from the Dispersion and their ultimate ingathering, it is absent from many passages where we should expect it, e.g. in Jubilees, Assumption of Moses, Sibylline Oracles, IV Ezra 13:39-47, which all predict the return of the ten tribes, but say nothing of the Exiles. Could it be that it was so popular a longing that it scarcely required express mention or were the blessings of the Messianic Age to be reserved only for those Jews still living in Palestine, (as in Sibylline Oracles 3:652, II Baruch 29:2 "For at that time I will protect only those who are found in those self-same days in this land.")? Nevertheless the return was in fact ardently desired (cf. the poem of the return in Psalms of Solomon 11:1 ff. "Blow ye in Zion on the trumpet to summon (the) saints, Cause ye to be heard in Jerusalem the voice of him that bringeth good tidings; For God had pity on Israel in visiting them. Stand on the height, O Jerusalem, and behold thy children, From the East and the West, gathered together by the Lord.") There are also many other passages in the same vein, I Enoch 90:30; Jubilees 1:15; II Maccabees 1:6,18, I Enoch 57.

The passages cited are culled from a fairly representative section of the whole literature. They are not proof texts: the ideas they embody are fundamental and discernible in almost every facet of Judaism in that epoch. Jahweh and Israel are yet closely bound together. The nation still takes pride of place. When Jews in the later post-Exilic age turned their eyes towards the Future their desire was riveted still upon a COLLECTIVE fulfilment in the Consummation. The Jew yearned for a share in the NATIONAL future golden age, not for a blessed lot in eternity for himself alone, in isolation from his fellow Jews, and he craved that the Kingdom of his dreams might be realised upon earth. In its original apprehension the resurrection was to take place at the beginning of the earthly Messianic Age, and had no connection with a great world-assize at the End. When the national restoration depicted in figurative terms by Hosea and Ezekiel was extended and realistically applied to individuals and the conquest of physical death by an incipient resurrectionism, it still did not mean that Jews therewith had been induced to give credence to a rigorous doctrine of individual election. The prophetic promises of coming salvation were offered to Israel as a whole: Jews subsequently in a day of dread persecution when many of the faithful were giving their lives for the cause, pondered in their hearts at once the sad fate of the martyrs and the imminence of the End when God's justice would stand supreme and His people triumph. None of the late departed, they felt, could be excluded from the joys of this coming day. To them too who had died, "not having received the

promises" all joy would be fulfilled when they would be resurrected to life in the Consummation. So the resurrection primitively is comprehensively national rather than intensively individual - the solidarity at least of the true Israel is in view. The resurrection in germ is an adjunct of the immensely popular hope of a Messianic Kingdom. In this its primitive form the resurrection idea makes a dim appearance in I Enoch 1-36; in Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs it has taken much more definite shape. The possibility of the occurrence of the idea in I Enoch 83-90 is gravely disputed. All three documents are akin in this that their perspective does not stretch beyond an earthly Messianic Kingdom. Each is now considered in turn.

I Enoch 1 - 36.

The opening Chapters 1-5, probably introductory to the whole Book of Enoch and connected in phraseology with every section of it except 72-82², depict the Judgment of God in biblical imagery with no mention of a resurrection. The wicked and godless will be removed, but the elect righteous will enjoy peace and mercy and protection. In Chapters 6-36 there is little advance upon the Old Testament prophetic conception of the Messianic Kingdom, and the pictures of the future blessing seem like an adorned reproduction of those in Genesis. They are not, however, totally naive or unethical, for there is affirmed a final Judgment which will remove the sinners and reward the righteous. Judgment in fact occupies the centre of the stage (as so frequently elsewhere in the Apocalypses) and precedes the future state of blessedness. It does not seem to be very

imminent and is forensic in nature, falling at its duly appointed time. (22:4).

Ardently exclusivist nationalism has little place in these chapters; there is no bellicose and fanatical propaganda against the nations. Significantly enough resurrection is mentioned, if at all, only very tentatively. But the time of blessing does originate from the Holy Land, for after the Judgment the Tree of Life is to be transplanted to the Holy Place beside the Temple of God, the King of the World (25:6). The scene of the future life is to be Jerusalem and its valleys. O the dear mother soil! That Judgment is to be here not so much upon the heathen nations as upon the sinners, to be chastised in the accursed valley (27:2).

The stern fate of the wicked Enoch witnesses at the culmination of his mysterious angel-conducted tour (Chapters 21-27), in which he sees the seven stars of heaven having broken God's command, bound and consumed with fire for ten thousand years, the fiery abyss, the angel's prison to which they are consigned for ever, the mountain of God whereon He sits when He descends to the earth in goodness. Near this mountain is the Tree of Life. "As for this fragrant tree no mortal is permitted to touch it till the great judgment, when He shall take vengeance on all and bring (everything) to its consummation forever Its fruit shall be for food to the elect³ (Charles has restored the text here following G. E, i.e. the Ethiopic text, is very corrupt): it shall be transplanted to the holy place, to the temple of the Lord, the Eternal King. Then shall they rejoice with

joy and be glad, And into the holy place shall they enter,
And its fragrance shall be in their bones, And they shall
live a long life on earth, Such as thy fathers lived." (25:4-6).

The righteous (the "elect") apparently are alone to partake of the Tree of Life, and so enjoy long and happy lives upon earth. This whole conception is sensuous, and the whole expectation is of a purely terrestrial Kingdom.

Resurrection is not explicitly mentioned, but is in fact implied in such a phrase as "its fragrance shall be in their bones", and "they shall live a long life on earth." That the writer had resurrection in view seems to be corroborated by the inference that since, as he conceives it, one class of sinners is to endure perpetual torment after the Judgment and another is not to be visited or raised (v. infra), there are those who will rise. In any case the kind of life to which he believed men would attain, whether or not he thinks of its attainment as made possible only through resurrection, is lucidly enough presented. It is the earthly life of an earthly Messianic Kingdom, purely physical in its essence. As such it can be experienced and enjoyed only in the body.⁴ If then he is in fact thinking of resurrection it is plainly a resurrection of the body; their bones are to contain the fragrance of the Tree of Life.

The 'elect' here is a collective term, used to describe a class: of whom can the writer be thinking but the faithful core or nucleus of Israel? This is authenticated by the words which follow immediately, visualising Jerusalem, the centre of the earth in the author's view, 26:1, as the particular locus

from which is emitted the life of blessedness. It is RIGHTEOUS JEWS who are to rise (it is to be remembered, however, that this is inferential since the author has not openly named the fact of resurrection) in PALESTINE. Nor has he even consistently maintained this point. He is guilty of some confusion on this very subject of who are to enjoy the blessed life to come. In another context, as will be noted presently, he thinks of the SINNERS of the second division of Sheol as rising, but only for a severer condemnation. Vagueness is characteristic of the author, his confusion on this score is to be noted, it cannot be explained.

His delineation is to a large degree Old Testament Messianism rechauffé, with a resurrection for those already dead only very obscurely superimposed. The resurrection is here in fact a very incomplete affair. Chapter 10:17 to 11:2 is a passage which furnishes ample proof of the assertion that what we have here is an embellishment of the Genesis' picture of a restoration of paradisiacal conditions - "the righteous shall live till they beget thousands of children, and all the days of their youth and their old age shall they complete in peace the vines which shall be planted shall yield wine in abundance and each measure of olives shall yield ten presses of oil." Yet curiously combined with this utopianist hope of the time when men would enjoy a marvellous longevity and the earth an amazing fertility, is a high ethical standpoint. I.T.Beckwith writes: "All the material and earthly blessings of the Messianic Kingdom and the New Jerusalem are

only the corollary of its spiritual perfections."⁵ And justice is to be done certainly to the devotees of a fervent earthly Messianism! In the Kingdom they foresee, all men shall then worship God, the earth shall be cleansed from all defilement, and truth and peace shall be associated throughout all the days of the world (I Enoch 11 : 1). But in the last resort the dream of a Messianist, such as this Enochic author, remains set upon a material Future: it is historical , temporal, earthly still.

At a certain juncture in the course of his grand 'mystery tour', Enoch was conducted to "a great and high mountain of hard rock. And there was in it four hollow places deep and wide and very smooth." (22:1 and 2). There he found displayed to view "the spirits of the children of men, who were dead" (22:5). Apparently Sheol is regarded here as situated in the far West (and not in the underworld), and as the intermediate abode of all the dead. Of its four partitions, the first is for the souls of the righteous, the other three for the souls of different classes of sinners, one for those who come before God to plead their cause with complaints that they were slain in the day of sinners, and yet another for those who are "complete in transgression", whose spirits shall not be slain in the day of Judgment, and yet they shall not be raised.

This passage is concerned only with Jews; there is no mention of the heathen. If resurrection be here in the writer's mind, and if, as seems at first sight possible, it be a general

resurrection, the declaration would be unique, it has been held, in pre-Christian Jewish Apocrypha.⁶ But that is most improbable in view of the author's tendencies exhibited elsewhere in the work. It is clear that while in general his views of the future are built upon the traditional foundations, he has nevertheless made a considerable advance upon the ancient conceptions of Sheol. With him the Sheol concept becomes not merely negative but dynamic, for there now moral, not social distinctions are preserved and the departed have a positive existence. From the passage 22:4 ff. then it would appear that at least a partial retribution is entered upon immediately after death, and this view was to become more widely prevalent. (cf. IV Ezra 7:78 ff., Wisdom 3:1 ff., I Enoch 103:7; Apocalypse of Baruch 36:11; Jubilees 7:29, 22:22; Slavonic Enoch 18:7, 40:12. cf. also Luke 16:22).⁷

Elsewhere than in this developed notion of Sheol and the not very precise implication of a resurrection for the righteous dead, the writer depicts the future in the terms of Old Testament prophecy. With the sensuous description of the Messianic times already remarked in 10:17 to 11:2, there are parallel passages in several of the prophetic books, in Amos' announcement that the reaper would overtake the ploughman, and the treader of grapes the sower of seed. (Amos 9:13 and 14; cf. Hosea 2:22,23; Jeremiah 31:5; Isaiah 25:6; Ezekiel 28:26; 34:26 and 27.) Through many of the trappings and mysterious apocalyptic paraphernalia that are here in evidence (the union

of angels and the daughters of men producing giants, the angel-conducted tour, pillars of heavenly fire and mountains of precious stones), there appears the writer's profound and reverential respect for the traditions of prophecy.

The Messianic Kingdom has Jerusalem as its centre in his imagination and the community of righteous Israel as its denizens. Judgment is in the forefront of the picture of the Last Things, resurrection only in the background. The modus operandi of the resurrection is nowhere clearly described. The Tree of Life in some mysterious way provides the long life of the Messianic Age, but whether the dead rise through a reunion of the spirits from Sheol with the bodies from the graves (the later orthodox rabbinic doctrine) we are not openly informed. That which would ensue after the long and blessed lives of the Messianic Kingdom were over is not either specified. Would there follow a peaceful death, as in Isaiah 65:20, "There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old"? Exact knowledge is denied us, although it has been inferred from 25:6, "And they shall live a long life on earth such as thy fathers lived", that the life of the risen in the Messianic Kingdom will be terminated by death in the natural course of events.⁸ There is only this certainty, that his horizon is limited to the temporal scene; the Messianic Kingdom is for him eternal, so far as he could conceive it; there is nothing beyond.

Three brief concluding notes on this section of Enoch can be set down here:

1) Is I Enoch 25:6, "its fragrance shall be in their bones" a distant echo of Ezekiel's vision of the revivification of the Dry Bones? The prophet is asked, "Son of man, can these bones live?" Only the Enoch writer's expanded notions of Sheol (22:4 ff.) preclude us from saying that his prophecies of 25:4-6 mark in effect no real advance upon Ezekiel's figurative presentation of a restoration of the nation. Certainly in the Enoch passage 25:4-6 there is no mention of the conquest of physical death, and the phrases "its fragrance shall be in their bones", and "they shall live a long life on earth" may apply not to those resurrected from the dead, but to those who are alive at the inauguration of the Messianic Kingdom.

Yet on the other hand, as was noted, there is that other verse which denies a rising again to a certain class of sinners in Sheol, and seems to imply that the writer in fact knew of the resurrection. What can be recognised here is not a vivid resurrection doctrine, but rather the soil of the earthly Messianic expectation which fertilised the idea of resurrection and gave it eventually, e.g. in Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, a more definite shape than it has assumed in this place.

2) There is no Messiah in the picture. The Messiah figures but little in the intertestamental literature. But it is a great mistake to think with Lagrange⁹ that hopes of a national restoration could not be maintained without an individual Messiah. Messianic pretensions include those which look for the consummation from the centre or axis of the civilisation or people concerned. Enoch 6-36 expects therefore a Messianic

Kingdom, its capital at Jerusalem. With this hope of a nationalist-collectivist Fulfilment the embryonic resurrection hope is connected.

3) The impossibility of placing Enoch 6-36 at a specific point in a chronological position of Eschatological thought follows from the complete uncertainty that prevails as to its date. Charles considers that it is Maccabaeian, Rowley with greater probability that the writer is an inferior imitator of Daniel. Eissfeldt assigns it to a date not later than 150 B.C., Schürer to the end of the 2nd century B.C., Bousset to sometime between 164 and 80 B.C., Beer between 167 and 64 B.C., Baldensperger and Causse to the reign of John Hyrcanus.¹⁰

In the present enquiry I Enoch 6-36 occupies first place because of its complete acceptance of the naive and sensuous hope of an earthly Messianic Kingdom. One astonishing feature of the whole picture is that the idea of light as a blessing of the Kingdom in 14:8-25 did not to some extent rid the popular Messianism of its materialism. The potency of the popular temporalist expectation was a force to be reckoned with; it would never voluntarily surrender.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

A few preliminary notices on the nature of this book

must be served:

1) The work is an ethical treatise and not an apocalypse proper, but it does contain apocalyptic elements.

2) A remarkable feature is that the universalist note is struck by the writer. God's salvation is, it seems, to be revealed to all the Gentiles (Test. Benj. 10:5). We should expect no less of an ethical teacher so noble as this. Nevertheless his universalism, as will become clear, by no means ousts his nationalism, for he is still bound by thoughts of the community of Israel. The Jewish Messiah is depicted as opening the gates of Paradise (Test. Levi 18:10 f.), and the Patriarchs rise at the head of their tribes (Test. Benj. 10:7). Israel is the purveyor of salvation to the Gentiles.

3) The problem of Christian interpolations in the work is acute. It was long held indeed to be a Christian work. Doubtful passages can be dealt with if and as they occur. R.H. Charles, it may be added, is so uncertain about the date of Test. XII¹¹ that he refrains from building upon its evidence in his chronological picture of Jewish Eschatology.

Relevant passages can now be investigated. The resurrection is several times mentioned in Test. XII. In Test. Simeon 6:5,6,7 part of the dying Simeon's words are given. Textual difficulties are numerous, particularly in verse 5. The mss. of the Armenian Version (called by Charles¹² A^a, A^b, and A^h) are here obviously corrupt, reading: "Then shall Seth (probably a corruption of 'Shem') be glorified, for the Lord our God shall appear on earth (as man), And Himself saves again."

The two types of Greek text (designated α and β by Charles) vary respectively between "Then shall a sign be glorified greatly unto Israel (τὸ σημεῖον ἐνδοξασθήσεται μέγα τῷ Ἰσραήλ), For the Lord appearing on earth shall come (as man), And saving through him man", and "Then the sign shall be glorified, For the Lord God the Mighty One of Israel appearing on earth (as man), And saving through him man".

σημεῖον is probably a mistake for Σημ , and μέγα τῷ Ἰσραήλ for μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ which has wrongly been transposed by some Greek and Armenian mss. to the second line. If μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ belongs to the first line, ἐνδοξασθήσεται must be a mistake for δοξάσει , i.e. assuming a Semitic original, the Niphal $\Gamma \Delta \Delta$ has been rendered instead of the Piel $\Gamma \Delta \Delta$. Further 'as man' is certainly a Christian interpolation, possible only in the light of Jesus Christ. And the third line "And Himself saves again" is corrupt in the Armenian mss. and wanting in several Greek mss.

From this mass of uncertainties the text has been restored thus: "Then the Mighty One of Israel shall glorify Shem, For the Lord God shall appear on earth, And save the sons of man." This incursion into text criticism is rendered necessary by the fact that the idea of the appearing of God upon earth will figure largely in the subsequent discussion. It appears from a study of the mss. evidence that the general tenor of the verse is not in doubt; details, however, must remain obscure. The notion of a Theophany at least seems to be native to the original text. Theophanies are common enough in the

Testaments, Test. Levi 2:11, 5:2, 8:11; Test. Judah 22:2; Test. Zabulon 9:8; Test. Naphtali 8:3; Test. Asher 7:3. But in the present context it assumes for us a more vital importance by its relation to the writer's resurrection prophecy in verse 7. To this we shall revert later in some detail. Meantime it seems hazardous to deduce from this present idea of a Theophany a primitive conception of an earthly Messianic Kingdom, such as is found in I Enoch 6:36. Nor can it be emphatically pronounced that in the subsequent verse 7 the writer is thinking of resurrection to this Messianic Kingdom upon earth. Other corroborative evidence from other passages would be required before that claim for the author could be substantiated.

The passage then Test. Simeon 6:5,6,7, though it defines not clearly the resurrection life, its nature and its scope, openly proclaims the fact of resurrection. Thus verse 7: "Then shall I arise in joy, And will bless the Most High because of His marvellous works." The resurrection is no longer figurative, but real, defeating physical death, extended to the individual. But it is still impossible to maintain even from this passage in isolation that the resurrection is a privilege bestowed through an individual providence and election, or that the resurrection life has its blessings reserved for the individual alone and apart. The emphasis, the thought atmosphere is Israel, not purely the individual person qua individual. The author is possessed of a strong community-consciousness. Simeon may well be speaking collectively, as the representative of his clan:

there is support in fact for the rendering: "I TOO shall arise in joy". Again parallel to this passage is Test.Zabulon 10:2 "For I shall arise again in the midst of you and I shall rejoice in the midst of my tribe." Without that felicitous ending in a re-union of Israel, the resurrection is in its primitive conception unimaginable.

The proof-text method might be able, it is true, to adduce an argument of some weight for a purely personal notion of resurrection in this context. It may also have to be admitted that there can be no facile induction from this particular passage that the writer is thinking of the community life of the Messianic Kingdom upon earth. But the admission can be rescinded and the argument overruled in the light of the important passage in Test.Judah 25:1 ff. where the writer is clearly moving in the circle of early ideas of a terrestrial Messianic Kingdom and the restored community of Israel therein, made full and complete by the resurrection of ~~the~~ dead of Israel. These verses run: "And after these things shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob arise unto life, and I and my brethren shall be chiefs of the tribes of Israel: Levi first, I the second, Joseph third, Benjamin fourth, Simeon fifth, Issachar sixth, and so all in order And ye shall be the people of the Lord and have one tongue; And there shall be there no spirit of deceit of Beliar, For he shall be cast into the fire forever. And they who have died in grief shall arise in joy," ("And they who were poor for the Lord's sake shall be made rich" - a Christian interpolation!)

This section is crucial to an appreciation of the writer's resurrection doctrine. Several aspects of it will be treated in turn.

1) It so happens that the Chapter immediately preceding these verses is perplexingly difficult. In that Chapter, 24, verses 5 and 6 are obviously a doublet of the first four verses; verses 5 and 6 mention the appearance of the Messiah as though verses 1-4 had no reference at all to it and it were a new subject. Charles regards 5-6 as interpolated¹³. What has probably occurred is that two small Messianic fragments have almost inadvertently been brought together. The general purport is clear. Verses 1-4 describe the character of the star that will arise out of Jacob and something of the blessings that will accompany his advent. The subject of the fragment might appropriately be entitled "The rising of the star out of Jacob". Verses 5 and 6 are to be regarded either as an interpolation or a doublet of 1-4. They describe the restoration of Israel from captivity among the nations. Now even if verses 5-6 are taken as a doublet of the preceding, it is natural to regard this restoration of Israel and the rising of the star from Jacob as more or less coterminous, parts of the same Messianic advent.

On this view the words "after these things" at the beginning of Chapter 25, mean simply "after the restoration from captivity and the rising of the star out of Jacob" so that what is delineated in this Chapter is still part of the Messianic consummation. A rigoristic interpretation of the

phrase "after these things", paying no sufficient regard to the nature of the passage immediately preceding, desires to regard Chapter 25 as a description of what will occur after the Messianic Age is all over. It is, however, much more probable that the acts described in Chapter 25 are also part, as is maintained above, of the Messianic Consummation. That Chapter prophesies first a resurrection of the Patriarchs of Israel, and then of those "who have died in grief" (verse 4). Their rising is then one of the acts of the Messianic drama. Through the mouth of Judah the author is predicting a resurrection of the Israelites of all generations to participate in the renewed community life of the earthly Messianic Kingdom. He thinks presumably therefore of resurrection of the body.

G.F. Moore has concluded about the resurrection teaching of the Testaments in general: "The resurrection, beginning with the patriarchs, is a restoration to a life on this earth, with the old tribal organisation in idealized conditions."¹⁴

2) Reference has been made to the author's universalism. It is here at least temporarily in abeyance: the popular ideals outweigh it. The tribes of Israel constitute the all-important nucleus of the privileged in the new resurrection life. The national solidarity means much to him. Israel's Patriarchs are first to rise. Her fulness would be incomplete without them. Resurrection is here social more than individual in its connotation. The writer's nationalist outlook is further authenticated in the words of verse 3: "And ye shall be the

people of the Lord, and have one tongue". While there are here textual variants, and a more probable reading is "And there shall be one people of the Lord, and one tongue", the sense is in no doubt. Hebrew MUST be the language of the risen in the Kingdom.¹⁵ How far is ISRAEL in the van! The proclamation of verse 5, "And all the peoples shall glorify the Lord forever" is not so much testimony to his entertaining the notion of a universal resurrection, as a quite illogical retention of a relic of the temporalist expectation of a glorious vindication of Israel, and a deference to his own heart's desire of her earthly glorification.

3) Verse 4 "And they who have died in grief shall arise in joy" has been interpreted in the above as indicating resurrection to the earthly Messianic Kingdom. The Patriarchs rise first, perhaps not so much in order of time as of preference and precedence, as the indispensable mainstay of Israel. Then only "they who have died in grief" arise. That they are those who have died for Israel's sake is entirely likely in view of the following words, "And they who are put to death for the Lord's sake shall awake to life."

M.J.Lagrange¹⁶, however, (and more recently E.F.Sutcliffe¹⁷) hold a totally different opinion about the nature of the resurrection in the Testaments. Lagrange has sought to establish the divorcement of resurrection from the primitive type of Messianism as early as possible in the development of Judaism, maintaining that in the MOST ANCIENT DAYS OF RABBINISM the resurrection of the dead inaugurated

the final or eternal period and followed the Messianic era. He goes further and asserts that the true order of events in the Consummation, as presented by the Testaments, is a Messianic period followed by a Theophany or manifestation of God upon earth, and THEREAFTER resurrection: only, the Last Period to which the resurrection becomes the gateway is not described in detail, and seems to be rather merely an End than a Period, an End beyond which the writer is either incapable or undesirous of taking us. Lagrange has set much store by that passage in Test. Simeon 6:4-7 given brief mention and consideration above. Verse 4 "Then shall all the earth rest from trouble, And all the world under heaven from war", Lagrange has taken as the first separate stage of the Last Things, (it should, however, be noted that verse 4 in fact is the concluding piece of a more detailed description of the Messianic Age); verse 5 "The Lord God shall appear on earth" is the second stage, the Theophany; and verse 7 "Then shall I arise in joy" the last stage, the resurrection to ----- and there, as it were, the symphony is unfinished! Whatever the End to which the resurrection introduces the risen dead, it is, in Lagrange's view, far beyond the Messianic Kingdom. But the Simeon passage is probably too general (v. above, pp.69 ff.) to admit of precise definition.

E.F. Sutcliffe in fashion similar to Lagrange has regarded the resurrection in the Testaments as unconnected with the Messianic Kingdom. He bases his judgment mainly upon the passage discussed previously, Test. Judah 25:1 ff. and takes

the phrase "after these things" in the first verse of that Chapter as indicating "after the Messianic times". That is, the Patriarchs and the rest (verse 4) will rise unto life, which cannot possibly be therefore the earthly life of an earthly Messianic Kingdom. Sutcliffe recognises a parallel, and an analogous notion of the resurrection in the highly significant passage, Test. Benjamin 10:55 ff. Since these verses have to be investigated at some length they are now quoted entire: (they contain an injunction and a promise to Benjamin's children.)

5) "Keep the commandments of God, until the lord shall reveal His salvation to all Gentiles. 6) And then shall ye see Enoch, Noah, and Shem, and Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob, rising on the right hand in gladness. 7) Then shall we also rise, each one over our tribe, worshipping the King of heaven (who appeared upon earth in the form of a man in humility. And as many as believe on Him on the earth shall rejoice with Him.). 8) Then also all men shall rise, some unto glory and some unto shame. And the Lord shall judge Israel first, for their unrighteousness; (for when He appeared as God in the flesh to deliver them they believed Him not) 9) And then shall he judge all the Gentiles (as many as believed Him not when He appeared upon earth).

"The impression given", says Sutcliffe of this passage, "is that the earthly Messianic Kingdom is over when the resurrection and the judgment take place". The writer of the Testaments may have been much less sure regarding the order of events in the final reckoning than many of his

interpreters. It should be called to mind that he had an amazing facility for amalgamating diverse strands of the Scriptural traditions. Precision was alien to him. Logical coherence is not to be imposed upon his conceptions from outside. With that proviso in mind it may more justly be claimed, as against Sutcliffe, that these verses visualise primarily a Consummation not different from that of Test. Judah 25:1 ff., a resurrection to the communal life of the Messianic Kingdom upon earth, of which Israel is the foremost subject. The following considerations on Test. Benjamin 10:5 ff. may now be noted.

1) Benjamin's children are enjoined to "keep the commandments of God until the Lord shall reveal His salvation to all Gentiles". From this the idea of a universal resurrection is commonly deduced. It seems more natural in view of the promise which follows straight away in verse 6, of a resurrection for the Patriarchs of ISRAEL, to regard the salvation vouchsafed by the Lord as God's salvation of His own people, to be laid bare before all the Gentiles. The Armenian in fact interestingly preserves what is certainly a less well-attested reading, "in all the earth", for the other "to all the Gentiles", but the Armenian may better have caught the original import.

2) The conjoining "then", at the beginning of verses 6, 7, 8 and 9 need not strictly delimit separate

stages or events in the consummation separated from each other by an interval of time longer or shorter. Only a leech-like fastening upon the full temporal force of the conjunction could lead to the supposition that the resurrection and Judgment of verses 8 and 9 must necessarily follow at some considerable distance the obviously communal life envisaged for Israel in verses 6 and 7. On these premises alone can it be claimed that verses 6 and 7 represent only a passing phase in the transition to the truly final consummation prophesied in verses 8 and 9, universal and clearly divorced from Messianism. It cannot be too strongly insisted that such smooth gradation is not the author's. If in fact there is any real continuity between the verses from 5 to 9, what is involved is rather the order of precedence or priority, first the Patriarchs, second the tribes of Israel, third all, are to enjoy the boon of resurrection. And still Israel is first! She is the first also to be judged by God (verse 8), but this is unwanted priority, and the author, man of high ethical ideals, has accompanied the proclamation of it with something of the perception of an Amos. But the reunion of Israel is the central feature of the Consummation, and the chiefest *raison d'être* of the resurrection. The brief section is rounded off,

here at least POINTEDLY we may take it, with the words:

"If ye therefore, my children, walk in holiness according to the commandments of the Lord, ye shall dwell securely with me, and ALL ISRAEL SHALL BE GATHERED UNTO THE LORD." (verse 11).

3) There is apparently much less point or purpose in the combination of the limited (nationalist) ideas of resurrection in verses 6 and 7 and the universalist notion of verse 8. Any view which imagines that the author had really fixed these resurrections in a schema orderly enough to satisfy our logic-loving minds is precarious. He has combined, to a large extent inharmoniously, the primitive and the more advanced. Verses 6 and 7 can hardly refer to anything other than a Messianic Consummation. Verse 8 may embody a vision of a realm beyond that, the very verge of eternity. But where he was himself so indefinite, the critics of his work should be wary of definition. There can, however, be assurance thus far! Verse 8, "all men shall rise, some unto glory and some unto shame" is an obvious reminiscence of Daniel 12:2, but the resurrection is here extended from the 'many' of Daniel to 'all'. He may have received the universalist impulse from his lofty ethicalism. This nevertheless does not accord well with the sentiments expressed in verses 6 and 7. But then the parent Apocalypse had brought together different perspectives of the life to come at the End. His debtors of a later day may the more easily have done the same. Yet over all, the Messianic outlook and the Israel-first standpoint take precedence in the Testaments.

4) Some weight is added to this latter contention by the consideration that verses 7, 8 and 9 in Test.Benjamin, Chapter 10 are textually very suspect. The intrusive hand of Christian interpolators has unmistakably been active here. The two types of Greek ms. and the Slavonic version read in verse 7 these words applying to the King of Heaven: "who appeared upon earth in the form of a man in humility. And as many as believe on Him on the earth shall rejoice with Him." And again in verse 8: "for when He appeared as God in the flesh to deliver them they believed Him not". In verse 9 the Gentiles are condemned for not having believed in Christ. It is quite feasible that verses 7,8 and 9 are entirely extraneous to the original. If that were so, everything would instantly become more straightforward. Test.Benjamin 10:5 and 6 would then be parallel to Test.Judah 25:1, and would then envisage the communal life of the restored Israel in the earthly Messianic Kingdom. Significantly in this connection, the Armenian is "innocent of this palpable Christianisation", and in verse 8 it reads, "Then shall we all be changed"(i.e.all the risen Israelites) for the "Then also all men shall rise" of the Greek and Slavonic.¹⁸ It has moreover been claimed that the Armenian "in what goes beyond the parallels cited from the other Testaments is itself not exempt from suspicion of amplification by a second hand"¹⁹, so no undue attention is to be paid here to the notion the Armenian conveys of a post-resurrection transformation.

In general, the textual surgeon ought not (though he love his profession!) to hack away the text in order to remove inconsistencies of thought in the eschatological passages of the intertestamental literature. In particular it is a quite arbitrary and unwarranted procedure to cut out of the present Greek text verses 7,8 and 9 in the interest of self-consistency within the passage. For it dates from an age in which fluidity and vacillation were characteristic of men's speculations about the future. And so in all probability the author of the Testaments had no exactitude in his resurrection doctrine, but has given us instead a remarkable mosaic of ideas.

Although the lack of harmony in the writer's different ideas of the Future is evident, the whole impression is that his primary obsession is with the ideal of a national restoration upon a renewed earth with the tribes of Israel reorganised. The resurrection and the Judgment occur (though there is great need not to be emphatic here in view of the writer's predominant indecisiveness) at the introduction of that earthly Messianic Kingdom which is the centre-piece of his hope. Those who come down decisively on the side of maintaining that in the Testaments the resurrection and Judgment follow the Messianic Kingdom and introduce the End or the End-period, which the author has either wittingly or unwittingly consigned to the obscure shadows by not describing it, are exceeding their sources in clarity (e.g. Lagrange and Sutcliffe to some extent). There is further impediment to that strict view in a passage occurring in Test. Levi 18:10 and 11: "And he shall open the gates of Paradise. And shall remove the threatening sword against Adam.

And he shall give the saints to eat from the Tree of Life, And the spirit of holiness shall be on them." These are the actions of the earthly Messiah, as is clear from 18:2 : "And he shall execute a righteous judgment upon the earth for a multitude of days"; and from verse 9, "And in his priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth". The 'Paradise' of verse 10 is the earthly Paradise and the life here reviewed is the life of the earthly Messianic Kingdom. Very frequently elsewhere, Paradise is thought to have its location upon the earth (cf. Genesis 2:8,14; I Enoch 32:3;60:8; 65:2; 61:1; 77:3; etc.). Sutcliffe, plainly eager to bring this into line with the interpretation offered by him of other passages, understands that here the reference is to a heavenly Paradise, and suggests that the passage gives the impression of finality as though an order beyond the Messianic Kingdom were here imagined.

The enormous difficulty of determining whether he had caught a glimpse of an eternal order beyond the earthly Messianic Kingdom, or whether that Kingdom was in fact the furthest limit of his vision, is exhibited further in two verses in Testament Asher. There is first Test. Asher 5:2: "Death succeedeth to life, dishonour to glory, night to day, and darkness to light"; (and all things are under the day, just things under life, unjust things under death;) wherefore also eternal life awaiteth death". The passage has undergone Christianisation. The Christian interpolations excised, the nucleus remaining reads: "Death succeedeth to life, night to day, and darkness

to light; wherefore also eternal life awaiteth death."

διὸ καὶ τὸν θάνατον ἢ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἀναμένει.

The last clause is clearly a 'non sequitur'. Positing a Hebrew original Charles somewhat ingeniously arrives at the reading 'succeeds' or 'follows after', which is the sense required.²⁰ And the second passage is Test. Asher 6:5 and 6: "For when the soul departs troubled, it is tormented by the evil spirit which also it served in lusts and evil works. 6) But if he is peaceful with joy he meeteth the angel of peace, and he leadeth him into eternal life." "Lead him into eternal life" is the reading of some Greek mss., but others, including the Armenian and Slavonic, have "comforts him with life", which Charles rejects as corrupt on plausible textual grounds, and retains the former.²¹

Both passages, despite textual difficulties, clearly speak in manner fairly absolute of "eternal life". The context is in both instances a series of ethical injunctions, and in the midst of these the promise of 'eternal life' is made. Gone are the Messianist accompaniments and eschatological speculations. The feeling imparted is that we are here in the midst of the loftier and more spiritual strain of thought from the individualist teaching of the purer Old Testament tradition, and that the idea is vaguely present of individual immortality immediately upon death in the life eternal with God. The question that arises is this: has the author ACTIVELY divorced this notion of eternal life from the ideals of an earthly Messianic restoration which are at the basis of his work? Or has he still here at the back of his mind the earthly life of

the earthly Messianic Kingdom, eternal so far as he could see, so that 'eternal life' in these verses is not different from the 'eternal peace' said to be enjoyed by the participants in the earthly Messianic Kingdom in Test.Dan. 5:11? The likelihood is that he has brought together unconsciously the more material and the more spiritual views with no attempt at harmonisation. A problem of a like kind will arise in II Maccabees, where in the midst of even crudely materialist notions of a resurrection there occurs the pronouncement that the martyrs just dead "have now drunk of everflowing life". In such instances the material conceptions seem to prevail and act as a check upon an advancing spiritualisation of the concept of the after life, so that the latter is tentatively, almost furtively, expressed.

Test.Dan 5:12 and 13 sheds more light upon the nature of the Messianist (nationalist) and materialist outlook upon the Future, which for the most part held the writer of the Testaments in its grip. The text is: "And the saints shall rest in Eden, And in the New Jerusalem will the righteous rejoice, And it shall be unto the Glory of God forever. And no longer shall Jerusalem endure desolation, Nor Israel be led captive; For the Lord shall be in the midst of it And the Holy One of Israel shall reign over it." The Eden of verse 10 is probably synonymous with the earthly paradise of Test.Levi 18:10. This is the first expression in this literature of the term 'New Jerusalem'.²² Here it is notable that God Himself presides over the last act of the drama and inaugurates the Kingdom, in contrast to Test.Levi 18:10. Yet the

representation is essentially Messianist since Jerusalem, centre of the world, city of the future, city of God, is the axis of the restoration, of the new order.²³ Charles wonders whether the New Jerusalem of Test. Dan 5:12 is to be identified with the 'Eden' that precedes, or the earthly Jerusalem that shall no longer endure desolation, which follows in verse 13. Nevertheless his description savours of the earthly and material, and he had not possibly distinguished very clearly between Eden and Paradise and the New Jerusalem.²⁴ His hope is bound to the earth, an earth transmogrified and a life made new at the End, the wondrous changes effected by the absolute centrality of God then and His indwelling presence. Incidentally the Theophany here appears to be a definite part of the Messianic institutions, a fact which militates against Lagrange's contention, noted previously, that the author conceived something like a strict order of sequence in the events of the Last Times, the Messianic Kingdom, then the Theophany and then the resurrection and the End.

Finally there is silence in the Testaments regarding the intermediate state of the dead. The author is preoccupied with other things. This work, we must remember, is not an apocalypse, and has no avowed intention of giving detailed descriptions of the state of the departed after death. It may reasonably be inferred from the ideas, which seem to be fundamental in the book, of resurrection to a renewed bodily life on this earth under utopianised conditions, that he held kindred Sheol beliefs to I Enoch 6-36.

An interesting gleam of light is cast upon the radically materialist form of the Jewish imagination, and upon the difficulties which crowded in upon all such as the writer of the Testaments in the intertestamental period, of evading the expectation of a temporal and earthly Future, by a perusal of Chapters 2 and 3 of the Testament of Levi. In these Chapters there is found the idea of Light as a basic element of the Final Age. The force of that idea might have been expected to lead to a process of spiritualisation, and to become itself a part of that process. But to the writer 'Light' is clearly not an abstraction. His description of the seven heavens establishes that, for to him these various heavens are not apparently just symbols, but concrete realities, unlike the lovely Platonic myths at the end of the Republic. That is only one striking illumination of how inevitably the materialist core of the Jewish imagination of the new Age won permanence.

While the Testaments to some extent hold out the resurrection hope as something of a solace and stimulus, the writer yet remains indefinite about the pattern of it. He wavers between the particular and the universal, blessing for Israel at the last and blessing for ALL the righteous, and to a lesser extent between the material and the spiritual. But it is to the particular or the national and to the material that he orientates emphatically in his views upon the Future.

Despite the writer's predilection for Messianism and the Messianist nature and framework of his not very precise resurrection doctrine, he has intimated, particularly in Test. Benjamin 10:8 a resurrection for all men. This extension of the resurrection to all men may have been accomplished because the logic of retribution demanded full and due requital upon the wicked (who had therefore to be raised for the purpose) as well as the reward of the righteous. It may again have been due to the contacts of this writer, an ethical teacher of high repute, with the profounder individualism of the Jeremiah-Job-Psalms lineage, inducing him to recognise to some extent and only by the side of his prior concern for Israel as a nation, the problem of the INDIVIDUAL who died before the End. But that problem remains entirely subordinate for him to the problem of the national destiny. It is incorrect to regard the idea of the universal resurrection in the later literature of the Ap. and Ps. as the triumph of individualistic religion over the nationalist ideals of the Future. There is no such triumph. Individual consummation takes second place. It is related to the communal and social consummation as part to the whole. The problem which rears its head is that of the extent to which such a man as the writer of the Testaments had successfully and completely integrated individual and national destinies. It is easy for us to see that individual and social fulfilment are mutually connected and dependent each upon the other, but we are somewhat less shackled than the writer of the Testaments was on one side to the materialist Messianism.

One moment he is committed to the idea of resurrection to an earthly life with the old tribal organisation of Israel restored, and another is proclaiming a universal resurrection, APPARENTLY ordained to some Age beyond the Messianic. Our own maturer perceptions are not to be read into his, where his are naive still at this level of progress in intertestamental Judaism.

I Enoch 83 - 90.

This section of I Enoch is akin to the Testaments and to I Enoch 6-36 in the form of primitive Messianism it embodies, and to the former especially in the dim and obscure manner in which it alludes to the resurrection, if such an allusion can be at all supposed. A few general remarks must be prefaced on the nature of the work. It is a detailed allegory, the details of whose interpretation are of small interest here. Frequently the name is given to it of 'Dreams' or 'Dream Visions', and Chapters 85-90 unfold the panorama of history, as revealed to the seer, from Adam and Eve to the Maccabaeian Age. Charles has called it 'a Semitic philosophy of religion'.²⁵ The historical review passes into a forecast of the future after Chapter 90, verses 9-16, which relate the appearance of a deliverer to Israel, the 'great horn' of verse 9, identified by Charles as Judas Maccabaeus, by Schürer (also by Dalman and Köstlin) as John Hyrcanus.²⁶ The prophetic section which follows only is of interest here. The throne of Judgment is set up in Palestine (90:20) and the books are opened before

the Lord. The fallen angels (the stars of verse 22), the seventy angelic shepherds who had usurped the authority they had enjoyed over Israel are cast into Gehenna, the abyss of fire, (90:22-27). Thereafter the New Jerusalem is set up in the place of the old, which is borne away to the south land, but the New Jerusalem is upon the same earthly site as the old.

Charles, betraying a tendency to assign to the writer of this section a loftier spiritualism than is in effect his, remarks in the first instance that "the writer has advanced considerably beyond the naive and sensuous views of the kingdom presented in the earlier fragment." (i.e. I Enoch 6-36).²⁷ His ideas are more spiritual, it is claimed. Further Charles detects here an incipient dualism whereby the earthly Jerusalem, however purified, is no longer regarded as a suitable abode for God among men. Consequently Jerusalem the new must come down from heaven in the stead of the old, as the spiritual and temporal metropolis of the Messianic Kingdom. It is doubtful whether all these claims can be sustained.

The Kingdom of his prophecy is earthly still. His views are certainly less crudely physical than those of I Enoch 1-36. Nevertheless he sees the future Kingdom as still upon this earth. The extremely smooth transition from the résumé of earthly history to the prophecy of the coming Kingdom is noteworthy, as though there were to be no violation of the earthly continuity. Moreover 90:29 (the text is: "And I saw the Lord of the sheep till he brought a new house greater and loftier than the first, and set it up in the place of the first which

had been folded up: all its pillars were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than those of the first one which He had taken away and the Lord of the sheep was within it."), while it announces a New Jerusalem that comes from heaven, described it still in a materialist terminology. The stress, it appears, is not so much upon the ethereal, heavenly nature of the New Jerusalem, as upon the fact that it is God who establishes it and guarantees its superiority by His dwelling in the midst - "the Lord of the sheep was within it." But it is established upon the EARTH. Dualism between two worlds can scarcely be detected here even in embryonic form. There is in fact little difference between the notions represented in this section and those of I Enoch 1-36 and Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The new world is created WITHIN THE OLD. The writer is limited by the terrestrial Messianic hope. He thinks, however, that the old world has to be submitted to a revolutionary transformation of its existing conditions that an amendment might be ensured.

Yet again he also is primarily concerned with Israel. "And I saw all the sheep which had been left, and all the beasts on the earth, and all the birds of the heaven, falling down and doing homage to those sheep and making petition to and obeying them in every word" (90:30). The Gentiles are saved - for bondage to the Jews, the 'sheep' of the allegory. The nationalist note is clearly struck!

Such is the background of his hope of an earthly Messianic Kingdom. Has he also found room in the picture for a resurrection of the dead? He never clearly reveals that he has.

But the notion of a resurrection has usually been inferred from 90:33: "And all that had been destroyed and dispersed and all the beasts of the field and all the birds of heaven (i.e. the converted Gentiles; cf. Verse 30) assembled in that house and the Lord of the sheep rejoiced with great joy because they were all good and had returned to His house." In this Charles has found explicit reference to the restoration of the dispersed of Israel and thereafter to the resurrection of the righteous dead of Israel to participate in the Kingdom. Everything hinges in this regard upon the word 'destroyed'. Uncertainties enshroud the difficult compound phrase 'destroyed and dispersed'. The structure which Charles raises upon the one word 'destroyed' is therefore precariously posed. Charles maintains here that "our writer holds fast to the original and spiritual view of the resurrection, that the risen life is the organic development of the righteous life on earth". Then on the basis of the subsequent verses 34-38 (34) "And all the sheep were invited into that house, but it held them not. 35) And the eyes of them all were opened to see the good, and there was not one amongst them that did not see". Thereafter follows in the text, verses 36-38, the birth of the white bull, the Messiah, and the metamorphosis of all the sheep into white oxen.), Charles continues thus: "Finally, after the resurrection follows a transformation of all the members of the kingdom into a higher form of life. From this transformation of the righteous into the likeness of the Messiah we naturally conclude their eternal risen life.

Thus we have this idea for the first time in Jewish literature."²⁸ C.F. Burney has reached the same conclusion as Charles, and is ready to argue that from the transformation of the righteous and from the fact that no limit is placed to the duration of their lives, we are perhaps justified in assuming that the writer is picturing the new form of existence as eternal life in the fullest sense.²⁹

There are good reasons for opposing this acceptance of the passage.

1) It has already been remarked that in the first instance everything turns on the word 'destroyed' or 'perished'. That one word alone justifies the attribution to the author of the idea of a resurrection from the dead. If this one word were to disappear there would be no cause to believe that the writer considered the Messianic Kingdom to be attainable by any but those who would be alive at the time of its inauguration. As it chanced, it requires no subtle stratagem to achieve its disappearance. It is true that the sense 'destroyed' or 'perished' seems accurately enough to represent the Ethiopic text, but such a sense is remarkably incongruous with the co-ordinated verb, 'dispersed', and appears to be out of place. More suitable to the context would be in the place of the first verb another representing 'who had been punished' or 'who had been lost'. The latter is in fact by no means unlikely. It has been suggested, on the postulate of a Semitic original, that the verb in the original was אָרַבְּ , which may very readily

stand for 'who have been lost'. "There is nothing else in these chapters to suggest resurrection", G.F. Moore has written, "and it may well be doubted whether a single word in a translation at the second remove from the original (that is, the Ethiopic Version, via the Greek via the Semitic archetype) is sufficient reason for attributing the belief to the author".³⁰

2) The above proposition is somewhat conjectural. The Ethiopic 'perished' may truly represent the purport of the Semitic original. In that case there is an intimation of a resurrection in the present passage. But there is nothing to invalidate the opinion that it is again resurrection to the earthly life of the Messianic Kingdom, instituted by God with its centre in the New Jerusalem. It is beside the point to argue that the life to which the resurrection introduces is 'eternal life in the fullest sense', as Burney has done and Charles also, the latter proffering the additional proof that since the writer depicts Enoch and Elijah as being transferred to the Messianic Kingdom from Paradise, the new existence is certainly an eternal one. The writer has not fixed any limit to the Messianic times BECAUSE HE KNOWS OF NOTHING BEYOND THEM. The resurrection life of these times is not 'eternal life' in its completest meaning, but rather UN-limited life - he has not cared to define its boundaries, mainly because he was not aware of any boundaries to the Messianic Kingdom. M.J. Lagrange,³¹ with that eagerness of his already noticed to assign the incidence of the resurrection to the absolutely ultimate Consummation beyond the Messianic realm as early as possible

in the growth of Eschatological thought, wrongly supposes that if this writer had in view the resurrection, the time of its occurrence could befall only after the birth of the Messiah, so that it is aligned with an order after and beyond the Messianic. On the contrary the resurrection brings the righteous of Israel to the earthly Messianic Kingdom.

The resurrection effects the solidarity and completeness of the TRUE ISRAEL in the Messianic Age. So ardently does the writer desire this objective that by some mysterious mechanical device he has Enoch and Elijah transferred from their place of waiting in Paradise to the Messianic Kingdom. They, of all the saints of Israel, could not be omitted from the day of joyous restoration! That which rejoices the Lord of the sheep above all else is the ingathering of Israelites to the Temple (verse 33). Further the Gentiles are to be preserved, as was noted before - but only for homage to Israel. "Le servage, c'est là l'extrême limite de la générosité juive"³², comments de Faye tersely. The author is patently immersed in the popular nationalist ideals.

Enoch and Elijah were transported to the earthly Messianic Kingdom to save the fulness of Israel in the Last Times. That is quite a different implication for this strange event than that imagined for it by Charles. So also the transformation of the risen righteous into what is supposed to be a likeness to the Messiah (90:3), need not imply, as Burney supposed, their eternal risen life. It is rather a change made

necessary in them to adapt them to their new environment, Jerusalem now transmogrified and idealised. It does not carry us beyond the Messianic Consummation. From the notion of successive changes in the bodies of the resurrected to fit them for a spiritual heavenly existence, which shall be met with later, this is still a far cry. The significance of the transformation in this Enoch passage may indeed be quite trivial. For in the last resort the risen righteous are not like the Messiah at all, since whereas they are become 'white oxen', he has become 'a buffalo' (90:38). The change of the risen righteous into oxen may mean rather a resumption of the old stature of their ancestor Abraham - the Golden Age is to be a renewal then of the glories of patriarchal times. That apart, the hopes of this writer for the future quite definitely gravitate towards the earth. The scene of the Messianic Kingdom is still the earth, however transformed.

In the last resort very little can be deduced regarding this writer's resurrection doctrine from that solitary word רָבִיב , occurring in a prophetic allegory.

There is a close kinship among the three documents examined in this Chapter in their allegiance to the expectation of a terrestrial Messianic Kingdom, though each writer has imparted his own nuances to his presentation. Uncertainties and inconsistencies have already appeared in the notions of resurrection. But the primitive emphasis is clearly upon the great consequences of the resurrection for making the Messianic Fulfilment for Israel fuller yet.³³ The social or national aspects of the idea of resurrection have been firmly grasped to the neglect of the personal and individual.

CHAPTER IVRESURRECTION, A FAITH AND A CONSOLATION.

In I Enoch 6-36 and I Enoch 83-90 the resurrection was an idea at the best only dimly perceived or even merely implicit. But in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs it won its way decisively into the picture of Things to Come. There the hope of resurrection is to some extent held out as comfort, yet it is not preached in bold sharp outline, for the preacher (he is in a manner worthy the name) has not precisely apprehended the fashion of it.

II Maccabees moves in the same circle of temporal and materialist ideals of the Future as these others, but in II Maccabees resurrection has become much more a definite tenet of the Jewish faith, and less a subject for speculation. That which was merely germinating in these Enochic sections, and was promulgated, apparently with little sense of urgency or immediacy in the Testaments, is here in II Maccabees declared boldly as a sure and steady hope. It is now Resurrection, written as it were with a capital letter.

II. Maccabees.

At a glance it seems strange that a historian should proclaim a lively resurrection faith. But the historian of II Macc. is not the same sober and prosaic purveyor of fact as his brother narrator of the I Macc. He writes rather history with a 'Tendenz', for he has constantly in view the specific object of glorifying the Jews. Always then he is forward to

describe the martyrdoms of the faithful, and miraculous interventions by God to succour His people. To him "the probability of a story was a matter of little importance if it was interesting and patriotic".¹ The apologetic note is sounded throughout, so it is no matter of surprise that religious teaching plays a prominent part in the record of this historian. The prevailing religious passion of the book is the bodily resurrection of the dead: the belief is powerfully reiterated with all the vigour of a sustained polemic against its enemies, in numerous passages, 12:43-45; 7:9,11,14,36; 14:46. "In no other of the few passages in pre-Christian Jewish literature in which this belief appears is it so clearly and emphatically expressed."² Religious sentiment of so great intensity is not expected in an 'academic' historian, but is normal in a history whose obvious aim is the effecting of a more perfect unity of will and purpose in the people to whom it is directed. II Macc. is an epitome of an earlier work of Jason of Cyrene, probably for the most part a faithful epitome. Certainly then it is easy to appreciate how in this work Resurrection should be written with an initial capital, for the days of that Jason were days of capital crisis and challenge, in the Maccabean revolt, evocative of a sturdier faith.

II Macc. does aim at being a history. Whatever else it is, it is not programme-writing like I Enoch 6-36 and 83-90, or like certain parts of the Testaments. The result is that, whereas in the programmatists their resurrection doctrine had

in large measure to be deduced from their speculative portrayals of the Age of Consummation, the process is now reversed, so that the nature of the Consummation envisaged has largely to be inferred from the pattern of his resurrection faith. But there are hints enough in II Macc. of a devotion to a terrestrial Messianism - resurrection of the BODY goes primitively hand in hand with that.

In the 7th Chapter of II Macc. there is related the story of the seven martyr sons and their mother. Verse 9 (the reply of the second son when put to the torture by King Antiochus) "And when he was at the last gasp he said: Thou cursed miscreant! Thou dost dispatch us from this life, but the King of the World shall raise us up, who have died for His laws, and revive us to life everlasting. 10) (the reply of the third son) And after him the third was made a mocking stock. And when he was told to put out his tongue, he did so at once, stretching forth his hands courageously with the noble words: 11) These I had from heaven; for His name's sake I count them nought: from Him I hope to get them back again 14) (the reply of the fourth son) And when he was near his end he said: 'Tis meet for those who perish at man's hands to cherish hope divine that they shall be raised up by God again; but thou - thou shalt have no resurrection to life 22) (Part of the mother's words) How you were ever conceived in my womb I cannot tell! 'Twas not I who gave you the breath of life or fashioned the elements of each! 23) 'Twas the Creator of the world who fashioneth men and deviseth the generating of all things,

and He it is who in mercy will restore to you the breath of life even as you now count yourself nought for His law's sake. 29) Fear not this butcher, but show thyself worthy of thy brothers, and accept thy death, that by God's mercy I may receive thee again together with thy brothers 35) Thou (addressing Antiochus) hast not yet escaped the judgment of the almighty God who seeth all. 36) These our brothers, after enduring a brief pain have now drunk of everflowing life in terms of God's covenant, but thou shalt receive by God's judgment the just penalty of thine arrogance. 37) I like my brothers give up body and soul for our father's laws, calling on God to show favour to the nation soon and to make thee acknowledge in torment and plagues, that He alone is God, and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen upon the whole of our nation end in me and in my brothers."

The distinctive features of this long and important passage (and others incorporated with it) can best, in the interest of orderly investigation, be set forth in catalogue form.

1. The Text of the passage.

Verse 9: The Greek phrase εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς is perhaps inadequately rendered in the traditional translation 'to everlasting life' (thus Moffatt in Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol. I p. 141). The phrase literally = 'to eternal revival of life', that is, 'to revival of life for ever'.

Verses 10 and 11: Difficulty is in some quarters experienced with the fact that the third son is asked to put out his tongue (when the first had done so his tongue was cut off!) and only

THEREAFTER makes a brief speech. Some support is found for regarding his speech as an interpolation in that two mss. of the Old Latin Version read: "And when his tongue was cut out, he held his hands courageously over the fire", and omit verse 11, omitted also in another old Latin ms.³ It is pedantic to insist that verse 11 should be excised as an interpolation on these relatively slight grounds. The first objection in particular has no validity - the author is telling a highly embellished story; the precise point at which a tongue has to be cut out or a speech made he is not required to define! And even though the speech of the third brother be omitted, it detracts nothing from the general vivid certainty of a resurrection in other verses.

Verse 23: This verse is introduced in the Greek by the particle τοιγαροῦν . The translation given above preserves accurately enough the sense of the original, but the connection with the preceding verse 22 is better represented if the illative particle is given its full value. The mother's reasoning seems to be that it is God who is the Creator of men, and THEREFORE He can and will re-create them after death - if they are martyrs for His sake, as her sons!

Verse 36: οἱ μὲν γὰρ νῦν ἡμέτεροι ἀδελφοὶ βραχὺν ὑπενέγκαστες πόνον ἀνάου ζωῆς ὑπὸ διαθήκην θεοῦ πεπτώκασιν.

Hort has restored the original sense of the verse by his suggestion πεπτώκασι for the unlikely πεπτώκασιν of the Greek mss.⁴ πεπτώκασι which has to be rendered: "For these

our brethren, after enduring a brief pain, have now died under God's covenant of everlasting life", hardly gives the required antithesis to the clause immediately following: "But thou, through the judgment of God, shalt receive in just measure the penalties for thy pride", and is not probably correct.

2. The apologetic and polemical nature of the whole passage: a dogmatic resurrection belief.

A. Loisy has noted that II Macc. refers to the resurrection as though he were upholding it against the attacks of an opposition. "The second book of Maccabees mentions the resurrection, but in the manner of an apologist who argues with objectors."⁵ The apologetic note is evident in verses 22 and 23, where the mother REASONS from God's formation of man in the womb to His power to re-form men after death and dissolution. God's power to do the former gives courage to believe He will also do the latter. The resurrection belief as it came to life in Israel was clearly not attained only by a rational inference from 'the human situation' in the Maccabaeian age, not stimulated solely by the Antiochene persecution. It depended firstly upon Israel's knowledge of her God and her relationship with Him.

The present stress on God's Creatorship, man's creatureship as ground for faith in recreation by the resurrection introduces a more personal touch. Yet here such an idea is not based upon any philosophical speculation concerning the inalienable right of every creature to resurrection, nor upon a rank individualism. The martyrs are to be re-fashioned by God at the Last according as they freely surrender themselves

for the sake of the Law He has given to Israel. When the hope of resurrection came to life this extension of the idea of God as Creator⁶ (which permeates the Old Testament and the Ap. and Ps.) to the idea of God as re-creator in the resurrection was natural with the Jewish emphasis upon the body. But the subject of bodily resurrection will recur in this and later Chapters!

The whole passage in II Macc. is even polemical, as verse 14 plainly shows: " 'Tis meet (εἰς τὸν) for those who perish to cherish hope divine that they shall be raised up by God again." There was obviously opposition to the resurrection doctrine. It is even more definitely marked in 12:38-45.

3) Resurrection in the body, a grossly physical conception.

The third martyr son, immediately before his end, expresses the conviction that after death he will receive back again from God the limbs severed and mutilated by his persecutors (verse 11). The words of the second (verse 9) and of the fourth sons (verse 14), and also of the mother (verses 22 and 23) refer somewhat less crudely to a bodily resurrection. It has been suggested that the word πνεῦμα, 'breath' in the mother's speech cannot have the meaning 'spirit', and the

comment passed that "the mother in her woman's wit is not speaking theologically, but mentions breath as the best known sign of life."⁷ Neither the suggestion nor the comment is really necessary. τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ is a common enough hendiadys meaning 'the breath of life'. None could in any case mistake that the thought of these verses is of anything but bodily resurrection.

The crudities of 7:11 are mild beside those of the story of the revered Jerusalemite elder Razis⁸, contained in 14:37-46, of which only the last two verses need be cited here: 45) "Still alive, however, he got up in a fury of anger and ran, with blood pouring from him, sore wounded as he was, right through the crowds: 46) then, standing on a steep rock, his blood now drained from him, he tore out his bowels, taking both his hands to them, and flung them at the crowds. So he died, calling on Him who is the Lord of life and spirit to restore them to him again."

Such a restoration of the physical properties of this present in the life to come can only mean that the environments of that life are completely earthly, material. The Messianic Kingdom upon earth is intruding itself silently into the near foreground of the conception. The resurrection still falls within its primitive surroundings. Nowhere else in the Ap. and Ps. is the resurrection of the present body, apparently unchanged, more definitely proclaimed than in these passages of II.Macc.

These crass ideas of the resurrection were later

developed to fantastic lengths: the Jewish scribes rack their brains over the problem whether the clothing of this corporeity in the other world would begin with skin and flesh and complete itself with veins and bones (Hillel) or vice-versa (Shammai)⁹. Great Biblical scholars of the early Christian Church vigorously upheld these physical bases of the resurrection. Jerome, on the basis of a false exegesis of Job 19:26 proclaimed that there would be a resurrection of the bones, veins, nerves, teeth and hair. In all ages, and in nearly all cultures in which there was developed a doctrine of an after life, there has been a clinging in places to crudely physical notions of that life. In Greek mythology, the murdered Pelops, when restored to life, must have his shoulder which had been eaten by Demeter, replaced with one of ivory. Tylor in 'Primitive Culture' tells of the pathetic hope of the Australian native, "Black fellow, tumble down, Jump up, white man".

Paul had to combat purely materialist ideas of the resurrection. They persist still in the present day. It is not at all clear that H.K.Luce is correct in saying that "the modern mind cannot accept the idea of a bodily resurrection for humanity. The future life is viewed as a spiritual not as a physical existence".¹⁰ There are in fact masses who find difficulty in weaning themselves from the ideas of the continuance of the physical organism and the carnal significance of the resurrection. But now these ideas are not even distinguished by that spark of logic, which here at least marked the Jewish conceptions - for the Jews, having been first-

ly captivated by the dream of an earthly and material Messianic Kingdom, could not imagine its citizens dwelling there in other than an earthly corporeity. There was of course a second highly important factor, the traditional Jewish respect for the body, but of that subsequently!

4. The Messianic Kingdom in II.Macc.

It can be inferred from the writer's crude notions of a physical resurrection then that his ideas of the future Kingdom would differ little from those of I Enoch 6-36 or 83-90 and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Several passages bear that out. The words of 7:37, a prayer that God will show favour to the nation soon and that His wrath may now come to an end with the martyrdom of the seven brothers, indicate that the day of Israel's fulfilment was felt to be near at hand. That is true also of the expectation of God's coming reconciliation (7:33). In 14:15 God is invoked as "One who had established His people to all eternity". Despite their present trials therefore He must yet save them. The Kingdom, as he conceives it, is indeed, purely temporal - it is the now imminent time of their deliverance from the tyrant Antiochus. Not only those alive when the joyous day comes will survive to share its glories, for the martyrs of the moment will be raised from the dead that they too might participate. The very choicest of His people God would not exclude.

The nationalist hope of a Messianic restoration for Israel which in large measure had contributed to the birth

of the resurrection idea, now by the seeming nearness of its own fulfilment gives that resurrection hope urgency and vitality.¹¹ The theme of COMMUNAL restoration in the resurrection life occurs again in 7:29: "Fear not this butcher, but show thyself worthy of thy brothers that by God's mercy I may receive thee again together with thy brothers." The sentiment expressed here reflects in the author that apprehension of the resurrection belief which fastened primarily upon communal fulfilment, and thought not of individual destiny for the individual's sake.

5. 'Everflowing life'.

The youngest of the brothers uses language of a different savour, no more a crude materialism.¹² "These our brothers, after enduring a brief pain, have now drunk of ever-flowing life in terms of God's covenant, but thou (Antiochus) shalt receive by God's judgment the just penalty of thine arrogance." The phrase 'everflowing life' is general enough to admit of very different interpretations. The width of its possible reference is a remarkable contrast to the categorical notion of a crudely material resurrection. This contrast has too often been allowed to pass unnoticed. On the face of it a description of martyrs, but a moment ago persecuted for their faith's sake, as having drunk of 'everflowing life' might hardly allude to a crude resurrection of the fleshly body to an earthly Messianic Kingdom.¹³ There may be here a reference to the future state in terms of immortality.¹⁴ Certain considerations seem to support this view:

a) $\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\sigma\iota$, it will be remembered, was Hort's probably

correct restoration of the text. The perfect may denote a present condition resulting from a completed action. They are now in the state of everlasting life.

b) The verse appears to show some interest in the problem of individual retribution. Antiochus, in contrast to the martyrs, is to be justly punished. Earlier concern with that same problem in Jeremiah and several of the Psalms was a signpost pointing the way to a culmination in a doctrine of individual immortality in another sphere than this.

c) It has been established that consistency in ideas of the future life is the very last thing that must be demanded of the Jew in the intertestamental period. The traditional Messianic, nationalist and materialist expectation of the End had a prolific energy; it won the widest acceptance. It holds the field in II Macc. But spiritual ideas of an individual mortality in another order of existence than the present, were marching on also in that age. We shall later watch them go from strength to strength. It is quite possible that they have made an inroad even here in II Macc., so that they are found set in the midst of thoroughly physical ideas of resurrection to some restored earthly state - couched in this place, certainly inharmonious with their surroundings, and perhaps unwittingly introduced by the writer.

On this interpretation, 7:36 betraying in the writer the notion of an immortality ensuing more or less quickly after death, is inconsistent also with his adherence to the common idea of Sheol or Hades as the intermediate abode of the

departed dead pending their restoration to the earthly Messianic Kingdom at its institution (cf. 6:23 and 12:38-45). Furtively to pass by these incongruities, or silently to assume that the intimation of 7:36 is in line with the presentation of a purely physical resurrection to a form of earthly life in other passages, as many interpreters have done, is a procedure that merits reproach. It would be far less reprehensible to recognise the essentially different terminology of 7:36, to admit that on the surface it does not appear to refer to an earthly and material future life in the Messianic Kingdom, and if it were felt that it SHOULD have this reference, to produce some arguments in support of the contention. The reasons that might be proffered for regarding 7:36 as no different from the prophecies of a resurrection of the body are these:

a) $\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{\omega}\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota$ might be regarded as a prophetic perfect, indicating that they had as good as drunk of 'everflowing life'. The martyrs had already all but attained.

b) In 7:9 there occurs the phrase $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha - \beta\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ = 'to eternal renewal of life'. The reference in that verse is obviously to the resurrection life. Can it not therefore be supposed that 'everflowing life' in 7:36 might also refer to the life of the resurrection in the body?

c) The exclamation that they are attaining to the new life IN TERMS OF GOD'S COVENANT, may betoken a concentration here not upon individual retribution or individual immortality, but rather upon God's promises to Israel of Messianic salvation at the Last. $\delta\iota\alpha \theta\eta\acute{\kappa}\eta$, the word employed here, is of course

the common Deuteronomic word for the Covenant of God with His people Israel.

Nevertheless it is difficult to escape the feeling that in these words of the youngest brother there is reflected the perception of a more spiritual life, of immortality. Yet it is a fleeting and hurried intimation, imperfectly blended with the materialist expectation embedded in the popular Messianism. The more instinctive hope of communal or national salvation quickly reasserts itself in the prayer of the next verse: "I like my brothers, give up body and soul for our father's laws, calling on God to show favour to our nation soon, and to make thee acknowledge, in torment and plagues, that He alone is God, and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and my brothers." That would appear to be a clear subordination of the destiny of the individual to the dearly hoped for communal salvation for Israel.

6) The Intermediate State in II Macc.

Hades receives both the righteous and the wicked immediately upon death. The experiences of Hades are a foreshadowing of the final destiny, as appears from 6:26, where Eleazar, commanded to take part in the heathenish sacrifices of Antiochus proclaims: "Even were I for the moment to evade the punishment of men, I should not escape the hands of the Almighty in life or in death." This is in line with the development of the Sheol doctrine witnessed in I Enoch 6-36, for God has now obviously the power to pursue men as far as Hades (but compare

Psalm 139:8). It would seem, however, that complete annihilation is in store for the wicked at death. Sutcliffe has denied Morfatt's claim that according to this book, "after death only the righteous rise", protesting on the ground of Daniel 12:2 that what the brother is here confirming is that the tyrant, if he persisted in his wickedness, would not share in the RESURRECTION OF THE GOOD.¹⁵ But both in 7:14 and 7:36 the doom of the heathen stands in such marked contrast to the LIFE of the righteous hereafter, that there is hardly sufficient reason for forsaking the face value of the words addressed to the persecutor. It is the contrast between the ideal Israel and the wicked heathen.

The subjects of the Intermediate State will occur again in the section which follows.

7. Judas Maccabaeus offers sacrifices for the dead at Adullam.

There now falls for investigation a passage unique in intertestamental Jewish literature in that it depicts Judas offering sacrifices on behalf of the dead, "BEARING IN MIND THE RESURRECTION". It is contained in Chapter 12:38-45, which continues the narrative of the campaigns of Judas, and tells of the incident at Adullam when Judas and his army found the corpses of the slain Jews, each one carrying under his tunic an amulet of the idols of Jamnia, a practice forbidden to the Jews by Law and a very grievous sin. Verses 43-45 may here be cited: 43) "He then collected from them, man by man, the sum of two thousand drachmas of silver, which he forwarded to

Jerusalem for a sin offering. In this he acted quite rightly and properly, bearing in mind the resurrection: 44) for if he had not expected the fallen to rise again, it would have been superfluous and silly to pray for the dead, 45) and having regard to the splendour of the gracious reward which is reserved for those who have fallen asleep in godliness - a holy and pious consideration! Hence he made propitiation for the dead, that they might be released from their sin."

This passage has been characterised as "one of the remarkable contributions made by this book to our knowledge of contemporary Judaism".¹⁶ Whether so much can be claimed for a passage so singular is doubtful; we are not justified in inferring from it that the practice of prayers for the departed dead in the light of knowledge of the resurrection was general in the Judaism of the age, apart from its particular desirability in the view of the author of II Macc. He seems rather to commend it earnestly as a practice which he was aware would not easily win acceptance.

E.F. Sutcliffe, according to his predilections, whereby he regards II Macc. as canonical and 'inspired', goes even far beyond the above claim for the passage and maintains that it has "the highest dogmatic value", for, as he indicates, the author praises Judas' action: "in this he acted quite rightly and properly"(43) and in (45) the remembrance of the resurrection is called "a holy and pious consideration".¹⁷

But it is not a just conclusion from the passage that these articles were fully dogmatic for contemporary

Judaism, nor, assuming the Protestant evaluation of the Apocryphal books, universally dogmatic. The most that can be said is that the writer of II Macc. through the mouth of a great Jewish hero, seeks to rally his people to this faith and this practice.

Another opinion of Sutcliffe's deserves brief attention here. Sutcliffe has discovered in this narrative the doctrine of a Purgatorial state. "In the belief of Judas and his collaborators", he writes, "there is an intermediate state after death proper to those who have attained a final state neither of reward or punishment..... This intermediate state is what in later Christian times came to be known as Purgatory or place of cleansing". In this last assertion Sutcliffe has gone too far, for as has been already remarked, the author's view seems to be that ALL go at death to Sheol (6:23), that it is still only the intermediate place of waiting, and not, even vaguely apprehended, a place of cleansing for a particular class of the departed. Presumably the martyred saints are in it - and they require no purgation. While there has been development in the Sheol concept to the extent that God is now regarded as having a more expansive power over Sheol, nothing is sufficiently clear or definite in the narrative to warrant Sutcliffe's assertions.¹⁸

The truth is that not only are the writer's Sheol beliefs not precise, his notions also of what class or classes are to enjoy the privilege of resurrection are quite uncertain.

For his hortatory comment, "if he had not expected the fallen to rise again, it would have been superfluous and silly to pray for the dead;" conveys the idea of a general resurrection at least of all the dead of Israel, whereas other passages seem to reserve the privilege only for the persecuted SAINTS. But when we turn to the fascinating story of the Adullam Jews, the special circumstances of the incident have to be taken into account. These Jews both deserved and did not deserve the resurrection. They had died righteously for their faith's sake, and yet sinfully by their wearing the amulets of the idols of Jamnia. Since by the former they merited the resurrection, something must be done about the latter - so Judas is moved to his act of prayer and his summons to a corporate sacrifice, that God, now believed to hold a greater sway over Sheol, might perchance be prevailed upon to efface the transgression and grant them the prize of resurrection. The story in fact betrays an understandable hesitancy to exclude any Israelites, who had died in battle with the persecutors, from the resurrection, and to envisage anything like a parallel destiny for the dead Jews of Adullam and the wicked pagans. The undercurrent of the narrative is the ardent desire for the re-union of ISRAEL, now suffering bitterly, when the End comes. The rigid antithesis between Israelites and heathen was the inevitable product of that day of persecution.

8. Opposition to the resurrection doctrine.

The writer's word of praise to Judas in 12:43, "he acted quite rightly and properly, bearing in mind the

resurrection", shows that he was aware that Judas' action required defence. There was, it is clear, a strong opposition in intertestamental Judaism to the growing resurrection idea. With great force the earlier Apocryphal books proclaimed the traditional Sheol beliefs: the new hope would plainly not win adherents without a tremendous struggle. Incipient Sadduceanism denied and opposed it from the start.

The present concern is not so much with the extent and composition of the opposition to the resurrection belief, as with a recent assertion of its doctrinal nature. On the basis of the Acts 23:8 and the words of Josephus (Antiquities XVII 1 4), "According to the theory of the Sadducees souls and bodies perish together", Sutcliffe correctly enough maintains that for them men ceased to exist altogether at death. He continues: "In these circumstances when one party necessarily denied the resurrection of the body because they rejected the survival and immortality of the soul, it is not surprising that for those who believed in the immortality of the soul and in the resurrection these two terms became so identified that when they spoke of the resurrection, they had in mind also the immortality of the soul, as if to deny the former was equivalent to denying the latter." He follows that with an unusual view of I Corinthians 15:32 holding that when Paul says that "if the dead do not rise", it must include immortality of the soul; logic demands that, in Sutcliffe's opinion, for even if the dead do not rise bodily, there may yet be unspeakable delights laid up hereafter for immortal souls, so there would still be

much to hope for after death. "And this thought reflects contemporary opinion," concludes Sutcliffe, "according to which men either accepted or denied both immortality and resurrection". Similarly he says concerning II Macc. 12:44: "It is supposed that belief in immortality implies belief in resurrection; and at the period this no doubt reflects the historical situation".¹⁹

That is a crucial and most unhappy misunderstanding of the real nature of the trends of Jewish thought concerning the future life. The grain of truth in Sutcliffe's whole interpretation is that in the terms of Hebrew psychology, the body is the outward manifestation of the soul; the two are so intimately united that a distinction can hardly be made; therefore in the Hereafter the soul will REQUIRE the form of a body. It is also true that the conservative opposition to the new ideas denied all forms of future existence.

But beyond that Sutcliffe's theory is extremely dangerous in the manner of its expression. It obscures the prevalence of physical conceptions of the resurrection, its integral relation at least in its origins with terrestrial Messianism. The ideas of immortality of the soul and resurrection of the body, so far from being mutually inclusive, have different roots, and the complex interplay and conflict between the two is a distinctive feature of Jewish Eschatology. It would, for instance, be difficult to imagine that the writer of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs or II Macc. ACTIVELY incorporated within their dominant notions of a

physical resurrection to a restored earthly Kingdom, any notion of the immortality of the soul. They rather, after the Hebrew fashion, regarded man as a psycho-physical unity. And it is the materialist outlook that prevails with them! And what has actually happened is that a certain tension, not yet very strong, has been created in the representations of both by the intrusion in a few places of more spiritual and individualist ideals of the future life, deriving from the loftier Old Testament traditions.

The thoroughgoing doctrine of the immortality of the soul is purely Greek. It is amazing that II Macc., by reason of its literary provenance, has not been more touched and influenced by it, probably not even in that one important pronouncement of 'everflowing life' in 7:36, for whose origin there is no need to look beyond the inward Hebrew-Jewish development. II Macc. in fact offers singular proof of the permanence and pervasiveness of the materialist and temporalist notions of the Future - these would appear to be inescapable, when not even the Epitomist of the original history of Jason of Cyrene, who wrote in Alexandria probably, and had himself passed through a Greek school of rhetoric, has extruded them.²⁰

9. Survival of the idea of a this-worldly retribution in II Macc.

II Macc. contains an interesting illustrative instance of how even a firm grasp of the resurrection belief did not immediately banish the orthodox and traditional tenets which

had their true place only upon the narrower stage of this present world. Several passages in the book indicate a satisfaction with the old idea of an adequate retribution within the scope of this life. In 6:12-16 God punishes His people but does not remove His mercy from them. The suffering of the martyrs is acknowledged to be due to their sin (7:18,33, 37). Terrible earthly destinies are assigned to the heathen persecutors, to Epiphanes (7:17; 9:5-12) and Nicanor (15:32-35), and also to the Hellenising Jews, Jason and Menelaus (5:7-10 and 13:8 respectively). The lower notions exist alongside the higher, which might have been expected to leave them far behind. "Retribution after death", G.F.Moore writes, "established itself in Judaism as a complement to the old belief in retribution in this life or in the article of death, not as a substitute for it."²¹

II. Macc., notably divorced from Daniel in literary form, has some near affinities to that book. The Epitomist of II Macc. in the main probably stood faithfully by his considerably earlier sources. Both books then are the product of a dark and comfortless day in their people's history. They are forced to offer comfort in the time of persecution to a harried and persecuted nation. The martyred Jewish saints helped to give birth to the resurrection hope in Israel, and in turn the hope once born gave birth again to new martyrs. II Macc. presents it as a consolation and a stimulus, dogmatically and emphatically. There is not here any insatiable

curiosity about distant mysteries of the future, waiting to be unravelled: all is urgent and pressing: the people in the hour of need require a lively hope. With that II Macc. is concerned to furnish them in the article of the resurrection. So is the resurrection belief held out in this book, all possible attacks against it beaten back and a stern defence offered on all fronts of opposition. It is a different world from the hazy speculations of the Apocalyptists.

That is not to say that we are to demand an absolute consistency from II Macc. in its own presentation of the resurrection doctrine. That is not to be found - even here! Beside a certain unsteadiness in the ideas of the intermediate state, and on the subject of who exactly are to enjoy the resurrection, there is that somewhat furtive announcement of 'everflowing life', ill-suited to the substratum of materialist Messianic ideals, incorporating the vision of a future physical life in an earthly order. It is in this materialist circle of ideas that the resurrection belief first revolves, in I Enoch 6-36 and 83-90, in Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and II Maccabees. And apart from a very occasional and only vague herald of another order of future existence in the last two, it is the materialist, physical notions which win the day and prevail.

The traditional Messianic expectation still holds the fort. The community-consciousness remains ultra-powerful. There is the smallest concern with individual destiny for its

own sake. All is subordinated to the nation's future. That future will fall within the temporal order: resurrected BODIES alone can inhabit that order. This is the primitive stress and emphasis, and as will become clear, it does not fade quickly away.

In II Macc. particularly, the deliverance is at hand, it is the next phase of Jewish history.²² It is not surprising that the awakening, and in II Macc., the full-born resurrectionism, does not open up vast new horizons, but is instead limited itself in width and scope by the nearer terrestrial horizons of the Messianic visions that are alone as yet within view. "The resurrection idea does not mark a step in the part of Judaism towards a less narrow conception of the future. The earth is the horizon which neither those who affirm the resurrection nor those who seem to ignore it pass beyond. At bottom, in spite of this belief Jewish eschatology is more completely materialist than that of the prophets who did not speak of the resurrection."²³

CHAPTER V.TRANSCENDENTALISM.

It was inevitable that Judaism must at length pass beyond the frontiers of the traditional earthly Messianic expectation. A future world, quite other than this, remote, distinct was bound soon or late to break into her vision. Yet when these aspirations did dawn upon Judaism, it was not by a projection of the fondly cherished hope of an earthly Messianic Kingdom into the skies and the eternal beyond. For the old yearnings and cravings for an earthly restoration at the End remained too firm and steady for that. She was driven rather to a cosmos-embracing eschatological view by other impulses, by the advancing individualism of the post-Exilic age, which with its corollary in a sweeping universalism, pointed the way towards regarding ALL individuals as related to Eternity; by the vagaries of her amazing fortunes in history, which drove her in her most despondent moods to despair of the present order and of any good future within it.¹

Yet, when she turned to think of the future, abandon the

dear earth she could not altogether, cling to it she must! Thence the persistence of Messianism in some form or other even in those eschatological schemas, wherein broader vistas of a totally new heaven have appeared and the whole cosmos is to be cataclysmically transformed. With such potency did the popular Messianism react upon this universal Eschatology that it lent subsequent representations of the beyond Age some of its peculiar traits. The later tendency of Jewish thought on Things to Come is a deepening tension between Messianism and universal Eschatology, and not a unilateral development of one or the other. The resurrection is but one act in the drama of the Last Things: it cannot but suffer from the confusion characteristic of the whole plot.

That deepening tension effects an increasingly uncomfortable juxtaposition of the material and the spiritual, the earthly and the heavenly, and between the particular and universal in views of the Future in Judaism. Something of the same cleavage is evident in her thinking on the Future, as lies at the very heart of the whole Jewish life in that age, Judaism's tenacious adherence on the one hand to forms meant to maintain the sanctity and separateness of the Jewish people, and on the other Israel's consciousness of a mission to all the world.

In the history of Greek philosophy Aristotle deserves the name of 'recalcitrant Platonist'. The intertestamental exponents of Jewish Eschatology are for the most part

'recalcitrant Messianists'. Among the least recalcitrant of all, however, is the writer of that section of I Enoch contained in Chapters 91-104. This document stands at a watershed in Jewish Eschatology. It represents on the one side a break with the traditional earthly Messianic expectation; it is itself fairly thorough in its Transcendentalism. Now while that transcendentalism was given by some a fuller expression, it became more antagonised in most by the primitive Messianism than it has been in I Enoch 91-104.

I Enoch 91-104.

The work is the product of a passionate mind. Chapter 102:4 to Chapter 104:9 reads like a sustained and often bitter polemic against the age-old doctrine of Sheol. From this passage it is gathered that he regards Sheol as the place where men are requited according to their deserts. At least a partial retribution is to be entered upon immediately at death without waiting for the 'last days' (103:7). All this beside revealing a tremendous development on the orthodox Sheol doctrines, exhibits the writer's vital interest in the question of retribution, and with him it is significantly very much more the question of individual retribution. Job-like, he is anxiously concerned with the unmerited suffering of the righteous: his vexation is revealed in a long imaginary debate between himself and Sadducees who uphold the conservative Deuteronomist view of a purely hither-wordly retribution - the good prosper here and now, and here and now the wicked suffer

and there is no difference in death.(102:6). It is a problem whose answer does not lie this side of the earth. 'Job' was on the brink of that discovery. I Enoch 91-104 has made it. He has cast himself beyond the temporal to the eternal and the heavenly to find solace and comfort for his distress: "And your spirits - (the spirits) of you who die in righteousness, will live and rejoice and be glad, and their spirits will not perish, and their memorial will be before the face of the Great One unto all the generations of the world: wherefore, then, fear not their contumely" (103:4). Soon also, as he foresees it, the righteous "will shine as the stars of heaven". They will shine and be seen and the portals of heaven will be opened to them (104:2). This is an expansion of that glimpse of Eternity and a higher future life apart from the earthly Messianic Kingdom, bestowed apparently upon the seer in Daniel 12:3, but there in extremely close contiguity with the typical Messianic expectation of 12:2.

That the Eschatology of I Enoch 91:104 is not either completely free from admixture of the more naive Messianist ideals, and is not quite consistently transcendentalist is clear from an examination of his schema of the Eschata. But first it is worth noting that R.H. Charles has apparently been guilty here of two rather astonishing lapses from his almost always accurate scholarship. Firstly in the 1893 edition of the Book of Enoch (translated from Professor Dillmann's Ethiopic Text) on page 261, contrasting Enoch 91-104 and Enoch 1-36, Charles observes that in both, the scene of the

Messianic Kingdom is the earth as it is. Then on page 263, contrasting Enoch 91-104 and Enoch 83-90, he remarks that the scene of the Messianic Kingdom in 91-104 is apparently heaven, for in 91:14-16 the former heaven and earth are destroyed and a new heaven created, but no new earth, and in 104:2 heaven is thrown open to the righteous. Secondly in the 1912 edition of the Book of Enoch Charles asserts that in I Enoch 91-104 the resurrection is 'in a spiritual body' (page LI before his translation). Then in the index at the end of his translation he refers to this same section of the Book of Enoch as teaching 'resurrection of the spirit only'.² These temporary aberrations on Charles' part have nevertheless a certain accidental value - they reflect a very real lack of certainty in the Enoch writer himself.

The proposed study of the author's eschatological schema raises the prior critical problem of the relation of the smaller Apocalypse of Weeks, as it is commonly called, contained in 93:1-10 and 91:12-17, to the whole section 91-104. Is it from the hand of the writer of the section and is it native to its present context? Or has the author picked up this earlier apocalyptic fragment and incorporated it with his own chapters?

Clearly there has been considerable dislocation of the text in this whole section; it is due probably to an Editor. Chapter 92 for instance should probably begin the section, "written by Enoch the scribe".³ But with regard to the specific problem of the Apocalypse of Weeks it is well to

bear in mind that too rigid separation of diverse strands in apocalyptic documents is almost always to be eschewed. This is plainly one of the instances where it is discreet to recollect the eclectic and random nature of most apocalyptic writing. The writer of this Enochic section is responsible for the remarkable mosaic of ideas, produced by the bringing together of many different elements from the mass of traditions that lay to hand, with little semblance of any real unity. We are not to leap at conclusions of composite authorship!

It is just a little strange therefore to find H.H.Rowley, who is keenly aware of the sometimes grotesque combinations of ideas accomplished by the Apocalyptist, somewhat strictly separating parts of this section of Enoch. Rowley observes that in the non-apocalyptic paragraphs of Enoch 91-104 there is NO coming Kingdom on earth, but only in the Hereafter will there be just and due recompense for man.⁴ The observation evokes the following criticisms:

1) Apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic paragraphs of Enoch 91-104 are not to be too distinctly isolated as far as their respective views of the End are concerned.

2) 96:8 alludes to a temporary Messianic Kingdom upon earth: "Woe to you, ye mighty, who with might oppress the righteous; for the day of your destruction will come. In those days many and good days will come to the righteous - in the day of your judgment."

This passing phase of an earthly Messianic Kingdom is

not the final goal or the true consummation for the righteous. Nevertheless its presence in the writer's scheme should not be glossed over. However fleeting and ephemeral the Kingdom may be in the picture, it constitutes a compromise with the materialist and nationalist Messianic expectation, which cannot be neglected. When it is recognised that he has not entirely succeeded in excluding the old national and temporal ideals, there can be more readily appreciated the conflicting views of the Judgment and the indecision in the notions of the resurrection which appear in the work.

There seems to be in his view a series of Judgments, the earlier of which are purely national and humanly vindictive in character. In 91:9 there occurs the prophecy: "And all the idols of the heathen will be abandoned: the temple will be burned with fire and they will be removed from the whole earth, and they (that is, the heathen) will be cast into the judgment of fire and will perish in wrath and in grievous eternal judgment". And again in 91:12: "And after that there will be another week, the eighth, that of righteousness, and a sword will be given to it that judgment and righteousness may be executed on those who commit oppression, and sinners will be delivered into the hand of the righteous".

These passages show well the type of Judgment, which as a wholly temporal sanction, falls at the opening of the Messianic Consummation, and is applied on the national scale. The former verse betrays a bitter nationalism. In the latter,

'those who commit oppression' are no doubt the Gentile nations upon whom Judgment is perpetrated by the loyal armed Israelites.⁵ It need not be supposed, with Charles,⁶ that since the nationalist convictions here expressed disagree with the teaching of verse 14, where the conversion of the Gentiles is apparently contemplated ("And after that in the ninth week the righteous judgment will be revealed to the whole world"), two different hands are at work. The Judgment of verse 14 certainly comes after the Messianic period, and is probably nearly related in the writer's mind to the 'great eternal judgment' of the following verse. This latter Judgment has place only in a TRUE and definitive Eschatology, and occurs at the moment when the incorruptible world succeeds the corruptible, when the ETERNAL destiny of each one has to be settled. But the close proximity in these verses of two Judgments of so vastly different character should not induce us to whittle away by any stratagem their inconsistency and incompatibility. The inconsistency is original to the writer, and without attempting any synthesis, he has retained on the one hand the idea of a national Judgment, and on the other, impelled by his wider vision, has committed himself to thoughts of a 'great eternal judgment' at the gateway of eternity. The temporary Messianic Kingdom, and the national Judgment are aspects of the End from which he cannot detach himself.

Messianic notions and the ideas of an ultimate Eschatology continued to be interfused in numerous ways in Judaism. So are the temporal and eternal, the material and

spiritual woven into a somewhat amorphous pattern. And thence the vacillation of such as the writer of I Enoch 91-104 in his beliefs about the future life, for he seems not to have expressed himself in such terms as to banish all uncertainty as to his meaning.

In 91:16 and 17 the life entered upon after the 'great eternal judgment' is a life of eternal blessedness: (16) "And the first heaven shall depart and pass away, And a new heaven shall appear, And all the powers of the heavens shall give sevenfold light; (17) And after that there will be many weeks without number forever, And all shall be in goodness and righteousness, And sin shall no more be mentioned for ever". The life envisaged in 103:1-4 is similar: (2) "I know this mystery and have read it in the heavenly tables, and have seen the book of the holy ones and have found written therein and inccribed regarding them: (3) That all goddness and joy and glory are prepared for them and are written down for the spirits of those who have died in righteousness, and that manifold good will be given to you in recompense for your labours, and that your lot is abundantly beyond the lot of the living. (4) And your spirits - (the spirits) of you who die in righteousness will live and rejoice and be glad and their spirits will not perish, but their memorial will be before the face of the Great One unto all the generations of the world". Then also in 104:2, 4 and 6 respectively: (2) "Soon ye will shine as the stars of heaven, ye will shine and ye will be seen and the portals of heaven will be opened to you (4) ye will have great joy as the angels of heaven (6) Ye will become companions of

the hosts of heaven".

A great cosmic transformation is envisaged at the End. A new heaven will appear - but no new earth! The hopes of the righteous are directly raised to heaven, the dwelling-place which finally awaits them. Light will become their substance, as it is the chief property of that other world. The contrast with the terminology and outlook characteristic of the Messianic pretensions of I Enoch 6-36, 83-90; Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and II Macc., need hardly be emphasised. Here aspirations are turned from earth to heaven. In this exalted mood the other world is conceived as a spiritual existence dependent not upon the race but upon the characters of individual men: for he regards man himself as responsible for his own sin, and to some extent adumbrates the open assertion of 'Baruch that "each man is the Adam of his own soul". Yet ultimately he was not logical enough to see where this should have led him, or to recognise that it should have vanquished forever the false conception of the antithesis set deep in the heart of the Jewish people between the ideal Israel and the other nations.

But here at least for the moment nationalist aspirations are in the background. The eternal world breaks upon ALL. It is spiritual. Souls or spirits enjoy the life of eternity. It is nowhere explicitly stated that they RISE to this other life, in the above passages. There is no precise definition. General terms are employed - "goodness and joy and glory are prepared" for the righteous; "manifold good" is to be given to them.

Their spirits "will live and rejoice and be glad". They will "walk in eternal light". It is hard to conceive how a disembodied spirit could be said to 'rise' or how a Jew of this period could imagine a disembodied spirit 'rising'. And certainly there is not in I Enoch 91-104 the exactness of terminology, apparent for instance in the Psalms of Solomon 3:16: ἀναστῆσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον . ἀναστάσις is the most exact term for 'resurrection' in the Ap. and Ps. as in II Macc. 12:43 and 44; 7:9; II Baruch 30:2 (אַתָּה).

However, the language used here does not NECESSARILY exclude all thought of a resurrection. Nor has it banished completely every element of the physical. The spirits 'will walk'. There is of course always the possibility that descriptions such as this of the SOUL's eternal life may be merely metaphor, straining to express what is really beyond expression, in human terms. The words 'will live', more than any other part of the delineation, perhaps imply the notion of a resurrection, vaguely apprehended by the writer. 'Vivificare' not uncommonly alludes to the resurrection, as in IV Ezra 5:45 and in II Baruch 23:5; 42:7; 49:2.

While the method whereby the transference of the souls to their eternal heavenly life is achieved, remains something of an enigma by all that the writer has told us, there is clear enough allusion to the resurrection in a few other passages. It is easy enough of course to carve up the document, Enoch 91-104, and assign these passages to another hand. But there is some ground for accepting the substantial

unity of the whole Enochic section. In that case such passages must be taken at their face value, and their inconsistency with those of a more spiritual quality (examined above) given full consideration.

In 92:3 it is announced: "And the righteous one will arise from sleep, will arise and walk in the path of righteousness and all his path and conversation will be in eternal goodness and grace". Parallel to this is 91:10: "And the righteous one will arise from sleep and wisdom will arise and be given unto them". And finally there is 100:5: "And over the righteous and holy he will appoint as guardians holy angels to guard them as the apple of an eye until He has made an end of all wickedness and all sin, and though the righteous sleep a long sleep they have nought to fear".

From these passages E.F. Sutcliffe has deduced that "this section definitely teaches the physical resurrection of the righteous".⁷ He holds that it is the body which sleeps the sleep of death and if the righteous are spoken of repeatedly as 'rising from sleep', it is their bodies which are to arise and be reunited with their spirits. It is most natural to think of 'sleep' in this context as referring to the sleep of the body in the grave. Even that is not quite certain!

It has been customary to regard the watch of the guardian angels appointed over the righteous (100:5) as a means of protection for them in this present life, so that the sleep still to come can only be again the sleep of death in the earth. But that is a quite feasible interpretation which considers that

the righteous souls are here already in the place of the departed; it is from this intermediate abode that the 'spirits' rise to eternal blessedness at the last. How they are to rise the writer, by accident more probably than by design, has not informed us.

It would obviously be rash to assert dogmatically the conception in this writer of a purely physical resurrection on the basis of the 'rising from sleep' passages. Nor should any effort be made by something of a tour de force to harmonise them with the passages of a purer spiritual import. But such endeavour has been made - the argument offered is that such words as 103:3 f., "All good and joy and glory are prepared and destined for the souls of those who have died in righteousness", refer to the time before the resurrection; or again that he here "speaks of the spirit as the dominant part of man without excluding the body as its partner in bliss".⁸ Non tali auxilio. Clearly Chapter 103:3 refers to the blessing laid up in store for the righteous in eternity. And whether the Jew of the time could ever have thought of the spirit as 'the dominant part of man' is much in doubt.

Too broad generalisations on the other side, like Rudolf Otto's⁹ claim that throughout the Book of Enoch, with the sole exception of one dubious passage the resurrection is entirely spiritual, must also be condemned.

Better far is it to recognise the writer's oscillation between material and spiritual conceptions of the future life.¹⁰ He seems unable to make up his own mind. The

encroachment of Messianic ideas, particularly of the Judgment, into his universalist Eschatology, his inability to accept the conclusions to which the logic of his vision of a spiritual world should have driven him, have previously been noted. It was inevitable almost that his resurrection doctrine (the resurrection is but one event fitted into the schema of the Last Things) should be neither purely material nor purely spiritual, but a combination of both in a manner difficult to define.

Wolfson¹¹ has lately endeavoured to explain this imperfect blending of the material and the spiritual in views of the future life or the resurrection in terms like these - the language more proper to bodily resurrection is taken up by the writer from the scripture or the popular traditions and applied to the immortality of soul which he wants to preach. (Wolfson's views will be discussed more fully in a later Chapter, dealing with Wisdom of Solomon).

M.J.Lagrange¹² has said in effect of this Enoch section: Supposing that the writer had not only in view the salvation of the soul, but the resurrection, the resurrection would have nothing of the character of an episode in the national restoration; it is here purely spiritual.

Wolfson deserves praise for having noticed that there is language more proper to bodily resurrection even in the most advanced spiritualist ideals. Lagrange appears to have passed it by in I Enoch 91-104. Wolfson attributes to such writers as this in Enoch a conscious adaptation of the traditional

materialist terminology to depict the future spiritual existence of the soul. Lagrange puts all stress upon the purely spiritual nature of his resurrection doctrine. Neither does full justice to the permanence and power of the traditional, popular type of Messianism with its materialist notions of the future, or to the basically materialist fashion of the Jewish imagination. The materialist notions of a restored earthly state and a physical resurrection linger on by the side of the spiritual ideals, less by conscious choice than by instinct - an instinct mainly religious because implanted in the Jewish people through the Covenant of Sinai.

That the writer of I Enoch 91-104 is not quite free of that instinct is exhibited by several signs of the primitive materialist expectations, the fleeting glimpse he gives of a temporary Messianic Kingdom upon earth; some purely nationalist ideas of the Judgment; the 'rising from sleep' passages, which are probably not, despite the attractiveness of the proposal, to be explained away as referring to the rest of the souls in the intermediate state, presumably in some prototype of the 'promptuaria' or 'repositories of souls' of IV Ezra. Finally 92:5 affords an interesting example of the difficulty experienced in effecting a disengagement from every relic of earthly Messianism - "And sin will perish forever, and will no more be seen from that day for evermore". This to happen AFTER the eternal Judgment had already wrought the establishment of eternal blessedness of the righteous! Thus it forces itself into

the final picture and mars its coherence.

Nevertheless this writer is in fact worthy of the title , 'least recalcitrant Messianist'. Heaven is the final destination of the righteous, the world is changed, and the earth - could he but consistently have retained the assurance! - is done away at the last. Palestine and Jerusalem are no more the locus of the new order that is to come. He has far transcended the intense nationalism of most of his compatriots. The final change is cosmic. Within this universal setting, the primitive emphasis upon the communal and national fulfilment for Israel appears to have vanished. But he has not entirely forgotten the social blessings desirable in the life to come, for he tells of the righteous that "all his path and CONVERSATION will be in eternal goodness and grace" (92:3).

Yet in all, he has left so much unsaid or undefined on numerous scores, that dogmatism about what he believed or did not believe about the future life is quite unwarranted. He himself has not set out to give a definite account of his beliefs. Were he to learn of latter-day attempts at definition, where he himself long ago refrained, righteous indignation would no doubt kindle within him, for he was a seer with considerable warmth and passion in his heart.

Nothing could be further from the truth than the assertion that "the growth of belief in the resurrection impelled men to seek for a final consummation in another world than this".¹³ The resurrection belief at its inception was neither central nor effective. It was closely associated at the outset with the expectation of an earthly Messianic Kingdom, which gave it its first shape and form. When by a varied set of impulses, hopes were directed to the other world, beyond the present, eternal in the heavens, the resurrection, as an event transferred now to a new and different atmosphere, was, through the logic of these wider hopes, necessarily spiritualised. The process was the reverse of that supposed by the above quotation. The Light of the other, heavenly world demanded Light in those who were to become its denizens. They were to live in angelic spheres. They must therefore become like angels, that they may be fit companions of the heavenly hosts. It has, however, been observed in an earlier Chapter that these images were for the Jew much more concrete, much less abstractions than they appear to us, for him more REAL.

The spiritualisation of notions of the after life in I Enoch 91-104 is therefore Jewish, not at all Greek. There is no indication anywhere of Greek ideas of the soul's inherent indestructibility, its immortality as the one abiding part of man. There is in fact no doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as that doctrine is commonly conceived. Although Greek ideas of the immortality of the soul and retribution for the individual immediately upon death may have been widely

prevalent in Alexandria a century or more before the Christian era, and may have made some inroads into the literature produced by Alexandrian Jews, the conceptions of the Hereafter in Palestianian Judaism went their way almost totally unaffected. I Enoch 91-104 may, however, have been influenced to some extent by Greek thought in his notion of a partial retribution entered upon at death (103:7), but probably even more by a maturer reflection than perhaps the great majority of his contemporaries, upon the article of death. But that apart, his conception is wholly eschatological. The righteous must await the Last Days.

CHAPTER VI.

TRANSCENDENTALISM AND EARTHLY MESSIANISM -

A DEEPENING TENSION.

Some deep inner voice seemed continually to keep telling the Jew that Israel's glory would be restored at the End upon the earth. The effect was, as we have seen, to materialise to a large degree his conceptions of the life to come and the resurrection as the means of attainment to it. Another factor, already briefly mentioned, contributed to that result. The idea of complete immateriality was always alien to Hebrew and Jewish thought.¹ When therefore Hebrew or Jew thought of the 'soul' he did not regard it as totally separated from the body, as the Greeks did in their dualism of the soul and the body and their $\psi\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ concept. Hebrew and Jew thought rather of man as a unity, soul and body.² "The man of clay," J. Pedersen has written, "was a dead thing, but by the breath of God he was entirely changed and became a living soul. Soul and body are so intimately united that a distinction cannot be made between them. They are more than 'united', the body is the soul in its outward form".³

According to these presuppositions, amalgamation of material and spiritual views of the future life came very easily to the Jews with but little conscious process of harmonisation on their part. I Enoch 91-104, chiefly transcendentalist in his Eschatology, nevertheless exhibited

that tendency to a limited degree. In the Psalms of Solomon, Jubilees and Assumption of Moses the interplay between the Messianic and the universal eschatological perspectives is more clearly marked. The antinomies are increased. This Chapter is given to an examination of these books.

Psalms of Solomon.

The Psalms of Solomon is plainly not an Apocalypse. But one of its main themes is Messianism, especially in Psalm 17, and on that account it is usually included in surveys of the Apocalyptic Literature. It is, however, messianic rather than apocalyptic. In literary style the Psalms occupy a middle place between Ecclesiasticus and the much more diffuse composition of the Apocalyptic writers.⁴

The problem of authorship is here serious and very relevant. Is the work a unity or are there two authors? Ryle and James perhaps most reasonably of all declare: "whether we have the work of more than one writer it is impossible to determine".⁵ C.C.Torrey⁶ remains silent, and H.H.Rowley⁷ also appears to pronounce no verdict on the question. Is their acceptance of unity of authorship to be inferred? The only word spoken by G. Buchanan Gray⁸ is an incidental reference in the clause: "These Psalms are the work of a writer or writers.....". Also J.J.Bonsirven⁹, leaving the matter open speaks of the 'Psalmist or Psalmists'. M.-J. Lagrange¹⁰ in an exposition of the Eschatology of the Psalm remarks that there is no reason to suppose that the Psalms of Solomon belong to two

different authors. And Oesterley with greater caution claims: "Whether the hand of one or more writers is to be discerned is an open question".¹¹

R.H. Charles¹² is therefore rather lonely in his assertion of dual authorship. He rigidly separates Psalms 17 and 18 from all the rest on account of their divergent eschatological systems, differing from the others 'in essential respects'. In these two Psalms, according to Charles, all emphasis is upon the future reign of a personal Messiah: in the others there is scarcely any reference to the future at all, and certainly none to the personal Messiah; the righteous rise not to a kingdom of earthly prosperity, but to eternal life (3:16; 14:7; 15:15). "Whatever degree of importance they may attach to the expected kingdom, they do not regard it as the recompense of the righteous".¹³

But these differences of outlook are not sufficient to prove duality of authorship, in the absence of other token. And other grounds, diversities in style and language, are in fact lacking or at the best only very indecisive, to judge by the restraint and uncertainty of Ryle and James, Bonsirven, and Oesterley, and the silence of Torrey and Rowley.

The combination of the fervent Messianism of these Psalms 17 and 18, and the loftier, and for the most part more spiritual (but the Messianism of 11:1-8 will be indicated below) interests of the rest, is typical of Jewish eschatological speculation in the Ap. and Ps. It has been

witnessed already in several other works. Several considerations Charles seems inadequately to have taken into account in maintaining so definitely a dual authorship for the Psalms on the ground of diversity of outlook and ideas -

- 1) The Psalms are not a continuous composition. Each forms a unity and is composed upon a separate plan, and may reflect a quite different mood. A collection like this may readily combine lower and higher ideals of the future:
- 2) Psalms 17 and 18 are nothing more than a collation of Old Testament Messianic texts. Their omission of certain topics, e.g. the resurrection, cannot be overstressed. *Argumentum ex silentio* is here very dangerous.
- 3) Sometimes bizarre combinations of ideas were characteristic of that age of doctrinal fluidity and movement.

The desire to impose consistency upon the eschatological schemas proffered in many documents of the Ap. and Ps. has led already to an undue sectionalising of the sources. Pushed too far, the effort ends in chaos, and would reduce each to countless bits and pieces.

It is politic therefore to allow the Psalms of Solomon their inconsistencies and to tackle their somewhat amorphous fusion of many different traditions as they stand. What is the relation of the Messianic ideals not only of Psalms 17 and 18, but also 11:1-8 to the hope of a future spiritual existence expressed in other parts of the work? Are they blended together into one view of the future, albeit

crudely and imperfectly? Or is the Messianic consummation divorced completely in the writer's mind from the final eschatological consummation? Is the resurrection the introduction to Eternity? First a glance at Psalms 17 and 18.

In true apocalyptic fashion Psalm 17 begins with a historical survey. Thereafter the Messiah is predicted - a personal human king, quite definitely of the house of David (verse 23 or (21)).¹⁴ He will "shatter unrighteous rulers" and deliver Jerusalem wholly from oppressor nations (24). The holy people presently dispersed will be reassembled by him, and sin will be no more in their midst because of him (28 and 29). Among the restored of Israel he will share out the land, in which no aliens shall any more dwell. He shall be judge of the peoples (30 and 31). Heathen nations will be under bondage to him and all will come to do him homage, for a great king is he, trusting not in weapons of war, but in the Lord Himself (32 to 38). By the power of his word he will rule the people in wisdom and will never falter (39 to 43). Psalm 18 conveys exactly the same ideas in much briefer form.

Jewish nationalism is rampant in this idealist, but often finely drawn, picture of the future Messianic Kingdom. The foreign nations that threaten Jerusalem are to be overthrown and excluded. They shall only marvel from the distance at Israel's glory. The tribes are to be restored to Jerusalem, which is to be the centre of the earthly Messianic Kingdom. That this glowing picture of the Kingdom to come has the

impression of finality can hardly be in doubt. This will be the End! Over the Messiah is the Lord his King, who is Israel's King for ever and ever (38 and 51). The Messiah "will smite the earth with the word of his mouth for ever" (39). These words are a quotation from Isaiah 11:4; but it is significant that the Psalmist has himself added εἰς αἰῶνα 'for ever'. The Kingdom is to be an everlasting Kingdom.¹⁵

It has on the contrary been claimed (by R.H.Charles)¹⁶ that "the Messianic Kingdom in these Psalms is apparently of temporary duration, for there is no hint of the righteous dead rising to share in it. Only the surviving righteous become members of it." The argument is based on 17:50,

"Blessed are they that shall be born in those days,

To behold the blessing of Israel, which God shall bring to pass in the gathering together of the tribes."

But this passage does not necessarily exclude a resurrection. Jews, awaiting the coming of the Messianic Age, were always inclined to stress the greater blessing or the greater part allotted to those who would be alive (here in 17:50 οἱ γινόμενοι , 'they that shall be born') in the day of its inauguration, even though they had been awakened to a resurrection belief. The sentiment occurs in almost the same words, it may be noted, in 18:7. There is this much to support the claim that the author of Psalm 17 has no resurrection belief - the normal apocalyptic practice is to associate the resurrection with the Judgment: but here in verses 28 and 31,

predicting the Judgment of the Messiah, the subjugation of the heathen and the restoration of the tribes, there is no reference whatever to the resurrection. On the other hand the Psalm is simply "a tissue of biblical reminiscences" in which resurrection has really no place. The silence is not to be pressed.¹⁷ Bonsirven asks: Can the resurrection find any place in the Messianic picture of Psalm 17? And he suggests the answer that it cannot be categorically excluded from the belief of the writer of the Psalm.¹⁸

Another argument has been advanced in favour of believing that the Kingdom in this Psalm is of a transitory nature. It is held that "the Messiah here is a single person, and not a series of Kings"¹⁹ so that his Kingdom is coterminous with his rule. The argument carries little weight. For the true King is obviously in the Psalmist's belief, God Himself, and to Him the Messiah is subject. (verses 38 and 51). If the Kingdom be coterminous with the reign of the true King, it is eternal. Although the 'days' of verse 36 ("And there shall be no unrighteousness in his days in their midst, For all shall be holy and their king the anointed of the Lord.") and verse 42 ("And relying upon his God, throughout his days he will not stumble.") seem to indicate a CLOSED period, it is still of endless duration. In his present mood at least, the Messianic Kingdom is the furthest reach of the Psalmist's vision.

There is in the Psalms other than 17 and 18 no

mention of a personal Messiah, but there are sufficient traces and relics of Messianism to debar Charles' theory of a dual authorship and the reasons adduced for it. Psalm 11 contains a Messianic passage predicting the coming glories of Jerusalem, when the children of Israel will be gathered back within her. Again there is that feeling of finality, as though the writer conceived this to be the everlasting Kingdom. Here then, as in Psalms 17 and 18, there is no thought of anything beyond the Messianic Kingdom upon earth.

There are moreover several other passages which allude to the Messianic redemption. 10:8, "the salvation of the Lord be upon the house of Israel unto everlasting gladness", can hardly be anything other than a prayer for the joys of the Messianic Age. The preceding verse also contains the prophecy: "And the pious shall give thanks in the assembly of the people; and on the poor shall God have mercy in the gladness of Israel". The last phrase (εὐφροσύνη Ἰσραὴλ) has been accepted as meaning the 'day of gladness' for Israel to which Jews looked forward.²⁰ G.B.Gray asks whether it may not be a term for the Messianic Age.²¹ Psalm 15, verse 8, "For the mark of God is upon the righteous that they may be saved. Famine and sword and pestilence shall be far from the righteous", reads like a reference to the Messianic redemption of the righteous. The people, the nation occupies an exalted place in the writer's mind - "The salvation of the Lord be upon Israel His servant for ever. And let the sinners be destroyed from before the face of the Lord together: and

let the saints of the Lord inherit the promises of the Lord." Ryle and James interestingly suggest that here the phrase ἑπαγγελίας κυρίου is used for the first time in Jewish literature, so far as we know, to sum up the assurances of the Messianic redemption.²² Finally in 16:5 ("I will give thanks unto Thee, for Thou hast helped me to (my) salvation; And hast not counted me with sinners to (my) destruction".) the direct contrast between σωτηρία and ἀπωλεία referring to the violent end of sinners, is striking.

The actual historical situation reflected in the résumé of events in 17:1-27 was just such as to call forth that outburst of national feeling which finds expression in a resurgent Messianism. The Psalms are generally supposed to emanate from Pharisean circles. The Pharisees were in the main quietist in their politics, but that curbed their active engrossment in social and state affairs far more than it stifled their hearts' longing for a coming day of glory in Israel in the Messianic Age. Their very quietness and inactivity must have enhanced their dreams. The central object of firm faith and burning hope in the Psalms of Solomon is the coming Messianic Kingdom upon earth.

In the Messianic contexts in the Psalms there is no mention of the resurrection. But, as we saw, not much can be rested upon that silence. There are in the Psalms, however, a few passages which definitely allude to the resurrection. Is this event of the resurrection then totally unrelated

to the Messianic consummation so plainly envisaged in numerous parts of the Psalms? An answer to that problem must now be essayed. The relevant 'resurrection passages' are here discussed in turn.

"But they that fear the Lord shall rise again unto life eternal, and their life shall be in the light of the Lord, and it shall fail no more" (3:16). The happy lot of the righteous is contrasted with the grievous fate of the sinner, set forth in verses 11 to 15. In his present disposition the author is obsessed with the problem of retribution, of merit and demerit, and the eventual vindication of the justice of God. And in this obsession he has entered into the heritage of Jeremiah and Job and the rest of a like insight. The future life, visualised by him in such a mood might be expected to be spiritual, the life with God. And certainly he at least has left no doubt at all that the future bliss of the righteous is to last forever. They rise to 'eternal life' (ἐνασκήσουνται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον): their life 'will never fail'. Nevertheless he gives only the merest outline sketch of the scope and form of this unending future life; none of the details is filled in. It is proclaimed to be 'in the light of the Lord', but the phrase itself imparts little fresh knowledge, and it not probative. For in the popular delineations 'light' is as frequently a blessing bestowed by God in abundance upon the earthly Messianic Kingdom as a property of the celestial life.

Ryle and James²³, observing that the words here are probably based upon Daniel 12:2, seem tacitly to elicit the feeling that the resurrection is here connected with the Messianic Kingdom, as it is in the Danielic verse. There is nothing in Psalms of Solomon 3:16 absolutely to forbid such a view.

But all effort to explain away 3:16 as referring solely to a renewal of prosperity within the present life, in order to banish every discrepancy with the temporal Messianism embedded in the Psalms, is merely futile. Without doing violence to the transparent value of the words in such a fashion, it is possible to say that 'eternal life' MAY refer to the life of the earthly Messianic Kingdom, envisaged elsewhere in the Psalms as an endless Kingdom. Not more than that can be claimed.

Lagrange²⁴ on the contrary believes that in the Psalms the resurrection and Messianism are completely divorced. The future life, in the opinion of Lagrange, belongs to the domain of definitive Eschatology, and far transcends the Messianic horizons. He argues that when the writer speaks of the blessing of the righteous beside God (but does 'in the light of God' mean as much as 'beside God?'), he makes no allusion at all to the Messianic felicity, for when he deals with the Messianic times he says twice: "Happy are those who will live in this time" (17:50 and 18:7). But this last statement of the writer's does not, as was noted, inevitably

exclude the resurrection and a possible share in the Messianic Kingdom for those who had died before the advent of the happy day of its establishment. Moreover the conflicting notions of resurrection to an ETERNAL order in the BEYOND, and a Messianic Kingdom upon earth which is also, as far as can be seen, eternal, intensify greatly the problem of the relation of Messianism and transcendentalist Eschatology in the Psalms.

Lagrange indeed appears to have sensed this difficulty. He does remark that the temporal blessings of Israel were assigned an indefinite duration, and upon these blessings Israel entered forever by the fulfilment of the promises held out to the nation: on the other hand EACH ONE could enter into the blessed future life only at the moment of the truly final Judgment of every individual. The two are very hard to reconcile. Lagrange rightly maintains that it is not for us to seek to extricate ourselves from the impasse by positing two different hands in the Psalms of Solomon.

Reconciliation of the two opposed perspectives has not been attempted by the author - the Psalms, says Lagrange, believe in an eternal life which the righteous merit by their good works, they believe also in the reign of the Messiah but they keep the two consistently apart. H.H.Rowley has arrived at substantially the same conclusion. Dating the work about the middle of the 1st century B.C., Rowley states that in the Psalms there is no background of crisis, "and so

speculation on the destiny of the individual was not brought into association with a great cataclysm that should inaugurate the Messianic Kingdom".²⁵ But if the summary of events in 17:1-27 can be trusted, the days were critical enough: the Jewish polity had fallen into decadence, for which the only remedy seemed to be the appearance of a Messianic King to usher in the golden times of renewed glory that would last forever. At any the slightest suggestion that the destiny of individual Israelites was in no wise related to that coming Messianic Kingdom, his fellow-countrymen must have revolted. And if in fact he had offered them the choice between an eternity of bliss in the heavens for themselves apart and a share in the glorious earthly order, they would unhesitatingly have opted for the latter.

But has he himself so consistently held the two apart? A precise answer eludes us. The only place where there is a real assurance in the Psalms is on the coming misfortunes of sinners (2:17-19; 3:13-15; et passim); they are to perish forever (15:15). On the other topics there is far less precision.

W.V.Hague²⁶ then quite mistakenly recognises in the Psalms a conscious synthesis of the idea of a temporary Messianic sway with that of an everlasting heavenly Kingdom, comparing Psalm 11:1-8 which teaches a temporary Messianic Kingdom to 3:16, where there follows a spiritual resurrection of the righteous to eternal life. But beside the fact that there is no good reason to suppose that the Kingdom is merely

temporary, the author has not reached any such active compromise. Most probably he had neither harmonised his Messianic outlook with his individual Eschatology (as Hague and Ryle and James suggest), nor kept them strictly separate (Lagrange and Rowley).

One or two passages seem to reveal a certain equivocation on the writer's part, and certainly make the enigma of the book's Eschatology the more baffling to its students. For instance 14:6 and 7 have the promise: "Therefore their (that is, 'sinners') inheritance is Sheol and darkness and destruction: and they shall not be found in the day when the righteous obtain mercy. But the pious of the Lord shall inherit life in gladness". It is impossible to eliminate all doubt as to whether the 'life inherited in gladness' is the same life as that which the righteous are said to enter in the day when they obtain mercy, which latter most likely alludes to the Messianic Consummation (Ryle and James).²⁷ It cannot be decided! Nor again could it be easily proved of 15:13 to 15²⁸ ("And sinners shall perish forever in the day of the Lord's judgment, when God visiteth the earth with his judgment. But they that fear the Lord shall find mercy therein, And shall live by the compassion of their God") that the writer has in mind resurrection in the 'spirit' to eternal life for the righteous. On the contrary it seems to refer to the earthly Messianic Judgment and subsequent fulfilment. These uncertainties were real uncertainties to the author himself.

Other passages, generally taken to refer to the eternal, purely spiritual risen life of the righteous are 13:9 and 10, 9:9 and 14:2 and 3; but it should be noted that they do not explicitly mention resurrection. They add nothing to 3:16, and do not evoke much further comment.

a) 13:9 and 10, "For the Lord spareth his pious ones, And blotteth out their errors by His chastening. For the life of the righteous shall be forever." Little can be inferred from terms so general either about a resurrection doctrine in the writer, or about the nature and manner of the future life. It is fascinating to watch how the writer of the Psalms appears to number himself with the 'saints' of Israel (οἱ ὅσιοι , οἱ δίκαιοι), who alone were to inherit the blessings in store.

b) 9:9, "He that doeth righteousness layeth up life for himself with the Lord" (θεσπυρίζει ζωήν). The verse reveals nothing about the writer's notions of the Hereafter. It may not indeed refer to the future life at all, for it is parallel to the similar thought in Proverbs 2:7

θεσπυρίζει τοῖς κατορθοῦσι σωτηρίαν (cf. also Tobit 4:9).

c) 14:2 and 3, "The pious of the Lord shall live by it (that is, the Law) forever; The Paradise of the Lord, the trees of life, are His pious ones. Their planting is rooted for ever; They shall not be plucked up all the days, For the portion and inheritance of God is Israel". This interesting passage may be merely metaphorical, expressing the absolute

worth of the righteous to God, their immortality and their permanence, recurrent ideas in the canonical Psalms (compare Psalm 1, "And he shall be like a tree planted . . ."). The very last words significantly strike the communal or national note. ISRAEL, the TRUE ISRAEL is the inheritor of the promise.

Israel is in fact most often in the forefront of his thought. There is hardly a Psalm that does not display a prime interest in the nation. His Messianic expectation is with him a profound conviction; he develops it on clear and definite traditional lines in various parts of his work. And it seems in that mood to be the limit of his vision and the summit of his prayers. Yet another mood descends upon him when, obviously owing much to the Psalms of the Old Testament, he turns to thoughts of the individual and the life immortal in unbroken communion with God. His quest for this immortality would have been better rewarded, less tentative had he not been dominated by the other commoner hope of a goodly Kingdom for the faithful Israel. To what extent he felt the tension it is hard to say.

As it is, he has imposed the event of resurrection expressly upon only one place in the whole work, 3:16, 'the righteous will rise to eternal life'. In this only has he made true advance upon the canonical Psalms. Nevertheless we feel that he is groping, for he has defined nothing; much is left to the conjecture of his reader. Viteau²⁹ has ventured the

opinion that, though we do not see clearly what is the life of the righteous from his death until the general Judgment, his soul surely continues its life, and it seems that it rests here below until at the last God comes to take it for the day of Judgment. But the writer himself has not this information; this much is conjecture! Kabisch³⁰ argued that no text in the Psalms of Solomon proves a resurrection belief in the author, and denied its existence in him. Bonsirven³¹ shares something of this feeling, for he remarks that the resurrection here seems to be so closely bound up with the End that it is doubtful whether the author has any conception of a real resurrection at all.

Lagrange, it will be remembered, characterised the apocalyptists as 'les plus livresques des hommes'. The writer of the Psalms is not an apocalyptist, yet he merits that description to a nicety. He turns to the Scriptures, and fills his own work with Scriptural traditions, each line of which had its own appeal to him. Only thus can be understood the antinomies in his thoughts of the Hereafter. How marginal the resurrection belief was for him can be gathered from his having inserted it only once, the one novelty in the midst of the time-honoured traditions.

Jubilees.

The extreme divergence on the date of Jubilees, noticed in a previous Chapter, greatly jeopardises the attempts to assign it a fixed point in a chronological

exposition of Jewish Eschatology. It is included in this position in the present enquiry because it exhibits, more clearly than the Psalms of Solomon, a combination of transcendental ideals with a persistent earthly Messianism.

Jubilees has indeed little to say on the subject of Eschatology. It has the form of a Midrash on Genesis and Exodus; its primary object is to glorify the Law and the priesthood by tracing them back in their present form to the very beginnings of history. In its historical retrospect it divides all history into Jubilee periods of 49 years, and makes much play with the sacred number 7.

But the present concern is with what little there is in Jubilees of eschatological teaching. There is probably no hint here of a resurrection, as in the Psalms of Solomon. Only one passage intimates a blessed eternal existence, and again in quite general terms and without certainty.

In Jubilees (1:24, et passim) there is everywhere apparent the fundamental conviction that Israelites are constituted the children of God in virtue of their physical descent from Jacob. An earnest nationalism pervades the work. It breathes in the words promulgated of the Messiah of the tribe of Judah in 31:18 and 19, in which Isaac invoked a blessing upon Judah: "May the Lord give thee strength and power to tread down all that hate thee; be a prince, thou and one of thy sons, over the sons of Jacob; may thy name and the name of thy sons go forth and traverse the whole earth and

the countries; then shall the Gentiles fear thy face, and all the nations shall quake and all the peoples shall quake. In thee may there be the help of Jacob, and in thee may be found the salvation of Israel".

So rampant a nationalism issues inevitably in Messianic dreams. But here the dreams he dreams are different - the Kingdom to come is to be established without any direct intervention by God or any universal cataclysm. He is in this respect a forerunner of later social theorists whose naive Utopianism has leant only upon the inevitability of progress. That appears from the Messianic passage 23:26-31. It is preceded by a long section heralding the Messianic Woes ('calamity upon calamity' (13 ff.) , and finally an assault by the Gentiles upon the Holy Land). Afterwards there will be a general repentance on the part of Israelites, from their evil ways. Then "in those days the children will begin to study the laws, and to seek the commandments, and to return to the path of righteousness. (27) The days of the children of men will begin to grow many, and increase from generation to generation, and day to day, till their days draw nigh to a thousand years, and to a greater number of years than before were their days. (28) And there will be no old man, nor one that is not satisfied with his days; for all will be (as) children and youths. (29) And all their days they will complete in peace and in joy, and they will live, and there will be no Satan nor any evil destroyer; for all their days will be days of blessing and healing"

History culminates in the Kingdom by a steady advance. The Kingdom is depicted in rather physical and sensuous terms - men are to enjoy their days in satisfaction with their full portion of peace and joy, blessing and healing. All is on the temporal plane.

It is, however, only when the author passes on to the further prophecies of verses 30 and 31 that the scene at once becomes confused and the steady measured tread by which he made advance in his account right up to the institution of the blessed earthly Messianic age, becomes instead limping and halting. These two verses have to be quoted:

(30) "And at that time the Lord will heal His servants, And they shall rise up and see great peace, And drive out their adversaries. And the righteous shall see and be thankful, And rejoice with joy for ever and ever, And shall see all their judgments and all their curses on their enemies.

(31) And their bones shall rest in the earth, And their spirits shall have much joy, And they shall know that it is the Lord who executes judgment, And shows mercy to hundreds and thousands and to all that love Him."

Event does not any more follow event in strict logical sequence. Verses 30 and 31 present a strange congeries of ideas. The salient problems raised by these difficult verses are as follows, 1) At what particular point does the writer think of the Judgment as taking place? Does he imagine more than one Judgment? 2) Does verse 30 refer to the resurrection? 3) What

kind of future life is envisaged for the 'spirits' of the righteous in verse 31?

1. Ideas of the Judgment in Jubilees (and of the Messianic Kingdom).

The notions of the Judgment and the Messianic Kingdom are of course so nearly allied that they can only be considered together.

Charles believes that "the 'day of the great judgment' seems to follow on the close of the Messianic Kingdom".³² He therefore regards the Messianic Kingdom here predicted as being temporary, and the Judgment falling at its close as the introduction to the spiritual life of the righteous. But at this point (verse 30 and 31) the writer of Jubilees appears to have put logic in his pocket, and Charles' categorical declaration of the sequence of events is more exact than the words of the text permit. The proclamation in verse 31 that when the righteous enter into their final state, they shall then recognise that Judgment is of the Lord, by no means fixes the time when the author held that Judgment to occur.

If anything like coherence and system and consecutiveness are demanded for the order of the events described in verses 30 and 31, a crop of perplexities springs up in a moment. Suppose that the Judgment executed by the Lord (verse 31) stands in place here, and in the author's view immediately precedes the entry of the righteous into their eternal and spiritual joy, what is to be made of the dire pronouncement, secularist and maledictory in tone, that they, the righteous "would see all

their judgments and all their curses on their enemies"? What are these 'judgments'? And assuming a gradual upward evolution from the Messianic age to the final eschatological consummation (incidentally an unwarranted assumption!) why is there any need for further Judgment, when already Satan and the 'evil destroyer' have vanished, and the righteous have entered their peace and driven out their adversaries? It is neither easy nor wise to apply rigorously the view that 'Jubilees' pictures the Messianic Kingdom as temporary, and in verses 30 and 31 carries us on to another and a final stage, the true End, preceded immediately by the real LAST Judgment.

Verse 27, "till their days draw nigh to one thousand years", need not be taken too literally, in support of that view of a true Eschatology transcending Messianism, as referring to the limited duration of the Kingdom. It may not be more than merely an announcement that the supreme blessing of the Messianic Age will be exemption from death. There may also be some significance in that passage of Jubilees, 1:27, where the New Jerusalem ('My sanctuary') is said to be 'for the ages of ages' upon the earth. At all events Lagrange³³, never keen in his examination of intertestamental Jewish Eschatology to give the Messianic expectation any more than its minimum due of place and importance, asserts that in this portrayal at least the Messianic Kingdom will evolve on and on without end.

On this view that he has traversed in vision of the future the boundaries of the Messianic Kingdom, it is possible

to hold that verse 31 ("And they shall know that it is the Lord who executes judgment") embodies the idea that the SUPREME END of the Messianist restoration is the establishment of God's reign, until whose accomplishment the process of Judgment is not complete. But improbable! For while this would accord well with the writer's view of a gradual incomming of the Kingdom, it would be a unique instance of a process of Judgment in contradistinction to Judgment as a sudden single event.

That the Judgment is visualised in Jubilees, however, as an event preceding the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom is the impression conveyed by passages mentioning it in the body of the work (cf. Jubilees 4:9, 5:10; and especially 9:15, "And they all said, 'So be it, so be it', for themselves and their sons forever throughout their generations till the day of judgment, on which the Lord God shall judge them with a sword and with fire, for all the unclean wickedness of their errors". cf. also 10:22, "Go to, let us go down and confound their language (that is, down to Shinar, where men were building a tower and a city), that they may not understand one another's speech, and they may be dispersed into cities and nations, and one purpose will no longer abide with them till the day of judgment". cf. also 23:11, "And all the generations which shall arise from this time until the day of the great judgment shall grow old quickly.") There is reason to feel from these passages that the Judgment falls within the temporal sphere, and is simply a more notable event of history.

2. Verse 30: "And at that time the Lord will heal His servants, And they shall rise up and see great peace, And drive out their adversaries."

Does this refer to the resurrection? It is most unlikely that there is allusion here to a real resurrection from the dead. For then the idea of rising from the dead would form a most unnatural complement to the preceding notion of the Lord's healing of His servants. The attribution to God of a healing activity towards the dead in preparation for their resurrection is found, so far as can be gathered, nowhere else in the Ap. and Ps. The 'rising' here is almost certainly recovery from their previous decrepitude and state of sickness. This passage would then be analogous to many in the Psalms of the Old Testament (e.g. Psalm 73), which Baudissin³⁴ and others have explained by showing that from the earliest times in Hebrew thought sickness and trouble were regarded as coming under the power of death, and to 'raise the dead' is to restore them from their illness. That seems a very reasonable explanation in view of the parallel mention of 'healing'.

Much less satisfactory is Charles' predisposition to exclude resurrection from verse 30 by virtue of his theory of the Eschatology of Jubilees - that Judgment will be at the end of the Messianic Kingdom and precede the spiritual bliss of the righteous,³⁵ and consequently verse 30 cannot refer to resurrection to the Messianic Kingdom. Let the source-book speak its word! 'Jubilees' is less definite than Charles here!

Now if by a remote possibility - and Charles for his part has not produced adequate grounds for denying resurrection in the verse - verse 30 did refer to an actual resurrection, it is hard to see what other it could be than resurrection to the earthly Messianic Kingdom, for the 'risen' righteous are immediately to 'drive out their adversaries'.

But to leave such hypotheses at rest, the suggestion that if the writer believed in the resurrection he must have mentioned it in verse 23 at the time of the transition to the Messianic Kingdom, is equally invalid with the reasons given by Charles for excluding the belief from the writer. The explanation offered above of the metaphor implied by 'rising' in verse 30 is the only sufficient one.

3. verse 31: "And their bones shall rest in the earth, and their spirits shall have much joy."

What kind of future life is envisaged here? It is spiritual, it is heavenly, in direct contrast with the EARTHLY restingplace of the bones. The heavenly existence of the righteous spirits greatly transcends the earthly life of the Messianic Kingdom. Yet these two incompatible ideals are brought together into close proximity in his schema of the Eschata with no evident awareness of their incongruity. Lagrange³⁶, placing Jubilees in the reign of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.), holds that at this period the beyond and the souls of the dead could not be neglected. Apart from the uncertainties surrounding the dating of the book, there is truth in the latter contention,

because it helps to authenticate the dynamism which undoubtedly belonged increasingly to the advancing individualism and loftier spirituality in ideals of the Hereafter in the later post-Exilic age. These it was which, grafted often awkwardly and artlessly on to the still more powerful, influential and the radical Messianic hopes of terrestrial restoration, created the antinomies, which are seen to exist in a representation like that of Jubilees, between Messianism and a transcendent future, and resulted in confusion and constant seeming indecision.

In Jubilees, beside his expansive account of what is to be in the Messianic consummation, his pronouncement of a higher, spiritual realm of life for the righteous departed is wan and feeble and quite lacking in precision. Much is again left to our fancy. How would the 'spirits' attain to their joy? The Sheol teaching in the work aids us nothing at all. Sheol is here 'the place of condemnation' or 'of judgment' (7:29 and 22:22). It cannot therefore be the intermediate abode of the departed souls. So Charles infers, presumably from the aggregate viewpoint of Palestinian Judaism, that they must go to some intermediate abode, such as Paradise (as in the Similitudes of Enoch) or else to heaven - but it is an inference! The writer does not enlighten us.

In the examination of Jubilees a long road has been travelled to reach a very mean destination as far as concerns the resurrection teaching of the work. But then the writer himself was in something of an eschatological labyrinthine

maze - hence our winding way!

Assumption of Moses.

The Assumption of Moses has many affinities with Jubilees. But unlike Jubilees it can be dated with some precision in the early part of the first century A.D. On this there is general agreement.³⁷ The 'insolent alien king' of Chapter VI is recognised as Herod the Great, and the statement that his sons would succeed him but reign for shorter periods than their father (6:7), shows that the work must have been written before his sons had attained the length of Herod's reign itself. It is reasonably certain that the book was written in the first three decades of the Christian era.³⁸ The date is peculiarly significant here. It shows that the unity of Israel, for Jewish nationalism permeates the book, was a dominant factor in men's thoughts not only in the Maccabaeian age, but in this much later day.

The title of the work is a misnomer, at least in the form in which it survives. It is rather, as we possess it, a Testament of Moses. Chapter I relates Moses' charge given to Joshua, and the rest of the book purports to narrate Moses' prediction of future events for Israel.³⁹ We look now in vain for the Assumption with which the book no doubt originally ended.

It embodies a typical retrospective survey of Israel's history, cast in the form of a prophecy of things still to come. The transition from the present phase of

history to the Messianic Kingdom takes place in the narrative at the beginning of Chapter 10, which is a hymn of the Messianic Kingdom, without a Messiah. Since it has to be investigated at some length, it is here given in full:

1. "And then His Kingdom shall appear throughout all
His creation,
And then Satan shall be no more,
And sorrow shall depart with him.
2. Then the hands of the angel shall be filled
Who has been appointed chief,
And he shall forthwith avenge them of their enemies.
3. For the Heavenly One will arise from His royal
throne,
And he will go forth from his holy habitation
With indignation and wrath on account of His sons.
4. And the earth shall tremble: to its confines shall
it be shaken:
And the high mountains shall be made low
And the hills shall be shaken and fall.
5. And the horns of the Sun shall be broken and he
shall be turned into darkness;
And the moon shall not give her light, and be
turned wholly into blood;
And the circle of the stars shall be disturbed.
6. And the sea shall retire into the abyss,
And the fountains of waters shall fail,
And the rivers shall dry up.

7. For the Most High will arise, the Eternal God alone,
 And He will appear to punish the Gentiles,
 And He will destroy all their idols.
8. Then thou, O Israel, shalt be happy,
 And thou shalt mount upon the necks and wings of the eagle,
 And they shall be ended.
9. And God will exalt thee,
 And He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of
 the stars,
 In the place of their habitation.
10. And thou shalt look from on high and shalt see thy
 enemies in Ge(henna),
 And thou shalt recognise them and rejoice,
 And thou shalt give thanks and confess thy Creator."

It has been supposed, 1) that the original hymn had only 8 stanzas (verses 3-10). Then the 'enim' introducing verse 3 is for 'D introductory. Moreover the subject of verse 2 is 'angel', whereas in verse 3 it is God. So Schmidt-Merx believe the hymn to be earlier than the general body of the work and of independent authorship; 2) that verses 3-10 are native to the original text, but verses 1 and 2 are no part of the genuine hymn, since Michael, the subject of verse 2 is never mentioned again, and instead it is God who punishes Israel's enemies. There adds strength to this second view, its exponent holds, the contrasting picture of perfect goodness and happiness throughout all creation depicted in verse 1, and the gloom of verses 4-6 and the vindictiveness of verse 10.⁴⁰

While verses 1 and 2 are not arbitrarily to be rejected on account of any difference of mood or subject or in the dramatis personae as compared with the rest of the hymn - it was the way of the apocalyptist to alter all the scene and movement quickly - their exclusion would have but small effect upon the spirit and tenor of the whole hymn.

This hymn is the reductio ad absurdum, or if the 'volte face' be permitted, the introductio ad coelum of Jewish Messianism. E. de Faye⁴¹ was greatly mistaken in regarding this as one of the most perfect examples of a popular apocalypse in which the horizon is purely terrestrial. Nor can the broad statement be permitted that in fact the consummation here envisaged is ENTIRELY supramundane.⁴² For while all things are trending towards the great climax of the supernatural glorification of Israel when she shall mount to the skies, temporal and terrestrial features still loom large in this picture of transcendental fulfilment. The hymn is poetry, imaginative, figurative: to it the measuring rod of consistency must not be too rigorously applied. Nevertheless the grotesque mingling of vast cosmic revolutions with the events which the cruder type of popular Messianism had always expected, of a transcendent consummation with the secular national destiny, is impressive and significant.

Only AFTER the mighty upheavals in the realm of nature (verses 4-6) is God to appear to punish the Gentiles and 'DESTROY ALL THEIR IDOLS' in an act of Judgment (verse 7). Moreover verse 8 may refer to Israel's triumph over Rome, and

indicate that at this stage the writer is introducing a temporary earthly Messianic Kingdom into his portrait, as a passing phase before Israel's exaltation to the skies at the End. And then again even when Israel has been raised to the heavenly places, he cannot refrain from extending to them a boon truly unworthy of their new estate - they shall then rejoice at the sight of their enemies tortured in Gehenna (verse 10). Two worlds are met together in this delineation, the earthly, dear vision of the Jewish Messianic dreams, and the heavenly spiritual world. Through his endeavour to make the best of both, his representation of the future is distinguished by its irrationality.

He has not at all separated in his thought, as Psalms of Solomon did to some extent, the notion of life immortal in the heavens for individuals and the destiny of the whole nation Israel. For him Israel is the central fact in the universe (from him comes the *pièce de résistance* of Jewish nationalism in the Ap. and Ps. - God "hath created the world on behalf of His people" 1:12), and so the Future which God has purposed will be hers and hers alone. It is here Israel, and not individuals who are related to the eternal heavenly world. The idea of the transference of all Israel to the skies at the consummation gives a new and yet more illogical turn to that tendency to fuse Messianism and Transcendent Eschatology which is a feature of most apocalypses.

The Assumption represents a return to a primitive

standpoint in so far as it pays no regard to the individual at all. The author thinks only of Israel, so that there appears here a notion that was to become current in the Jewish theology (e.g. Shemoth Rabba, Chapter 28) that the whole of the elect people would partake of the final blessings. The mysterious figure of Taxo⁴³ in Chapter 9 has been thought to stand for the elect people itself which proves itself worthy to be the first-fruits of the Messianic Kingdom. An interesting (if not completely reliable!) sidelight upon the absolute centrality of Israel for this writer!

There is no appearance of a personal Messiah in the hymn of Chapter 10. The Kingdom is instituted entirely by God's intervention, it is the reign of God Himself that must be assured (verse 7: "For the Most High will arise, the Eternal God alone"). Still the hymn is 'Messianic', for the true theme is the glorification at the End, of the elect nation, the 'Messianic' nation. Israel's inheritance of the Kingdom is not quite completely automatic; it is conditional upon the People's repentance: "His name should be called upon until the day of repentance in the visitation wherewith the Lord shall visit them in the consummation of the end of the days". (1:18). Yet thereafter all good things will be in store for Israel alone in the heavenly world.

The text of verses 9 and 10, intimating the exaltation of Israel to heaven, is difficult:

verse 9: "And He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of the stars

In the place of their habitation."

This translation follows the Latin text, which reads simply 'loco habitationis eorum'. On the assumption of a Hebrew original the text would therefore be something like **במקום חושבם** which is clearly defective and mars the parallelism. Some notice of the place of the stars is expected. On these grounds Charles has restored the text thus **והקים חושבך בם** a reasonable and probable emendation, now to be rendered, "And He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of the stars, And He will establish thy habitation among them".⁴⁴ As it is this second clause, in its emended form, which alone authoritatively announces Israel's future abode as being in the heavens at the consummation, caution has to be exercised before attributing to the author too clear a notion of this heavenly destiny for Israel. And even though the emended text be correct, the whole may merely be figurative. That is, however, infinitely less likely than if, excluding the adopted reading in the second clause, we are left with the words as in the Latin text. For it is very possible that the prophecy, 'He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of the stars' is a graphic and vivid manner of describing the not necessarily celestial glories of the consummation for Israel (cf. Psalms of Solomon 1:5; Jeremiah 51:9).

Nevertheless the cumulative evidence of verses 9 and 10 appears to justify assigning to the author the notion of Israel's translation to the skies at the End. Charles says of verse 10a ("And thou wilt look from on high and wilt see

thy enemies in Ge(henna), And thou wilt recognise them and rejoice"), "if both Israel and their enemies were on earth, and Israel had just triumphed over the latter, this statement would be absurd. But if they are respectively in heaven and gehenna, the recognition is full of point, and just cause for rejoicing".⁴⁵

In the Assumption of Moses individuality is absorbed in the collective racial life; collective Israel cannot be said to die a real death. She is therefore exalted to heaven smoothly and directly at the End (10:9). The idea of a real resurrection can arise only when physical death constitutes a real barrier to be overcome.⁴⁶ Death is no problem here. Charles appears then to go too far even in declaring that "there seems to be no resurrection of the body, but of the spirit only".⁴⁷ Israel is raised not from death, but from a lower level of life to the heavenly order. The conception of the heavenly world to come as the exclusive property of Israel may fairly be described then as indeed the reductio ad absurdum of Jewish Messianism.

The Assumption of Moses dates from a time when the belief in the resurrection must have been established in many places. Yet though there is room for its appearance here, there is in fact no sign of it. As in the Psalms of Solomon and Jubilees, the idea of resurrection here also has been hidden

away (it could hardly have been unknown to them) in the remote and dusty corners of the mind, or totally thrust out to yield place to other pre-occupations.

The rationale of the absence of any real resurrection hope from the works examined in this Chapter is its close and integral connection with the Messianic expectation, a connection original and primitive which could never easily be disrupted. The authors of these works, although dominated still by the popular and traditional Messianism, have nevertheless been granted some vision of a transcendent consummation, of a life eternal in the heavens for righteous individuals. While then refraining from all mention of the resurrection in its traditional place at the inauguration of the earthly Messianic Kingdom, they have not succeeded in transposing it in clear and definite form to the threshold of the future heavenly order of life. In this respect they differ from I Enoch 91-104, which has spiritualised the concept of resurrection and changed its whole environment.

It remains to append to this Chapter a note on a work, which presents peculiar problems of its own, The Books of Adam and Eve, and upon whose evidence it is wise to refrain from building.

The Books of Adam and Eve.

This work is usually described as the Book of Adam and Eve, or more frequently given the title "Life of Adam and Eve" (*Vita Adae et Evae*) from the Latin Version. It consists mainly

of haggadic material, or legendary incidents in the life of Adam and Eve not appearing in the Bible. Christians took it over and developed and expanded it, and so it bears in many places the obvious imprint of Christian hands. It is difficult to discover the original Jewish kernel. There are two forms of the work, the one just mentioned preserved in the Latin mss., and the Greek Version frequently erroneously called the 'Apocalypse of Moses'. The problem of the relation of the Latin and Greek is both important and perplexing. The Latin Version features the popular Messianism; the Greek on the other hand knows nothing of Messianism, but announces a life of delights and immortality in Paradise around the Tree of Life.

It is at once apparent that if the Apocalypse of Moses can be regarded as forming a whole with the Vita Adae, and the two comprise only ONE document, there is again that precarious balance between Messianism and transcendental ideals of a heavenly immortality. But not even the greatly daring could venture so finally to settle the critical question on the side of unity as to allow the deduction.

The view is in fact expressed by L.S.A. Wells⁴⁸ that the Apoc. Moses was the original document; it was taken up by a translator, combined with other Jewish legends and rendered into Latin. The addition of Christian touches may have been made subsequently. But whether the Apocalypse as it stands is itself a unity is well-nigh impossible to ascertain, so badly dis-arranged is the text.

Certain notable expositors of the book's contents do, however, seem to proceed on the assumption that the two do in fact form a unity.⁴⁹ And presumably all the extant types of text, Latin and Greek, Slavonic and Armenian, are descended from a single Greek original which itself goes back to a Semitic Archetype.⁵⁰ The present diversities in the text can be accounted for by the accretions that must have grown through the narration from memory of much of the haggadic material of which the work consists. But in the last resort the very nature of this collection of ancient legends relating to 'our first father' almost precludes us from speaking of the UNITY of either version itself, or of the two together.

Moreover the intrusive presence almost everywhere of Christian interpolations, its late date (guesses range between the 1st and 3rd centuries A.D.)⁵¹ make it hazardous to depend upon the teaching of the book at all as evidence for inter-testamental Judaism. Its main interest here lies in the manner in which the Apoc.Moses offers the resurrection hope as source of consolation, as II Macc. had done much more emphatically.

In sections 25-29 of the Vita Adae the popular Messianic hopes appear in their customary form. It is a passage full of the grotesqueries of apocalyptic descriptions of heavenly visitations. There is no personal Messiah. God's appearance upon earth marks the establishment of the Kingdom (29:7). This writer too succumbs to a comfortable utopianism - there will be a sudden transition to an age of innocence among men

upon the earth (29:9). The navel of the new age is still to be Jerusalem, the Temple there⁵², around which the life of the Kingdom revolves and in the vicinity of which God and the righteous live together. Resurrection is not mentioned in this context. But the life of the Messianic Kingdom is eternal, and the righteous are inviolable: the wicked suffer their due retribution at the hand of God. The idea of the righteous 'shining as the sun' (10:9) is here entirely figurative, for the Kingdom is very clearly earthly.

There is allusion to the resurrection in the Vita Adae 51:2, where Michael the archangel addresses Seth thus: "Man of God, mourn not for thy dead more than six days, for on the seventh day is the sign of the resurrection and the rest of the age to come; on the seventh day the Lord rested from all His works". The resurrection is here closely connected with the Sabbath rest. Allusion seems to be made to it as if it were a well-known and established belief, and required neither definition nor apology. Its mention here makes the silence concerning it in the Messianic passage 25-29 a little strange. But in a document so obviously incorporating haggadic fragments it is useless to try and co-ordinate such contrasting passages. It may, however, be significant that Vita Adae 51:2 is here parallel to the Apocalypse of Moses, in which the resurrection is elsewhere well attested but, there is no trace of Messianism. Accommodation of the documents with each other

at certain points is possible - for the Vita nowhere else mentions the resurrection than in 51:2, save in an obvious Christian interpolation in 42:2. But the intricate interrelationship of the documents cannot be unravelled.

As it occurs in the Apocalypse of Moses itself the resurrection idea bears the stamp of later Judaism. Whether it be to some extent through contact with Hellenistic ideas, the writer appears to admit a separate existence of soul and body - at least with the advent of death. In 31:4 Adam, about to die, addresses Eve thus: "God will not forget me, but will seek His own creature: and now arise rather and pray to God, till I give up my spirit into His hands who gave it me." In 32:4 the angel of humanity speaks thus to Eve: "Rise up, Eve, for behold Adam thy husband hath gone out of his body. Rise up and behold his spirit borne aloft to his Maker." Again in 35:1 and 2 Eve addresses Seth: "Look up and behold with thine eyes the seven heavens opened and see how the soul of thy father lies on its face and all the holy angels are praying on his behalf" The soul at death mounts towards God its maker. The body is taken to Paradise in the third heaven and left there until the day of Judgment and of resurrection. "There came one of the Seraphim with six wings and snatched up Adam and carried him off to the Acherusian Lake, and washed him thrice in the presence of God." (Then God hands Adam to Michael saying:) "Lift him up

into Paradise unto the third heaven, and leave him there until that fearful day of my reckoning which I shall make in the world." (cf. 40:1, where God speaks thus to the Archangels: "Go away to Paradise in the third heaven, and strew linen clothes and cover the body of Adam").

In 41:1 to 3, however, the body of Adam appears to rest in the earth: "And God called and said, 'Adam, Adam'. And the body answered from the earth and said: 'Here am I, Lord'. And God saith to him: 'I told thee (that) earth thou art and to earth shalt thou return. Again I promise to thee the Resurrection; I will raise thee up, in the Resurrection with every man who is of thy seed". Adam's earthly body at death has its counterpart which has been transported to the Paradise of the third heaven, there to await the resurrection. Now it may be doubted whether the accounts of the resurrection of Adam, the legendary figure, enshrouded with a host of myths, has any bearing at all upon the doctrine of the resurrection as that eschatological event was to affect ordinary mortals.

And even concerning Adam's fate the haggadist is confused in his speculations. Paradise appears to mean all and everything to him, the intermediate stage and the final abode of the blessed (13:4). The Greek notion of the dichotomy of soul and body does not appear to have been thoroughly assimilated, for while the fleshly body of Adam is in the earth, there is another ghostly body in Paradise, and that is

a far cry from the Greek view of the body as a tomb, which the soul leaves behind gladly. Such dichotomy as does exist according to the representations of the Ap. and Ps. is not in fact essentially un-Jewish, for as will appear more fully in a later stage, the separation of soul and body in their view is not natural, but an unnatural calamity produced by physical death which can only be overcome by their subsequent re-union. So there seems to be latent here in Apoc. Moses the idea, common to later rabbinic Judaism, of the reunion of the soul with the body from Paradise in the consummation.

Though his predictions about Adam are not to be predicated in detail of the rest of men, it is clear from 41:3 that he contemplates for all a resurrection in the body at the end of the times ("I will raise thee up, in the resurrection with every man who is of thy seed"). This appears even more plainly in the passage 13:2-5: "Seth, man of God, weary not thyself with prayers and entreaties concerning the tree which floweth with oil to anoint thy father, Adam. For it shall not be thine now, but in the end of the times. Then shall all flesh be raised up from Adam till that great day - all that shall be of the holy people. Then shall the delights of Paradise be given to them and God shall be in their midst. And they shall no longer sin before His face, for the evil heart shall be taken from them, and there shall be given them a heart understanding the good and to serve God only".

There is, as observed previously, no sign of Messianism in Apoc. Moses. The End contemplated is beyond that, final, definitive. The bald statement that all FLESH is to be raised up, joined with the pronouncement of a universal consummation in Paradise, seems remarkable and unusual, for some spiritualisation of the resurrection idea might have been expected, to adapt it to such a view of the End. But although the resurrection here brings men to the final state of Blessedness, to the life of immortality in Paradise, materialist traits are not necessarily absent from the description. The Jewish imagination could only tear itself away always with a great struggle from its materialist roots. Nevertheless too much stress cannot be laid upon the word 'flesh' here, for in a supposed Semitic original כָּל־בָּשָׂר would mean rather 'all mankind'. No more than that may be implied here, so the writer is not to be too hastily accused of combining a grossly materialist view of the resurrection with a spiritual view of the End.

The feeling is imparted by the Apocalypse that the resurrection is being preached as a universal solace. Yet there is no clear-cut resurrection doctrine in the work. In 13:2-5 the resurrection is to be the privilege only of the righteous, 'all that shall be of the holy people'. Elsewhere it is for all men (41:3). In 13:2-5 the risen are to enjoy a life of delights and immortality in Paradise

around the Tree of Life (cf. 28:4), very close to God Himself. And there is to be sin no more. In 28:4 only is a condition attached to the attainment of resurrection: "If thou shouldst keep thyself from all evil, as one about to die, when again the Resurrection hath come to pass, I will raise thee up and then there shall be given to thee the Tree of Life." Finally in 43:2 and 3 the resurrection is linked with the sabbath rest of God. From these diverse fragments it is impossible to gather details of the writer's conception of the mode and scope of the resurrection with any definiteness.

If the Apocalypse of Moses forms a whole with the Vita Adae and the two constitute together a single document, there is then in the whole work a very remarkable isolation of Messianism and definitive Eschatology. For then the author would be thinking of two distinct and successive stages, the Messianic times portrayed in the Vita 25-29, and then the life of Paradise at the final End to which men are brought by the resurrection. A divorcement so complete between the Messianic expectation and a universalist and definitive Eschatology would be unique in the Ap. and Ps. The two usually "run into each other and blend like the overlapping edges of two clouds".⁵³ But on the critical question of the relation of the two documents no final pronouncement can be made!

CHAPTER VII.EARTH AND HEAVEN.

The Similitudes of Enoch represent the culmination of the tendency to confuse the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and transcendental in delineations of the Eschata. It has been held that "it becomes possible to group the Apocalypses into 'this-worldly' and 'other-worldly' as one cannot group the Messianic visions of the great prophets".¹ But the claim is misleading in the light of the repeated inclination in the Apocalypses to merge earth and heaven, discovered at its strongest in the Similitudes. Earth and heaven join hands, as he images the future. Volz has written of the Similitudes: "The earth is heaven, heaven is the earth, the cleft is gone; God, the Son of Man, the blessed dwell together".² Unhappily the manner of Volz's expression tends to obscure the intense conflict in which the Enochic programmatist has to become engaged in his endeavours to shake himself free from the trammels of the earthly and the material, and reach to the skies in his portraiture of the End.

The title of this Chapter is significant in the order of its words. In this merging of earth and heaven, earth is the dominant partner. The Similitudes stand witness to the undoubted resiliency of the primitivist Messianic expectations. "In the Parables of Enoch", G.F. Moore has it, "the old

expectation of a national golden age is translated into a confused Eschatology".³

Similitudes of Enoch.

From the vast multitude of critical problems surrounding the Book of Enoch there emerges fairly clearly the fact that Chapters 37-71 constitute a separate section of the book. There agreement ends. The work has been subjected to intensive study by virtue chiefly of its 'Son of Man' teaching.

It is now commonly recognised that the Similitudes are not a loose aggregate of unrelated fragments, but a work of some order and with some semblance of literary unity.⁴ The undoubted presence of Christian interpolations has caused the work to be subjected nevertheless to a process of extensive obelising. Particularly Chapters 70 and 71 have been suspected.⁵ The task of sifting out from the supposed original Jewish kernel of the work allegedly Christian elements is immensely complicated. The text, it has to be remembered, is a confused Ethiopic version. A recent writer has therefore rejected the evidence of the Similitudes for pre-Christian Jewish ideas as completely untrustworthy, and "quite inadequate to prove anything".⁶ Lagrange anticipated this objection: "A very great reserve is imposed on us if we want to prove anything from the Book of Enoch - (especially regarding the title Son of Man)".⁷

It is as an important witness to a very definite

tendency in Jewish eschatological thought that the work has its place here. In the examination of its Eschatology which follows, its substantial unity is assumed, in line with most modern criticism.

The Coming Kingdom - and the Resurrection.

The Similitudes openly proclaim a Kingdom to come, neither completely terrestrial, nor yet wholly celestial. It is set rather in a new heaven and a new earth. Thus 45:4-6, (4) "Then I will cause Mine Elect One to dwell among them, And I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light. (5) And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing: And I will cause Mine elect ones to dwell upon it: But the sinners and evil-doers shall not set foot thereon. (6) For I have provided and satisfied with peace My righteous ones And have caused them to dwell before Me." Towards this notion of a vast cosmic revolution, developed from Isaiah 65:17 and 66:22, as already noted, foreign eschatological systems may have provided some urge. But sources are not the concern of the moment!

It is a mistake to believe that by this miraculous transformation the material earthly substratum of the new world that ensues is totally disintegrated, and that the scene of the blessings thereat to be enjoyed is all set in heaven. It seems impossible in fact not to recognise from 45:5 that the setting of the new order is a transformed earth, but earth still, with the heaven above the earth changed also, evermore clement and bright, without darkness,

but still the heaven above the earth. G.F. Moore asserts justly: "the restoration in the Similitudes is to a life on earth".⁸

The potency of the prophetic earthly and materialist traditions concerning the future is clearly seen in other survivals in the Similitudes. The Messiah exercises a powerful dominion over the nations of the earth (52:4). The assault of the Parthians and Medes upon the Messiah's domain is depicted in 56:5 ff.⁹ Israel after the destruction of her enemies is to be reconstituted as a nation (57:1, "And it came to pass after this that I saw again a host of waggons, whereon men were riding, and they came on the wings of the wind from the East, and from the West to the South". Through a misunderstanding of the phrase, 'on the wings of the wind', merely a metaphor for the swiftness of their return, Lagrange regards this as a purely supernatural restoration, ('Ce retour est ici complètement surnaturel')¹⁰. Even were it so, there is no gainsaying the note of intense patriotism: the return of the dispersed of Israel is deep desire for him: with him still is this relic of the popular Messianism.

He exhibits indeed a powerful community-consciousness, for he looks for the day, "when the cōngregation of the righteous shall appear, And sinners shall be judged for their sins, And shall be driven from the face of the earth" (38:1). A like prophecy is contained in 53:6, "And after this the Righteous and Elct One shall cause the house of his

congregation to appear: henceforth they shall be no more hindered in the name of the Lord of Spirits." Is he thinking of the restoration at the consummation of the Temple or of the synagogues? At any rate he is filled with thoughts of the worshipping society of Israel. Again in 61:4 his thought revolves round the righteous of Israel: the ropes and measures spoken of in this context seem to be the bonds of the community of Israel, surviving and departed. (61:4), "The elect shall begin to dwell with the elect, And these are the measures which shall be given to faith. And which shall strengthen righteousness. (5) And these measures shall reveal all the secrets of the depths of the earth, And those who have been destroyed by the desert, And those who have been devoured by the beasts, And those who have been devoured by the fish of the sea, That they may return and stay themselves On the day of the Elect One: For none shall be destroyed before the Lord of Spirits, And none can be destroyed").

Beside the continuance of these facets of the old Messianism there is also the presence of other Old Testament reminiscences among the more advanced ideas of the Similitudes. The notion of Sheol for instance is hardly developed in the Similitudes: in 51:1 it is the abode of the dead, and in 56:8 it is equivalent again to the pit of death: "And in those days Sheol will open its jaws, and they will be swallowed up therein, and their destruction will be at an end."¹¹

Several Chapters then, notably 56-57, mingle the

transcendent world catastrophe with the final political fortunes of Israel and Jerusalem and with the return of the scattered tribes, and so produce a blend of the popular Eschatology with transcendent celestial Eschatology. It is therefore inaccurate to assert, as Bonsirven has done, that every nationalist note is effaced and the whole setting is now completely supra-terrestrial.¹²

The confusions of that important passage in 39:4 ff. plunge us into deep and difficult waters: (4) "And there I saw another vision, the dwelling-places of the holy, And the resting-places of the righteous. (5) Here mine eyes saw their dwellings with His righteous angels, And their resting-places with the holy. And they petitioned and interceded and prayed for the children of men, And righteousness flowed before them as water, And mercy like dew upon the earth. Thus it is amongst them for ever and ever. (6a) And in that place mine eyes saw the Elect One of righteousness and of faith, (7a) And I saw his dwelling-place under the wings of the Lord of Spirits. (6b) And righteousness shall prevail in his days, And the righteous and elect shall be without number before Him for ever and ever. (7b) And all the righteous and elect before Him shall be strong as fiery lights, And their mouth shall be full of blessing, And their lips extol the name of the Lord of Spirits, And righteousness before Him shall never fail (And uprightness shall never fail before Him)."

There are here several curious inconsistencies.

They must be recognised. The righteous are pictured as dwelling in heavenly mansions with the angels. Do they now therefore enjoy the eternity of final blessing? It is clear that the angels still intercede for the children of men, presumably at this point still sojourners upon the earth. Has the great transformation not then occurred and the consummation not yet come? The delineation leaves much room for doubt. In the crucible of the writer's imagination earth and heaven are strangely fused. At the End in other words the scene lies now here, now there: there is no rigid line of separation.

The fact of this confusion has not often been firmly grasped. Consequently various devices have been adopted to resolve the anomalies of this perplexing passage 39:4-7. The dwelling of the righteous in 'mansions' with the righteous angels and even in the presence of the Lord of Spirits has been understood as their intermediate station preparatory to the bliss of the Messianic Kingdom on earth.¹³ Sutcliffe, favouring this interpretation, claims that R.H. Charles, holding that "the fact that the Messiah is surrounded by all His righteous and elect ones shows that the history of the world is closed", introduces into the passage the inconsistencies he thinks he finds there. But in spite of Sutcliffe's attempt at a simplification of the issue, the inconsistencies are in the passage before Charles' intervention. It is quite unlikely that the 'mansions' here refer to an intermediate dwelling-place before the final

consummation, for the idea of a CLOSE COMMUNION with the Lord of the spirits in the intermediate abode would be a rare and singular idea, and further it is announced that thus they are to fare for ever and ever (verses 6 and 7).

Alternatively this text together with the parallel passages in 61:12 and 60:8,23, where again the elect are placed in the garden of life or the Paradise of the righteous, have been quietly extruded as unoriginal to the Enochic text, 39:4 ff. as an interpolation inconsonant with the rest of the work, 61:12 and 60:8, 23 as fragments of the Book of Noah, and finally also 70:3-4 as an addition to the Similitudes.¹⁴

Charles was nearer the mark when he observed that in such visions as 39:4 ff. "there is no exact observance of the unities of time and place".¹⁵ The writer has not defined the consummation he envisages. On the one hand the Judgment seems past and over, and on the other the angels are found still praying for men upon the earth. The location of the dwelling-place of the righteous does appear at a glance to be heaven, for they are described as abiding under the wings of the Lord of Spirits (39:7a). But again this may be only a metaphor (cf. Psalm 91:4) for God's protective care of His own, wherever they may dwell. And at all events we find that the earth is still peopled with men, and the consummation cannot then have arrived. The inference that OUGHT to be drawn from all this is that the Similitudes,

owing to the sturdy persistence of the popular earthly ideals, run together into one the ideas of an earthly consummation and transcendent Eschatology.

Rudolf Otto¹⁶ on the other hand has recourse to exotic religious systems to explain the present notion of 'the mansions of the righteous'. He regards the inhabitants of these 'mansions' as the Jewish counterparts of the eastern pitaras and the Iranian fravashis, in the spiritual world which preceded the earthly world. But the setting up of counterparts in a religion to figures or ideas already established in foreign religions is neither the practice nor the method of foreign borrowings in religion.

Otto's proposal, however, of the notion of a spiritual world, which has always been in existence and preceded the earthly world, is more suggestive. W.D. Davies believes that the 'mansions of the righteous' are in fact the World to Come that exists already, the Eternal Age set over against this present.¹⁷ It is doubtful whether the Similitudes have arrived at a dualism so developed. The dwelling-places of the righteous are not here a conceptual notion, as though plainly in existence now: they are seen in 'vision': they are actually still to come: the Vision of 39:4-12 is a prophecy of things yet to be.

A plain recognition of the incoherences and the confusions resulting from the merging together of earthly and

heavenly perspectives of the End neither does violence to nor overdraws the evidence of the text, and does not either necessitate a departure from the main stream of the Jewish traditions in order to explain them.

The third Parable, however, in Chapters 58-69 does contain a number of passages embodying the notion of a more or less purely celestial existence for the righteous. Even Rudolf Otto, who ascribes to Judaism a large indebtedness to Parseeism for many features of its Eschatology, argues from this section of Enoch that the Eschatology of late Judaism is not simply and solely an alien phenomenon. His words are worth quoting in full: "Rather they (i.e. the later apocalyptists) work upon germinal ideas found even in ancient Israel. The thing lacking in ancient Israel, and first beginning to develop with apocalyptic, was a dualistic sense of a world of God, which is by no means this world, but which as the real world of God is even more strictly distinguished from and even opposed to it. Even if spatially conceived particularly as localized in heaven and in the skies, even if now conceived with heightened earthly images, nevertheless we can know and feel really for the first time the clearer consciousness of a transcendent unwordly, supramundane existence."¹⁸

Yet that dualism has reached a far greater maturity in the Apocalypse of Baruch and IV Ezra than in the Similitudes, where heaven and earth are so much merged

together that there can be no thoroughgoing dualism. Otto's words, however, could be accurately applied to the section, Chapters 58-69, where there is that keener perception of a supernatural existence - and that more especially if within this section can be included Chapters 70-71, regarded then as forming a climax of the whole book of the Similitudes. In 70:3 and 4 we read: "And from that day I was no longer numbered amongst them: and he set me between the two winds, between the North and the West, where the angels took the chords to measure for me the place for the elect and righteous. (4) And there I saw the first fathers and the righteous who from the beginning dwell in that place".

From these words it would appear that the heavenly realm, which is the dwelling-place of the 'first fathers and the righteous', is set over against the present earthly order and is co-existent with it. But this heavenly dwelling-place of the righteous forefathers is also the future abode of the righteous elect, for it is measured pending their arrival. The Future Age, that is, exists already, and has its present inhabitants. Parallel to this is 71:15, "And he said unto me, 'He proclaims unto thee peace in the name of the world to come; for from hence has proceeded peace since the creation of the world, and so shall it be unto thee for ever and for ever and ever.'" It would be hazardous in the extreme to seek to PROVE anything from these solitary and unique passages in Chapters commonly rejected in toto, or at least believed

to have been extensively interpolated by Christian hands. Too much therefore cannot be construed from these passages concerning a developed dualism in the Similitudes.

It should be noted, however, that in particular Chapter 71 is rich in suggestion for a dualistic approach in pre-Christian Judaism, if as Charles proposes, it dates from before the beginning of the Christian era.¹⁹ The verse 71:15, indicating a ripe dualism, deserves some passing mention. According to its terms, all peace has gone forth from the World to Come (הַעוֹלָם הַבָּא), from something which does not yet exist. Even now in the present, from the very creation of the world, this World to Come is the source of peace to those living present lives on earth.

By a terminology which would have startled the Enochic writer himself, whether rendered in the Hebrew idiom that may have been his, or again the Aramaic idiom, Otto designates the idea here as that of 'dynamic post-existence'.²⁰

W.D. Davies has more recently linked this passage with 39:4 and described their connotation in terms more congenial than Otto's. There is recognition here, Davies claims, of a realm that always is: into it souls come at death, and experience blessedness in this first Age to Come. The Age to Come is also said to come into being AFTER the Messianic Age and the General resurrection.²¹ The Age to Come therefore has two phases, it both IS and COMES.

"And in those passages", Davies writes, "where there is mentioned resurrection, the Age to Come which we enter at death finds its consummation in that Age to Come which follows the resurrection."²²

But the Age to Come which we enter at death of which Davies speaks (it is in fact entered at death in 39:4 ff, but there is no explicit mention of the fact in 71:15), could only have been a hair's breadth away, if even that, in the mind of the writer from the commonly held notion of the intermediate state for the departed dead.²³ And thus in fact E.F. Sutcliffe in the passage 39:4 ff. understood the future 'mansions' of the righteous, as their intermediate dwelling-place.

Even aside from that consideration, it is more than possible that such as Davies have read too much into the Enochic passages and filled them with the richer content of later developments. There is reason to doubt whether the Similitudes have these certainties and that definiteness about the Age to Come, and whether their author at all carefully separated the Messianic Age, the Intermediate Stage, and the final Age to Come.

In the bulk of his work confusion reigns on these great issues. It appears again in 51:1-5, (1) "And in those days shall the earth also give back that which has been entrusted to it, And Sheol also shall give back that which

it has received, and hell will give back that which it owes. (5a) For in those days the Elect One shall arise, (2) And he shall choose the righteous and holy from among them: For the day has drawn nigh that they should be saved. (3) And the Elect One shall in those days sit on My throne, and his mouth shall pour forth all the secrets of wisdom and counsel: For the Lord of Spirits hath given (them) to him and hath glorified him. (4) And in those days shall the mountains leap like rams and the hills also shall skip like lambs satisfied with milk, and the faces of (all) the angels in heaven shall be lighted up with joy. (5b) And the earth shall rejoice, (c) And the righteous shall dwell upon it, (d) And the elect shall walk thereon."

Earth, albeit a transformed earth, miraculously convulsed, is, according to the picture of these verses, the setting of the Kingdom. To participate in this Kingdom the dead are raised in the body (51:1). It is interesting that Lagrange²⁴ rejects this verse as an interpolation in the interest of his view that the Similitudes attest the tremendous superiority of the spirit over the flesh. But there are hardly sufficient grounds for his rejection.

The ideas of 51:1 are in fact very common in Judaism - earth gives up the body, Sheol the soul, and presumably they are re-united in the resurrection. That at any rate, as has been noted, became the orthodox belief of rabbinic Judaism (cf. Bab.Sanhedrin 91a-b).²⁵ The translation

given above of verse 4 is Charles' own. G.F. Moore has criticised it sharply: "Charles transposes, emends, construes and translates 'And the faces of (all) the angels shall be lighted up with joy' - a somewhat insipid conclusion."²⁶ The words should read: "And all will become angels in heaven". So in fact Charles took them in his first Edition of the Book of Enoch (1893)²⁷, remarking that this is not to be weakened into a mere likeness to the angels. He had evidently greatly changed his mind before his second Edition, and his later translation.

"And all will become angels in heaven" is a startling pronouncement of an eventual celestial destiny for the risen righteous, falling as it does at the end of a passage plainly contemplating an earthly consummation and a bodily resurrection for the righteous. Lagrange feels that these few words, if they could be regarded as belonging to the primitive text, would powerfully corroborate the view that the Similitudes portray the final blessing as totally transcendent in character.²⁸ He would fain use their assistance in support of this view, but reluctantly he considers these words to be a Christian interpolation.²⁹ But even the established authenticity of the pronouncement of 51:4 would not strengthen the opinion that the consummation here envisaged is purely celestial. They would rather be outstanding evidence of the fusion and blending of earthly and transcendent notions of the End - for in 51:1-5 terrestrial elements predominate in

the picture: but with the earthly Messianic promises the retribution of the eternal beyond is mingled (if verse 4 be genuine, as there is no strong reason to deny).

Lagrange has pressed his theory of the total isolation of Messianism and transcendent Eschatology in such a work as the *Similitudes* ardently. He dismissed Schürer's contention, made on the basis of 45:4-5, considered above, that ancient Judaism confused the World to Come with the Messianic Age, and held that this does not represent the true current of Judaism. Further he has named a number of passages in this work as indicating a REPLACEMENT of the Messianic reign with a heavenly eternal Age to Come. These passages may now be considered in turn.

1. 58:3 ff. (3) "And the righteous shall be in the light of the sun, And the elect in the light of eternal life: The days of their life shall be unending, And the days of the holy without number. (4) And they shall seek the light and find righteousness with the Lord of Spirits: There shall be peace to the righteous in the name of the Eternal Lord. (5) And after this it shall be said to the holy in heaven That they should seek out the secrets of righteousness, the heritage of faith: For it has become bright as the sun upon earth, And the darkness is past. (6) And there shall be a light that never endeth, And to a limit of days they shall not come, For the darkness shall first have been destroyed, (And the light established before the Lord of Spirits) And

the light of uprightness established for ever before the Lord of Spirits".

Earthly and materialist features are conspicuously lacking from this description of the lot in store for the righteous. Light will be the chief feature of their new existence. The contrast between this passage and 51:1 ff., where the dead are raised to the blessed life of the Messianic Kingdom upon a transformed earth, is clear. It is, however, one thing to note the difference and another to assert that this whole conception in 58:3 ff. is utterly divorced from all ideas of a Messianic consummation, which also are found in the work. Indeed the terms of the description are not themselves entirely probative and determinative. Light is, as noted previously, a common trait of the Messianic Kingdom. The righteous are not here said explicitly to 'rise' nor are they exactly and expressly placed in 'heaven'; it is rather only that the cruder materialist features have faded away. Moreover the passage is introduced (in verse 2) by a promise: "Blessed are ye, ye righteous and elect, For glorious shall be your lot", and notably in 48:7 the lot of the righteous is reserved for them by the Messiah. And again in the present passage there is exhibited a dynamic and not a static conception of the future life - the righteous will 'SEEK' the light. That agrees to some extent with 51:1 ff., where the righteous rise firstly, to the earth, and then suddenly are said to become 'angels in heaven', and may indicate that

the author had some vague notion of a progressive spiritualisation of the risen righteous. But the expressions used by him are neither clear nor definite enough to warrant a dogmatic assertion that such was his view. All is in fact safely accounted for by a comprehension of the unstudied ease with which he moves from earth to heaven in his visions of the End, and continues to oscillate between the two.

2. 61:12: "All who sleep not above in heaven shall bless Him: All the holy ones who are in heaven shall bless Him, And all the elect who dwell in the garden of life."

What was said above of the lengthier parallel passage in 39:4 ff. applies also to this present passage. Only a word need be added here therefore concerning it. The first two clauses refer of course to angelic beings, dwelling in heaven. The natural inference would seem to be that the elect spoken of in the next clause dwell also in heaven. That is clear from the different views entertained regarding the 'mansions of the righteous' in 39:4 ff, which apply presumably also to the 'garden of life' here. It has been taken as the intermediate state of the departed righteous preceding their restoration to the earthly Messianic Kingdom (Sutcliffe), as the Jewish counterpart of the abode of the fravashis and pitaras in Iranian religion, as an interpolation (in a Noachide fragment) in the Similitudes (Bonsirven), as the final heavenly condition of the righteous (Lagrange).³⁰ Certainty about what the author himself had in mind is

beyond us.

3. 62:13-16. (13) "And the righteous and elect shall be saved on that day, And they shall never thenceforward see the face of the sinners and unrighteous. (14) And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, And with that Son of Man shall they eat And lie down and rise up for ever and ever. (15) And the righteous and elect shall have risen from the earth, And ceased to be of downcast countenance. And they shall have been clothed with garments of glory, (16) And these shall be the garments of life from the Lord of Spirits: And your garments shall not grow old, Nor your glory pass away before the Lord of Spirits."

There is more to be said in favour of understanding this passage as a prediction of an earthly rather than a purely transcendent consummation. 13b would be quite pointless if the author were thinking only of a heavenly consummation. Verse 15 does not allude to resurrection from the earth into the celestial world: the words apply rather to God's achievement of victory for the righteous, no longer prostrate upon earth before their enemies.³¹ The details of the present description of the future of the righteous, some of them with a hint of the physical, are numerous enough to warrant the contrast with the opinions of some at least of the rabbis of later Judaism, who recognised the celestial Age to Come to be inexpressible in any terms of time and space. "Rabbi Hiyya ben Abba said in Rabbi Johanan's name: All the prophets prophesied (all the good things) only

in respect of the Messianic Era, but as for the world to come, 'the eye hath not seen, O Lord, beside thee, what He hath prepared for him that waiteth for Him'" (Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 99a).³²

The Similitudes still venture a description! Yet they rise to the vision of a transcendental world at the End (though that world borrow some of its traits and shape and appearance from the earthly Messianic Kingdom which largely dominated the writer's hopes also). It is transcendent enough and celestial enough to require a considerable spirituality on those who would be its denizens. That they might be adapted for their heavenly life they must be clothed upon with garments of glory. While therefore this act of being clothed upon with the garments of glory has the character of a spiritual Eschatology, it meant clothing with a body, but a new body composed of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$. It is well to observe that this assimilation of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$, in the Similitudes, is not closely connected, explicitly at least, with the resurrection. We are left to INFER the transference of the righteous somehow into that heavenly life in which they shall require new bodies. It is not the RESURRECTION which accomplishes the change: for in 51:1 the resurrection seems to bring men to earth, and there no immediate mention is made of glorification of the risen body.

The $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ of which the risen body is to be composed is not an abstraction, but in the materialist

Jewish imagination luminous matter (cf. I. Enoch 14:8-25; Test. Levi, 2 and 3), such as appears to constitute the substance of the celestial spheres.

Rudolf Otto was, in view of all that has been said, very wide of the mark in his statement that: "it is completely outside Israelite tradition, and undoubtedly due to Parseeism, when Enoch in Chapter LI (here only) presents the doctrine of a bodily resurrection"³³, or again that: "a conception of the bodily resurrection of the dead of which Israel had known nothing had come from the East, and penetrated into the book of Enoch, although it is quite definite in only one passage".³⁴

Chapter 51 of Enoch is rather eloquent testimony to the ingrained Jewish disposition to hope for an earthly consummation and a restoration of the present physical life, a hope which persisted illogically enough in the very midst of far more spiritual ideals of the future life. The Similitudes betray the profound tension in notions of the Eschata between the earthly and heavenly, the physical and spiritual, characteristic of Jewish apocalyptic speculation.

There are therefore grave doubts whether the resurrection in the Similitudes (or in the Psalms of Solomon and I Enoch 91-104, on all three of which Charles bases his judgment) the resurrection is so completely spiritual, or the tendency to spiritualise the resurrection so clearly marked even as to justify Charles' conclusion that "we find

that the doctrine of the resurrection which was current amongst the cultured Pharisees in the century immediately preceding the Christian era was of a truly spiritual nature".³⁵ Such conclusion of course obscures that very tension in Eschatological thought in which the Pharisees no doubt shared with the rest who were interested.

Even in the Apocalypse of Baruch where a dualistic separation of this world from the Age to Come has been attained, completely spiritual notions of the resurrection might have been expected, and yet there continue there with an obstinate persistence the more primitive ideas of a bodily resurrection to the present earth. How account for this survival except by recognising the foundational nature and continuous strength of these same primitive materialist ideals!

Certainly both early and later rabbinical thought dwelt much upon the present body in thoughts of the resurrection. The physical characteristics of the resurrection body tended in fact, at the expense of the much more infrequent spiritual notions, to grow more and more pronounced in rabbinic circles. First we find the respective schools of Hillel and Shammai debating the relation of the formation of the present body to that of the body in the future Age (Genesis Rabba 14:5). To a question whether the dead rise naked or clothed upon Rabbi Meir replies that even as the grain of wheat which is buried naked is clad in many garments when it appears, so is it with the resurrection

body.³⁶ Further we discover a report of the saying of Rabbi Eliezer: "All the dead will rise at the resurrection of the dead, dressed in their shrouds. Know thou that this is the case. Come and see from (the analogy of) the one who plants (seed) in the earth. He plants naked (seeds) and they arise covered with many coverings; and the people who descend into the earth dressed (with their garments), will they not rise up dressed (with their garments)?"

The Apostle Paul was probably true to his inherited Pharisaism in insisting upon the embodied nature of the resurrection, but he felt constrained to spiritualise it, possibly in the face of popular misconceptions.

In concluding this Chapter on the Similitudes notice must be drawn to the continued predominance of the Judgment within the eschatological schema. The Judgment idea permeates the whole work, occurring in very numerous passages (e.g. 45:3; 50:4; 38:1,3,5; 48:8-10; 54:6; 55:3; 67:10; 62:2-5,10; 63; 69:27; 55:4). Resurrection is nowhere the centre-piece, but occupies an outer place.

CHAPTER VIII.THE TWO AGES.

The Similitudes of Enoch exhibited a deepening awareness of another world set over against this present and different from it in essence. But the Eschatology of the Similitudes had not arrived at a true dualism, for the two worlds were merged into each other in thought, and were not yet separated by a great gulf.

The abyss between this world and the world of the beyond is extended to the fullest limits in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch¹ and IV Ezra. "How inwardly serene he must have felt", de Faye has written of the author of IV Ezra, "when the idea of the gulf between this world of darkness and death and that other of light and life was born in him!"²

Yet the logic of the new dualism has not pressed itself upon them with such insistence that they are either of them forced to abandon all hopes of the present world. So they stand as the climax of the two-fold tendencies of Jewish Eschatology, on the one side its increasing ability to project its aspirations into another world than this, eternal in the heavens, and on the other its amazing incapacity for accepting the logic of these loftier dreams and its perennial clinging in spite of them to the time-worn expectation of a Messianic Kingdom to come upon earth.

Apoc.Bar. and IV Ezra are undoubtedly close relatives:³ the problem of deciding which is senior is perplexing. Several different proposals have been made. It has been claimed that Baruch is an inferior imitator of IV Ezra on the ground that Baruch's images are less natural, his theological reflection more advanced, and that if IV Ezra had been a mere copyist his thoughts about the Last Things would have been far less poignant than they are. Upon quite other foundations the same process of 'purposeful imitation' on the part of Baruch has been suggested - since the one apocalypse is designed to improve upon the other, which it openly duplicates, it is obvious that the work which claims the earlier date and the greater name is the borrower for it thus eclipses its rival and holds the field. (The so-called Ezra Apocalypse of course bears the lesser name of Shealtiel or Salathiel). Schürer feels that the dependence may well be the other way round.⁴

In the movement of eschatological thought in Judaism Apoc.Bar. certainly represents a moment preceding IV Ezra. The dualism discoverable in Baruch is less advanced than in IV Ezra which represents its culmination. Apoc.Bar. is here investigated first.

Apocalypse of Baruch.

Unity and date are both greatly disputed. Charles⁵ assumes the composite nature of the book, but at variance with Kabisch and E. de Faye, earlier analysts of the work,

has himself made an independent and extremely complex division of the book, as was remarked in the Introduction. It is sufficient to add here to that previous notice that the Redactor (s) whom Charles introduces into the scene of the history of the book's composition, must have been thoroughly adept at producing puzzles so to have disseminated their materials through the whole, as Charles supposes. Further the important fact can bear reiteration that self-consistency is not the property of the apocalypses; and Baruch's quaint and incongruous *mélange* of ideas should have led to the recognition of inconsistency rather than an easy recourse to theories of composite authorship.⁶

Establishment of the date of Apoc.Bar. would be extremely valuable not so much for setting it at a specific point in a chronological account of the ideas of the apocalypses, but for the interpretation of the book itself. Schürer emphatically declares that it was certainly not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A.D. This date is commonly accepted, e.g. by G.F. Moore⁷, Charles, who dates the major part of the work after 70 A.D.⁸ On the other hand Torrey would put it before 70 A.D. It is worthwhile making some reference to the ingenious fashion in which Torrey arrives at the earlier date - he admits that Apoc.Bar. directly refers to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; some reader of Baruch felt that the prophet Baruch should have shown his knowledge of the second

destruction of Jerusalem, and inserted verses 2-4, paraphrasing Haggai, and in verse 3 predicting the great disaster.

Torrey's theory is plausible enough! Yet it is less the specific mention of the historic incident of the city's fall in a single verse than the general impression of the whole book which points to a date after 70 A.D. - the destruction of the holy city with its temple seems to be still fresh in the memory.

Messianism in Apoc.Bar.

This Apocalypse affords more striking proof than any other almost, of the rugged survival of the terrestrial Messianic hopes of the Jewish people. "It is touching to see the Jews after the catastrophes of 70 A.D. (and 135 A.D.), persisting in the conviction of their superiority, believing that, summoned by God to dominate the nations, they will yet see their hopes realised in the Messianic future, with such assurance that they think they are already on the verge of it."⁹ The persistence of Messianism is clear from these most relevant passages now to be examined, 1) 26-30, 2) 36-40, 3) 53-74.

1) 26-30:1.

The period of tribulation preceding the Messianic era has twelve parts, described in 27:1-13. A fervent nationalism appears in 29:7. "For at that time I will protect only those who are found in those self-same days in this land." The Messianic blessings are to be reserved for

those Jews alone still living in Palestine (cf. 40:2; 71:1). There follows in 29:3-8 an extremely sensuous description of the Messianic Kingdom. First the Messiah 'begins to be revealed' (29:3), but thereafter plays no active rôle. The inhabitants of the Kingdom have a diet of the flesh of Behemoth and Leviathan (29:4); the earth is then prodigiously fertile, each grape producing a 'cor of wine' (29:5). This crudely materialist representation of an earthly Messianic Kingdom is astonishing in its contrasts with the visions of a future celestial felicity elsewhere portrayed in the work.

Most crucial for the investigation here is 30:1, "And it will come to pass after these things, when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled, and He will return in glory, then all who have fallen asleep in hope of Him shall rise again".

The predictions about the Messiah here, coupled with that in 29:3 ("the Messiah will then begin to be revealed") are peculiarly difficult. That prediction of 29:3 Charles pronounces as corrupt and suggests in its stead 'the principate of the Messiah will be revealed'.¹⁰ The prediction of 30:1 he understands to mean that at the close of his reign the Messiah will return in glory to heaven. On this reading of the words, the resurrection envisaged in 30:1 will be to a heavenly life after the return of the Messiah into heaven, (Charles excludes the words 'of Him', it should be noted, and reads merely 'all who have fallen asleep in hope shall rise

again').

But a quite other interpretation than Charles' is more than possible. The text of 29:3 can reasonably be retained as it stands, 'the Messiah will then begin to be revealed'. This process of the revelation of the Messiah now begun, is completed only when he fully appears upon earth, 'when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled' (30:1). Thus Violet¹¹ has taken it. The intervening verses would then describe the signs and tokens of Messiah's coming ... and not the events that were to follow it, and the resurrection (30:1) would then bring men to the earthly Messianic Kingdom. There remains, however, that crux interpretum in 30:1 "and He will return in glory'. What is to be made of it? It need not allude to Messiah's return to heaven: it may on the other hand be an apposition to the preceding phrase and indicate the entry of the Messiah now into the full glory of his Kingdom. Or again the phrase has been frequently rejected as spurious, a Christian interpolation on the second Advent of Christ.

M.-J. Lagrange¹², fully realising the difficulty of this phrase, 'et redibit ($\text{ךוּן}]$) in gloria', suggests that a return of this nature would be absolutely unique in Jewish literature; the terminology, however, according to Lagrange, is Christian and the words are probably interpolated. By the exclusion of these words the acts of verses 4 to 8 could be regarded as only the prelude to the advent of the Messiah, and this advent would be accompanied by the

resurrection of the dead. But this sequence of events Lagrange rejects for two reasons, 1) either the whole of verse 30 is an interpolation or it is wholly genuine; 2) the Messiah's rule over a heavenly world is a notion out of harmony with the rest of the book; for in 40:3 his reign seems to end with the end of the world of corruption or at most marks the transition to the incorruptible world (74:2). Lagrange then infers that the resurrection here does not relate to the Messianic Era at all, but introduces the dead to the eternal world at the end of the Messianic Age. On this view the times of the Messiah are merely an interregnum, a passing phase.

The problem of 30:1 is intensified by the verses that immediately follow. If the Apocalypse is substantially a unity, and verses 2 to 5 of this Chapter are in their original place and sequence in the text, then they appear at first sight to be an expansive description of the resurrection mentioned in 30:1 and to refer to the resurrection to the final consummation of the times beyond the Messianic Age, (30:2) "And it will come to pass at that time that the treasuries will be opened in which is preserved the number of the souls of the righteous, and they will come forth, and a multitude of souls will be seen together in one assemblage of one thought, and the first will rejoice and the last will not be grieved. (3) For he knows that the time has come of which it is said, that it is the consummation of the times".

Nevertheless even that would not overrule the possibility of the connection of the resurrection with the Messianic Kingdom in 30:1 (and it is there somehow, if not very precisely, connected with the advent of the Messiah), and thereafter in subsequent verses the relation of the resurrection to the eternal world of the beyond. Such confusion would be in character, for in a work where expectations of a material consummation are retained beside the spiritual and transcendental, we should not look for a totally consistent resurrection doctrine. In all probability 'Baruch' had little regard for the unities and consistencies of time and place in his speculations on Things to Come.

J.J. Bonsirven¹³, with kindred outlook here to both Charles and Lagrange, feels that in Apoc.Bar. the resurrection is so much bound up with the ultimate Age beyond, and the great Messianic texts so little mention it, that he desires to exclude both verses 1 and 2 of Chapter 30 as alien to the context and incongruous with the rest of the vision. But the text should not thus be pruned to reduce inconsistencies, particularly in apocalyptic ideas.

Charles¹⁴ of course thinks the resurrection here is related to the Age of celestial felicity and not at all to Messianism, solely on the basis of 30:1, and his interpretation of it. Verses 2 to 5 in Charles' analysis of the book belong to quite a different section. Nearly all that has been done and written has been in the interest of imposing logic and

consistency upon the apocalyptic visions and prophecies of this literature! Naturally the central anomalies of Jewish eschatological thought have thus been obscured.

2) 36 - 40.

This prophecy is cast in the form of a vision, couched in allegorical terms, and interpreted to Baruch by the Lord. After the destruction of the four kingdoms (as in Daniel), the last to be identified probably with Rome, the principate of the Messiah will be revealed (39:7), and the leader of the only surviving enemy of Israel will be brought to Zion for judgment under the Messiah's rod (40:1). The Messiah will protect the 'righteous remnant' of Israel (40:2). Thereupon his principate will last forever until the world of corruption is at an end (40:3). G.F. Moore has described the Messiah in the Apoc.Bar. as 'a symbol, not a hero'.¹⁵ But in this prophecy on the other hand he is a warrior leader whose victories over the enemies of Israel will herald in the earthly Kingdom.

There is in the whole prophecy no mention of a resurrection. The question which the passage raises is whether for the writer the Messianic Kingdom partakes of the world of corruption, and therefore is not endless but temporary, or whether "the Messiah's kingdom appears to last so long as time shall last, and beyond its horizons there is nothing to be seen" (H.H.Rowley).¹⁶ In dependence alone upon the words which the writer has set before us in 40:3, "And his

principate will stand for ever, until the world of corruption is at an end, and until the times aforesaid are fulfilled", it seems impossible to decide. But even Lagrange¹⁷ admits that in 40:3 the Messianic Kingdom apparently lasts indefinitely as being precedently the salvation of Israel. Then in a moment, however, Lagrange is back plying his theory that in Apoc.Bar. all the interest is in the eternal world to come in the beyond as the final consummation, adding that the indeterminate duration of the Messianic Kingdom in 40:3 is not synonymous with the endless duration of the World to Come.

That the Baruch writer himself had this finesse and nicety of distinction is quite unlikely. There is great temptation here to be clearer than our sources. The distinction between the Messianic days and the eternal World to Come is less finely drawn in Apoc.Bar. and in fact in most apocalypses than perhaps Lagrange would wish. For whereas here the picture is wholly Messianic, the vision of 41-43 is of an incorruptible age apparently unconnected with the Messianic. The later Jewish visionaries saw now one consummation in a blinding light, and now another higher, transcendental, but they kept both sets of hopes, created by their visions, precariously poised together. They could not put away their Messianism even when the celestial Age to Come seemed to be pressing in upon them.

In 42:8¹⁸ ("And the dust will be called, and there will be said to it: 'Give back that which is not thine, and raise up all that thou hast kept until its time'"), there occurs a prophecy of the resurrection in the heart of a larger vision of the incorruptible age, but it is a bare and denuded intimation of resurrection with no attempt at spiritualisation to fit it to its loftier context. These incompatibilities did not strike 'Baruch' as they strike us.

3) 53 - 74.

This long vision of the coming Messianic Era pictures it in sensuous and material terms. A cloud appears from the sea and lowers upon the whole earth: it then sends down black waters and clear six successive times, after which there falls the blackest shower of all. Lightning tops the cloud and heals the earth, and twelve streams from the sea are drawn up to be subject to the lightning. The trappings and accoutrements of the vision can be passed over. It is their meaning as interpreted to Baruch that is of interest. After the appearance of the supernatural signs the Messiah comes to segregate the nations (72:2). Armed with the sword, he destroys Israel's persecutors, but spares others - for bondage to his own people! He then institutes the Messianic Kingdom (73:1). It is a time of joy and healing when all evils shall be done away (73:2-74:1), depicted in language similar to that of 26-30:1.

The verse which terminates the prophecy, 74:2 ("For that time is the consummation of that which is corruptible, and the beginning of that which is not corruptible") is like 40:3 not probative. On the basis of this verse it cannot be asserted categorically that the Messianic Age is merely a short period of transition between the present old world and the incorruptible Age to Come, for the terminology is ambiguous. The most that can be claimed is that the Messianic Age and the incorruptible Age to Come are, in the mind of the Jewish programmatist, contiguous, so nearly related indeed that in their descriptions each lends its own peculiar features to the other, and fast boundary lines are not drawn between them.

There is throughout the prophecy no mention of the resurrection. The words of 72:2 do not refer to the resurrection, 'ex eis vivificabit', but mean rather 'he will allow them life', as in fact Charles has taken it, 'some of them He will spare'.¹⁹ The silence is not to be unduly pressed, for the delineation dwells upon other things, the sudden removal of disease and pain (the old naiveté is here), and wicked passions of the heart by the direct action of the Messiah.

Nevertheless the omission of resurrection is here more singular than usual - in a work much indebted to early Rabbinism, which perpetually discussed the resurrection. Presumably the apocalyptic speculator, torn between yearning for a Messianic Age and visions of an eternal, celestial Age to Come, hardly knew how or where to place a resurrection

in his scheme, but chose to keep a judicious silence in his Messianic prophecies. And when he does expound his resurrection teaching (Chapter 51), he has not uniformly ordained it to one or the other coming Age.

Apoc.Bar. has been described as "the oldest literary evidence for the fusion of early Rabbinism and the popular Messianic expectation".²⁰ Rabbinic ideas abound in the work, the division into twelve parts, the theocratic interpretation of history, the sin of Adam (54:19, cf.54:15; 56:6-14), the promulgation of the Law on Sinai, the reigns of David and Solomon regarded as a sort of Golden Age which the Messianic times would renew. Apoc.Bar. has in fact a "wealth of Haggadah which in almost every point is verifiable in the Midrash".²¹ The particular value for the present enquiry of establishing the taking up of strands of the primitive Messianism and the weaving of them into rabbinic patterns of thought, is that it clearly reveals the permanence and penetration of the ancient, naive and terrestrial hopes, and shows these can be fused with later and frequently more advanced ideas and ideals - at all planes of the apocalyptic literature.

From the above study of the three Messianic prophecies (26+30:1; 36-40; 53+74) it is clear that there is present in Apoc.Bar. the tendency to relate most or all the divine favours still instinctively to the Messianic Age.

The resurrection either may not have been so much severed from its primitive Messianic framework as the silence (except for the doubtful verse, 30:1) regarding it in the Messianic prophecies seems to suggest - we shall see that when we turn to Baruch's detailed resurrection teaching in Chapter 51.

The Age to Come in Apoc.Bar.

Dualistic notions of a world set over against this present obviously exist beside the popular hopes of a Messianic Kingdom, which appear throughout the book and have not been displaced by them. The gulf between this age and the Age to Come is narrower in Apoc.Bar. than in IV Ezra.

But the conviction that this age of corruption will give place to the incorruptible Age does appear in several passages in Apoc.Bar. Yet again there are numerous passages, where because of the indefinite expressions employed it is extremely difficult to decide whether the writer has in mind at that particular point the Messianic consummation or the wholly other Age to Come or is confusing the two. In 48:39 for instance: "Therefore a fire will consume their thoughts, and in flame will the meditations of their veins be tried; for the Judge will come and will not tarry", it appears to be the Messianic Judgment which is contemplated (cf. 83:1, "For the Most High will assuredly hasten His times, and He will assuredly bring on His hours" -

it may here be the imminence of the Messianic Era that is in view. But cf. also 6:9 and 77:6 and 78:7 which reveal very common aspects of the popular Messianic hopes and can hardly refer to anything else than Messianism - 6:9, "For the time comes when Jerusalem also will be delivered up for a time, until it is said, that it is again restored forever"; 77:6, the return of the dispersion is prophesied; 78:7, "For if ye so do these things He will continually remember you, He who always promised on our behalf to those who were more excellent than we, that He will never forget nor forsake us, but with much mercy will gather together again those who were dispersed"). Again, there is considerable uncertainty about the exact reference of 10:3, "But do thou remain here amid the desolation of Zion, and I will show to thee after these days what will befall at the end of the days". But no passage better displays the difficulty of definition of what End is in view than 23:13-25, worth quoting in full: "(13) For if there were this life only, which here belongs to all men, nothing could be more bitter than this. (14) For of what profit is strength that turns to weakness, or the food of plenty that turns to famine, or beauty that turns to a hateful (thing)? (15) For the nature of man is always changeable. (16) For we have by no means been from the beginning what we now are, and what we now are we shall not afterwards remain. (17) For if a consummation had not been prepared for all,

in vain would have been their beginning. (18) But regarding everything that comes from Thee, do Thou inform me, and regarding everything about which I ask Thee, do Thou enlighten me. (19) How long will that which is corruptible remain, and how long will the time of mortals be prospered, and until what time will those who transgress in the world be polluted with much wickedness? (20) Command therefore in mercy, and accomplish all that Thou saidst Thou wouldst bring, that Thy might may be made known to those who think that Thy long-suffering is weakness. (21) And show to those who know not, and let them see that it has befallen us and our city until now according to the long-suffering of Thy power, because on account of Thy name Thou hast called us a beloved people. (22) Every nature therefore from this onward is mortal. (23) Reprove therefore the angel of death, and let Thy glory appear, and let the might of Thy beauty be known, and let Sheol be sealed so that from this time forward it may not receive the dead, and let the treasuries of souls restore those which are enclosed in them. (24) For there have been many years like those that are desolate from the days of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and of all those who are like them, who sleep in the earth, on whose account Thou didst say that Thou hadst created the world. (25) And now quickly show Thy glory, and do not defer what has been promised by Thee."

In its apologetic for a life beyond this present this long passage is more philosophical, still of course under the limitations of the Jewish penchant for the concrete, than is normal in apocalyptic: it might well be a reasoned reply to the scepticism of such as a Qoheleth.

The question which perplexed Rabbinic Judaism, 'How long will that which is corruptible remain?' is put here, one feels, yearningly: the advent of the incorruptible Age is eagerly awaited, when due retribution will be visited upon those who now 'transgress in the world' and cause dire vexation (verse 19). This longing, whose roots lay in the loftier, spiritual, individual strain of Jewish thought concerning itself with the life of immortality and retribution for each one, is even here, however, interwoven with relics of the communal consciousness in the unwontedly tender prayer, free from nationalist fanaticism, in verses 21 ff. There are thoughts therein of the city, Jerusalem and the 'beloved people', Israel, and in verse 24 (implying a resurrection) of God's having created the world for the sake of the patriarchs of Israel and those like them of their descendants. The passage too reveals a curious but certainly unwitting disregard for strict consistencies of time and place - reproof of the angel of death and the sealing of the jaws of Sheol would be acts superfluous enough in the day of dawning of the incorruptible Age, where death would be

no more, but earnestly to be entreated as immense benefits in a Messianic Age still upon earth. On this it would be pedantic to insist. Yet it is not either certain that the promises of God alluded to in verse 25 are not, after all the conviction previously displayed of an incorruptible Age to Come, the promises of Messianic salvation.

Resurrection is not openly mentioned in the passage, but is implied in the prayer that the treasuries of souls (promptuaria, repositories, cf. IV Ezra 7:101; 4:35,41; 7:80, etc.) might deposit those enclosed in them (verse 24), and in the notion of the long sleep in the earth of the Jewish patriarchs and 'those who are like them', whom God cannot leave forsaken since He created the world on their behalf. Nothing is disclosed of the place and time and scope of the resurrection: it will mean, it may be inferred, a re-union of the soul and the body.

The retention of many survivals of Messianism, and in places, of the whole popular hope of an earthly Messianic Kingdom is the more amazing in Apoc.Bar. in the light of the full-grown dualism of such passages as 15:7 and 8, and 44:8-15. In 15:7 and 8 there is the deepest gulf between this world of corruption and the Age to Come, (15:7) "And as regards what thou didst say touching the righteous, that on account of them has this world come, so also again shall that which is to come, come on their account. (8) For this world is to them a strife and a labour

with much trouble; and that accordingly which is to come, a crown with great glory." The same ideas are expressed in IV Ezra 7:3-14; Romans 8:18 and II Corinthians 4:17.

In 44:8-15 the World to Come, incorruptible, remote from the evils and vanity of this present time is the inheritance of the wise and righteous observers of the Law. According to Charles²² these verses do not belong in the present context but should be read after 32:6. If, however, they are native to their present context the verse that immediately precedes, intimating the Messianic restoration of Israel, "For if ye endure and persevere in His fear, and do not forget His Law, the times will change over you for good, and ye will see the consolation of Zion", is illuminating. The two consummations would then be brought together, and mentioned, as it were, almost in the same breath.

In all the passages so far examined in this Chapter the resurrection idea has been only incidental, and occurred only on the perimeter of the other central eschatological events. But in Chapters 49-51 Baruch devotes himself entirely to the resurrection doctrine, at far greater length and in more detail than any one else in the whole intertestamental literature. The same question which Paul put into the mouth of a caviller: "How are the dead raised up and with what body do they come?" (I Cor. 15:35) was profound concern of his. That may have been due to 'Baruch's'

contacts with the discussions of the early rabbinic schools in which the subject enjoyed considerable notoriety.

Apoc.Bar., Chapters 49-51 - Resurrection.

'Baruch' puts the question concerning the form and aspect of those who shall live in the day of the Eternal thus: "Will they then resume this form of the present, and put on these entrammeling members, which are now involved in evils, and in which evils are consummated, or wilt Thou perchance change these things which have been in the world, as also the world?" (49:3) The question implies a dualistic view of this world and the World to Come. The reply therefore takes an unexpected course - the dead, far from being changed, as the world is to be changed, rise just as they were for the purposes of recognition. (2) "For the earth will then assuredly restore the dead, which it now receives, in order to preserve them, making no change in their form, but as it has received, so will it restore them, and as I delivered them unto it, so also shall it raise them. (3) For then it will be necessary to show to the living that the dead have come to life again, and that those who had departed have returned (again). (4) And it will come to pass, when they have severally recognised those whom they now know, then judgment will grow strong, and those things which before were spoken of shall come" (50:2-4).

Immediately after this Judgment has taken place wonderful changes will occur in those who have been raised. The

righteous will have their splendour "glorified in changes, and the form of their face will be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die, which is then promised to them" (51:3). They will be transformed into the splendour of angels (51:5), and will behold the world which is now invisible to them (51:8). In the heights of this invisible world they shall dwell, and shall be made equal to the stars, becoming more and yet more glorious (51:10). Finally the extents of Paradise will be spread before them (51:11).

After the Judgment the wicked too are changed, but their aspect grows worse (51:2); their fate is to gaze with wonder upon the glorified righteous, and themselves to suffer torments (51:6); their dread punishment is due to their having rejected the invisible world (51:16).

Here at length is an attempt at developing in detail a resurrection doctrine. In the first instance the resurrection in 'Baruch's' view is plainly to this earth, and is general, for both the good and the wicked. The dead are to be raised with their previous bodies unaltered. That 'Baruch' has contemplated this as the first stage of resurrection is indeed surprising in view of his dualistic approach, and the fashion in which he subsequently piles up epithet upon epithet to describe the progressive spiritualisation which the risen righteous will later undergo ("made like unto the angels, equal to the stars, changed

into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, from light into the splendour of glory, having the extents of Paradise spread before them").

What is the rationale of this strange doctrine of a purely physical, even crudely material resurrection? The following considerations may be offered:

1. 'Baruch's' own confession is that it is the present body which must be raised in order to establish identity. There is that realistic touch of his in 50:3, "It will be necessary to show to the living that the dead have come to life again". But it is probable that these are the merest superficial reasons for the retention of ideas of the resurrection, which were primitive and came to him almost instinctively. The profoundest reasons he could hardly himself expound.

2. His views of world destiny are entirely illogical: beside the dualistic separation of this present and the wholly other Age to Come, there linger on - urgent and powerful and far more than just a memory - the primitive hopes of a Messianic Kingdom upon earth. His book breathes often the nationalist spirit: he is acutely conscious of the painful fortunes of Israel in her history. His people's cherished expectation of an earthly national restoration he cannot, in spite of himself, let go. With those popular hopes the resurrection idea in its origins was integrally connected. And so in his notion of a crudely physical

resurrection he is undesignedly compromising with the ancient, naive Messianic dreams. It is an unintentional compromise, the logic of which 'Baruch' could not probably have explained. It is not necessary to believe, in order to appreciate the force and the impact of the old Messianism upon him, that he must here be actively portraying the resurrection as bringing the departed to a Messianic inter-regnum.

Nor yet, however, can it be emphatically asserted on the basis of 50:2 and 3 that the resurrection is to take place only after the completion of the Messianic Age, or readily agreed with M.J.Lagrange²³ that here as always the resurrection is at the furthest horizon of the apocalyptic visions. The process of recognition of the risen dead (50:4) may take a shorter or a longer time, and there is no saying whether in the writer's mind resurrection, judgment and the process of spiritualisation follow each other in quick succession.

3. His resurrection doctrine is influenced not alone by the popular Messianism. Deep-rooted Jewish notions of the Judgment help to fashion and shape it. Although P.Volz²⁴ has called in question the universalist interpretation of the resurrection here, it seems clear enough, as we have seen, that Baruch does contemplate the resurrection of all, both good and evil, to the present earth. And here he is affected by the stock Jewish belief that the whole man must appear for Judgment, a belief embodied in that parable

given by Rabbi to Antoninus concerning the uniting of soul and body for the Judgment (Sanhedrin 91a-b). Judgment again dominates also Baruch's thought: all things else are secondary. Judgment in his conception may be likened to the two-headed Janus, standing at the gateway between this age and the Age to Come. It is only after the great process of Judgment has intervened that the risen dead, brought firstly only upon the earth, the land of the living, by the resurrection, shall begin to be increasingly spiritualised that they may be conformed to that new celestial, incorruptible world which he now visualises as their final abode. How their transference is to be accomplished he has not told us - he had not really cut a path for himself in his thought between the material and the spiritual, and the terrestrial and the celestial. But the agent of the glorious change in them seems to be the mechanism of the Judgment. At all events the resurrection is not immediately efficacious in producing spiritualisation and glorification in the risen dead, for it brings them only to the earth.

The contrast with the Pauline doctrine of the resurrection is quite clear. Against all accommodation to the popular materialist ideals of the future Paul inveighs: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God" (I Corinthians 15:50). For Paul the resurrection produces an IMMEDIATE transformation in the dead, being raised: "It is sown in corruption; it

is raised in incorruption (15:42). It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power (43). It is sown a natural body: it is raised a spiritual body" (44). And then also in 15:52: "The dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed."

'Baruch', greatly influenced by the popular materialist preoccupations of the Jewish imagination, visualises the dead as rising first in unchanged bodily form to the present earth: Paul's language in I Cor.15 reveals that he conceives the resurrection, when it does occur, as producing straightaway an 'unearthly' change in the risen dead.

Now the Pauline doctrine raises very serious problems of its own: does Paul think of a period of sleeping and waiting until the Parousia before the resurrection takes place? or does he imagine that the new body is assumed immediately at death (as II Cor.5:1 seems to indicate)? what are the relations between II Cor.5:1 and I Cor.15? But these are quite other questions, and whatever answer may be given to them, it has no bearing upon the salient contrast noted between 'Baruch' and Paul.

It is only subsequently, after the Judgment, as 'Baruch' conceives it, that the risen are to undergo a series of changes in their whole form and aspect that "they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die" (51:3). This adaptation of the risen body to its

heavenly environment is possible only by its appropriation of LIGHT and yet more light. Their glory is to be bright as the glory of the celestial world. By a Hebraic employment of the word (cf. Acts 22:11), unknown in this sense in classical Greek, δόξα has assumed the meaning of 'glorious appearance', 'beauty of form and colour'.²⁵ The final condition of the risen righteous, according to 'Baruch' is to be one of δόξα, of which light is the most essential constituent.

As was noted previously of another apocalyptic writer, the concept of 'light' is also for 'Baruch' far less of an abstraction than it is for us. For him it was the least gross substance which he could imagine. As the substance of the risen body is more and more changed into light and becomes like the angels and the stars (an interesting parallel is afforded by that imagination of the Jewish Theology, the notion of the formation of the walls of the sanctuary out of light, regarded as a sort of emanation from God), the crass and corruptible vanish away so that at last the righteous are able to penetrate an order of existence hitherto unknown to them.

The transference of hope in Apoc. Bar. to the Age to Come, far removed from this present world of corruption, and the notion of the dematerialisation of the risen righteous and their successive glorifications may have owed something

to the historical circumstances of the author's time, to the crushing of the popular political dreams after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. And yet generalisations to the effect that the apocalypses before 70 A.D. are hither, worldly and those after 70 A.D. other-worldly are far too simple and thoroughly misleading. For the fact is that the shades of the old Messianic expectations continue to haunt Apoc.Bar.

He was an ardent collator of the traditions, and though in his collection he has embodied many strands of Messianism, his greatest contribution to Jewish eschatological thought was the manner in which he took up that other side of the tradition heralding a spiritual and transcendental consummation, such as is contemplated possibly in Daniel 12:3, in I Enoch 91-104 and in other places, and developed it along more definite and precise lines, describing at length the spiritualisation of the resurrection body to enable it "to dwell in the heights of that world" (51:10).

H. St. J. Thackeray wrote that "the more spiritually-minded of Jewish thinkers in the time of St. Paul were familiar with the conception of a transfigured resurrection body".²⁶ But familiarity with such a notion and a firm and saving grasp of it are different things, and there is reason to believe, both from the Ap. and Ps. and from the rabbinic literature, that the cruder materialist notions of the resurrection so prevailed with the masses, that only a few

in Paul's time could have expounded the belief in a progressive glorification of the risen body so fully as 'Baruch'.

Yet no doubt men like 'Baruch' tried to circulate the idea as widely as they could, and the topic must have been in the air, even though rarely gladly accepted by a people to whom the old earthly hopes remained very dear.

R.H. Charles stated: "To some extent the Pauline teaching on the resurrection in I Cor. 15:35-50 was not an innovation, but an able and developed exposition of ideas that were current in the Judaism of the time."²⁷ Happily Charles italicised the opening phrase, thus invoking caution. And caution is necessary for the salient contrasts between the resurrection doctrines of Paul and Baruch are far more significant than the similarities.

It is peculiar, in the light of Paul's experience 'in Christ', that the need is frequently felt to search for Jewish roots for his resurrection teaching, and is often expressed in too extensive tracings. W.D. Davies, following Strack-Billerbeck, suggests that "the series of antitheses in I Corinthians 15:42-44 is not to be interpreted as un-Jewish; it would be the natural development of that contrast between *hâ - 'ôlâm ha - zeh andhâ - ôlâm ha - bâ'* which would be familiar to rabbinic Judaism"²⁸ (I Cor.15:42, "It is sown in corruption: it is raised in incorruption", etc.)

But if 'Baruch' is in any wise representative of

early rabbinic Judaism, it is exceedingly doubtful whether he could have succeeded in setting the contrast between this lower age and the higher Age to Come in a series of rigid and graphic antitheses, such as Paul employs to compare the life here with the more glorious life to come. And certainly 'Baruch' did not think of the resurrection as mediating the sudden transition in state, for with him the resurrection brings the departed first to earth. The truth is that, whereas for Paul the resurrection is first and central, and immediately effects a vast change, for 'Baruch' it is first the implications of his vision of 'hâ-ôlâm ha-bâ' which force upon him the notion of eventual successive changes in those already risen to a lower estate.

The manifold critical problems that still surround the subject of the authorship of the various elements of Apoc.Bar. make it impossible to decipher the relations of his Messianism and definitive Eschatology. The only certainty is that the two schemes are present in his work. Certain modern analyses of the book have succeeded in isolating the two fronts, the Messianic expectation and transcendent Eschatology, but the measure of their success in this is no criterion of their accuracy. The apocalyptic programme which completely separated the two would be so much of a rarity, that arguments for composite authorship and the classification of different documents within the

work, would have to be based on grounds other than their allegiance on the one hand to Messianism, or on the other to universal Eschatology. To isolate Messianic parts of the work from parts embodying notions of a universal transcendent Eschatology is to wrench asunder what the Jewish apocalyptists themselves could hardly ever separate.

It is not, however, certain that, even supposing that the text as we have it is in proper sequence and substantially a unity, 'Baruch' has attained to an active compromise whereby he has fitted the Messianic realm coherently into his schema of the Eschata. In the Apoc.Bar. "the last judgment and its issues", writes G.F. Moore, "lie beyond the Messianic Age, which thus becomes not final and endless, but a limited period, and recovers something of its original character."²⁹ There is in Moore's words the suggestion of a definite and clearly focussed perspective. But that most likely 'Baruch', illogical, champion at once of Messianism and dualism, never enjoyed.

IV Ezra³⁰

If in truth 'Baruch' is an inferior imitator of IV Ezra there is a certain fitness in making the book of superior genius the culmination of this chapter, and of this whole part of the enquiry.

Kindred problems of authorship to those surrounding Apoc.Bar. arise at once. Reference was made in the

introduction to G.H. Box's fivefold division of IV Ezra, commonly accepted, and apart from the question of diverse authors, a very useful and convenient division of the book on the basis of subject matter of the various parts.

Charles³¹ provisionally adopted Kabisch's analysis of the book, and assuming its composite authorship sought to define the part of the Redactor. G.F. Moore³² on the contrary has accepted its substantial unity, which has the support also of M.R. James, Clemen, Lagrange, F.C. Porter, Sanday, Burkitt, Violet and Gry, and also H.H. Rowley.³³

It has of course to be recognised that there is a medley of ideas in the book, and that in such a collection of fragments and traditions, diversity is to be expected within the unity. Each vision has its own particular interests and its own nuances.

Beside the wider problem, there is the specific problem of what constitutes the real nucleus of the work. It is generally agreed that the true Apocalypse of Ezra is contained only in Chapters 3-14 of the book which stands in the Apocrypha as II Esdras.³⁴ And the work as it stands in the Apocryphal collection is thus regarded as an expanded edition. Chapters 1, 2, 15 and 16 are wanting in the oriental Versions and are to be considered as later additions by Christian hands. Torrey advances upon this and rejects Chapter 14, as different in tone from all the preceding, and marred by the fantastic story in which Ezra

appears. It is therefore an appendix to the original Apocalypse of SHEALTIEL. In 3:1 occur the words, "I Shealtiel, who am also Ezra", which is part of the same process of re-editing. "The compiler who utilized this written source was anxious for some reason", writes G.H.Box³⁵, "to connect it with the name of Ezra; accordingly he inserted the words 'who am also Ezra'". Torrey³⁶ ventures to proffer the reason - successive Jewish apocalyptists tried to predict the time of the End, notably Daniel and Revelation. When their predictions remained unfulfilled the documents were put aside, re-interpreted or revised. Such is IV Ezra. Torrey sets out his theory in some detail. The substance of it is that the book was published in the first months of 69; when chaos followed the death of Nero, the five visions of Shealtiel were discredited as prophecy. Thereafter the book was rehabilitated during the reign of Domitian (81-96) and the Ezra vision of Chapter 14 appended.

Torrey has exercised considerable ingenuity and brought much out of little. With precision he has pinned down the historical references to certain specific historical figures, particularly 12:26 and 12:28, the former to Nero, the latter to Galba and Otho. But he keeps discreetly silent on the fact that many have assigned these verses (and adduced feasible arguments for doing it) to several different emperors (e.g. G.H. Box³⁷ to Trajan or Vespasian, and some

12:28 to Hadrian and Lucius Quietus).

In the following investigation Chapters 3-14 are included; they are called IV Ezra and their substantial unity is assumed.

IV Ezra is one of the profoundest books of the Ap. and Ps. and occupies a unique place as a moment in the development of Jewish Eschatology. R. Niebuhr has said of IV Ezra: "This apocalyptic book actually written, or at least compiled, in the Christian era, leaves a profound impression, with its invariably right questions and its usually wrong answers. Here is the perfect symbol of how Hebraic prophetism over-reaches itself with an ultimate question for which it has no answer, and which it seeks to suppress because it lacks the answer."³⁸

In IV Ezra the abyss between this world and the world to come is at its deepest, the Seer is troubled by searching new questions of the justice of God and whether there are any of the righteous at all who deserve to be saved in the Last Day (7:45; 7:118-120). But although the ULTIMATE problems have dawned upon the Seer, the answers given by God, as set forth in the body of the work, seek to convince him still by the old assurances borrowed from the conventional Messianic hope. Thus is the conflict between Messianism and a truly universal Eschatology dramatically represented in this apocalypse - it is in fact the most decisive proof of

the inextinguishable power of Jewish Messianism.

For there could not be greater testimony to that power than its survival here, even now when this most advanced of Jewish visionaries has penetrated into final questions concerning the justice of God and individual retribution, and has at last set world against world. That his new insights did not drive him to momentous solutions of the perennial problems was due to the inescapable limitations of Jewish Messianism. These had to be overcome and that Messianism revolutionised by the One Who came, Himself the Messiah, Son of God.

The survival of Jewish Messianism at the higher reaches of IV Ezra's discernment is reflected in ideas of an earthly Messiah set over against views of a heavenly 'Son of God', of Judgment on the national scale over against universal Judgment, of cruder bodily resurrection set over against the immortal life of the invisible Age to Come.

Yet over his predecessors in apocalyptic he had made this advancement too, that he felt some awareness of the antinomies that lay between the narrow Messianic expectation and universal definitive Eschatology, and had recourse, as we shall see, to the working compromise of portraying a temporary and carefully limited Messianic Kingdom as a phase of the Eschata.

The First Vision.

This first vision contains little of interest.

There appear in it the common notions that the end of the present age is near (IV Ezra, 4:44 ff., "Consider for thyself; for as the rain is more than the drops, and as the fire is greater than the smoke, so has the measure of what is past exceeded by far; but there are still left over the drops and the smoke.") The signs and portents that precede the End are described in some detail in 4:51 to 5:13. There occurs here also at least one of the classic expressions of Jewish nationalism, "Have the deeds of Babylon been better than those of Sion? Has any other nation known thee beside Israel? Or what tribes have so believed thy covenant as those of Jacob?" (3:31 and 32). But beside this particularist viewpoint and the tokens of a Messianic hope for earthly restitution, there is a sighing over the present world and an openly expressed pessimism, "this age is full of sorrow and impotence", due in the Seer's view to the bad seed sown in the heart of Adam (4:27-31). And in 4:36,42 this age and the Age to Come are placed in opposition.

Finally 4:35 and 41 are of interest as indicating that the souls of the righteous Jews and of the wicked have been separated without the machinery of a Judgment (such as is required in the Zoroastrian Eschatology) - Jewish theology seems to have inclined towards the view that partial retribution set in immediately after death.

The Second Vision.

This vision contains little of note save that other expression of fervent Jewish nationalism in 5:23 ff., "And I said: O Lord, my Lord, out of all woods of the earth and all the trees thereof thou hast chosen thee one vine; out of all the lands of the world thou hast chosen thee one planting ground; out of all the flowers of the world thou hast chosen thee one lily; out of all the depths of the sea thou hast chosen for thyself one river; out of all the cities that have been built thou hast sanctified Sion unto thyself."

The Third Vision.

The third vision is of great significance, and Chapter 7 especially will require detailed examination.

The Seer is greatly perplexed with the question, How long? How long will Israel, for whose sake the world was created, have to endure oppression and subjugation? (6:55-59). The answer vouchsafed exhibits 'Ezra's' endeavour to blend the Messianic hope and the expectation of an Age to Come by a compromise with the former. (7:26) "For behold the days come, and it shall be when the signs which I have foretold unto thee shall come to pass, Then shall the city that is now invisible appear, and the land which is now concealed be seen; (27) And whosoever is delivered from the predicted evils, the same shall see my wonders. (28) For my Son the Messiah shall be revealed together with those who are with him, and shall rejoice the survivors four

hundred years. (29) And it shall be after these years that my Son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath. (30) Then shall the world be turned into the *primaeval* silence seven days, like as at the first beginnings; so that no man is left. (31) And it shall be after seven days that the Age which is not yet awake shall be roused, and that which is corruptible shall perish. (32) And the earth shall restore those that sleep in her, and the dust those that are at rest therein, and the chambers shall restore those that were committed unto them. (33) And the Most High shall be revealed upon the throne of judgment (and then cometh the End)". There then follows in verses 33-44 a long description of the Judgment: it is administered in Gehenna and Paradise (36), set over against each other, and not upon earth. The process lasts for 'a week of years" (43).

The text of this important passage is in places uncertain. The above rendering of verse 26 is a correction based upon the argument that the Latin '*et apparebit sponsa apparens civitas*' has mistaken ἡ νῦν μὴ φαινομένη πόλις for ἡ νυμφὴ φαινομένη πόλις .³⁹ In verse 29 the Latin has '*filius meus Jesus*', a Christian interpolation.

The New Jerusalem, brought down from the sky, appears at the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom. Both the New Jerusalem and the Messiah seem in the author's view to be pre-existent. The New Jerusalem is 'now invisible' and the Messiah is concealed and has yet to be revealed. How

remarkable was the veneration for these figures in many Jewish hearts, that they can be thus accorded the eternity of God!

The Messiah is to be accompanied by his immortal companions, Enoch and Elijah, who had been translated to heaven. The manifestation of these saints of Israel is hardly to be regarded as a resurrection. Resurrection is indeed apparently excluded from the Messianic inauguration of the Kingdom, for the Messiah is described as bringing joy only to those alive at the beginning of his reign.

The joy of the Messianic Kingdom will last four hundred years⁴⁰, at the end of which ALL are to die, even the pre-existent Messiah. This sweeping of even the Messiah from the stage reveals an unusual and not at all characteristic deference, on the part of Ezra, to the desire to prepare the setting for the advent of the invisible and incorruptible Age to Come. The wonder is that he felt the necessity of retaining a temporary Messianic Kingdom at all in his scheme, as marking the perilous passage between this world, which has grown old (cf. 5:55), and the new world in the beyond.

To judge 'Ezra' from his work, he was not the man to offer, by the sweet consolation of a coming earthly Messianic Kingdom, blandishment to the popular masses with their naive Messianic dreams. He is self-revealing. He makes known his own secret desires. Still ISRAEL haunts his mind. He was loyal Jew enough to feel in his own heart that there

was that one most desirable compensation for the tragedies that had befallen Israel - that before the world was finally terminated (and God has, he knows, set His seal upon it), it would be the scene of the restoration of Zion, of the Messiah's victory over Israel's enemies, and of the felicity of Israel gathered together again around the New Jerusalem.

But his descriptions of the Eschata present something of an 'odyssey on a tight-rope', for paradoxically opposed to his concern with the popular Messianism is his, the loftiest individualism of all in the Ap. and Ps. He is not in the last resort satisfied with the comforting hope of a restoration of the whole nation, and will not even rest in the rigid distinction between 'righteous' and 'wicked' in Israel, which had become customary at least since the Maccabaeon age. He experiences instead much searching of heart and anxiety about the numbers of the individuals to be saved or damned. There will, he believes, be only a small inner circle of the saved (7:60 f., cf. 7:45; 8:3; 7:48). Concomitant with this is his worry over the fact of sin - he dwells upon the universality of sin (cf. 7:48 and 7:118. 7:48, "For an evil heart hath grown up in us and removed us far from life, and that, not a few only but well-nigh all that have been created." 7:118, "O thou Adam, what hast thou done? for though it was thou that sinned,

the evil is not fallen on thee alone, but upon all of us that come of thee.")

On the one hand an unquenchable religious sentiment surrounded the Jewish Messianism, and on the other a few rare souls such as 'Ezra' were roused by the theological awakening which brought awareness that among brother Israelites even the righteous might hardly be saved.

7:32, The Resurrection.

According to this vision, after four hundred years of the temporary Messianic Kingdom are completed history will be terminated, and for seven days there will be a return to the primaeval silence (7:30). Then this age will perish utterly and the incorruptible Age to Come will appear. The dead will be raised, the body from the earth, the soul from the chambers or promptuaria, presumably to be reunited, and thereafter immediately the Most High will be revealed upon the throne of Judgment (33).

7:32, intimating the resurrection is frequently assigned to R, the Redactor (Bonsirven, Box)⁴¹, and branded as a passage where he cannot refrain from interpolating his own personal doctrine. Here again the eagerness to impose consistency of schematisation upon parts of the documents has asserted itself. But if the seeming intrusion of the event of resurrection at this particular point in the schema of the Last Things disrupts all logical sequence it is not for that

reason to be hastily rejected as spurious.

The blatant inconsistencies of the apocalyptic visions are not to be resolved by textual stratagems. And the exclusion of 7:32 serves only to obscure the very real difficulties under which the Seer almost certainly laboured in trying to give formulation to his resurrection doctrine. He has compressed the event of the bodily resurrection here most awkwardly and incoherently between announcements of the advent of the incorruptible Age and the Judgment to be administered in Paradise and Gehenna, and not upon earth. From the terms in which the resurrection is mentioned in 7:32 it might be expected to relate to the earthly Messianic Kingdom. And it is not in fact certain that 'Ezra' has been able to dissociate the resurrection from its primitive connection with the Messianic restoration.

M.-J. Lagrange⁴² admits reluctance to argue that the resurrection is placed AFTER the times of the Messiah in 'Ezra's' scheme. His reluctance is produced largely by the feeling that verses 28 and 29 announcing the temporary Messianic reign may be interpolated. And certainly when these verses are extruded there is a greater ambiguity than ever regarding the TIME at which the Seer believes the resurrection to take place.

Nevertheless there are no adequate reasons for rejecting these verses, and with them the idea of the temporary Messianic Kingdom from the scheme of the Eschata

in the vision. Their inclusion serves to reveal the true nature of his confusions and uncertainties about the resurrection. For whereas he then has apparently gained a moderate success in so fitting it into the eschatological framework that it occurs after the temporary Messianic Age, he has derived his notions of the FORM that the resurrection will take, evidently a bodily resurrection to the present earth, from its original and radical connection with that Messianic Age.

The magnetism of the primitive associations of the resurrection in its form and scope with the Messianic restoration was too strong for him to escape. On the other hand there were forces compelling him to transfer the resurrection at least in point of time to the very threshold of the invisible Age. As that other Age to Come opened to his view, totally divorced from everything on this side, he saw that each individual now stood related to it, and must be judged in regard to it at the day of its advent. And so for him the Judgment heralds in the Age to Come. The last Judgment brings an immediate distinction between Paradise and Gehenna (36), 'time' has passed away. And the Judgment has become the great *raison d'être* of the resurrection. The resurrection, as he sees it, sets the machinery of the Judgment in motion.⁴³

How much the Judgment dominates the scene is clear from the lengthy description of it in 7:39 ff. - in contrast to the fleeting notice of a resurrection in 7:32.

His preoccupation with the idea of Judgment can be evidenced from many other passages, only one of the most striking of which need be cited here: "When the Most High made the world, and Adam and all them that came of him, he first prepared the judgment and the things that pertain unto the judgment" (7:70).⁴⁴

Such then is the vacillation in his ideas of the resurrection. Into his previously imagined plan of the Eschata, he wages a stern but unsuccessful struggle to fit the resurrection.

E. de Faye on the other hand believes that the process has been something the reverse. De Faye feels that his views of the resurrection have forced him to disarrange his whole scheme of the Last Things, that they have compelled him to postpone the last Judgment till after the resurrection has taken place. But it is not likely that his ideas of the resurrection were so central or so powerful as to effect a bouleversement of his eschatological plans. It is amazing how little effective the resurrection idea was in producing new imaginations of the world's destiny and new pictures of the End. We shall more probably be nearer the true order of thinking in those times when we visualise Ezra seeking hesitantly and waveringly to fix the resurrection into his general framework of the Eschata.

The confusion in his resurrection doctrine created by the tension between Messianism and definitive

Eschatology is the profoundest of all. There is also that other confusion whereby the belief in a general resurrection (7:32, cf. 5:45, frequently also assigned to the Redactor) is mingled with belief in the resurrection of the righteous only. For these reasons his notions of the resurrection lack definiteness and coherence.

—————

A detailed description of the existence which follows death.

In 7:75-101 there is a long excursus on the state of the soul after death. It has already been remarked that Jewish theology tended gradually towards the idea of a retribution setting in immediately after death. The Seer asks (7:75), "O Lord, show this also to thy servant: whether after death, even now when every one of us must give back his soul, we shall be kept in rest until those times come in which thou shalt renew the creation, or shall we suffer torture forthwith?" The Seer is then told that the spirit first leaves the body, adores the glory of the Most High, and then enters into a state of misery or bliss, according as it belongs to the wicked or the righteous.⁴⁵ The souls of the righteous and the wicked are separated, seemingly automatically. Thereafter the wicked wander about without habitation and suffer torment in seven degrees (7:78-87). The righteous spirits experience joy in seven ways. The writer was no doubt influenced by the old Babylonian tradition of seven heavens and seven hells.

The subtle delineation of the soul-life immediately after death is unique in the Ap. and Ps., it reveals a finesse far beyond I Enoch 22. Its singularity has led to the supposition that what we find in IV Ezra is the survival of a very ancient concept or perhaps a borrowing from the Persian religion.⁴⁶ J.J. Bonsirven⁴⁷ feels that this progress towards the idea of retribution immediately upon death is due to contact with Hellenism; and in fact G.H. Box⁴⁸ proposes that IV Ezra in general suggests the influence of Alexandrian rather than specifically Palestinian thought.

But the description of the soul's life after death may be less un-Jewish than is commonly supposed. While it is true that the Jews could not easily have thought of the soul as enough detached from the body thus to be able to follow from the moment of death its own particular destiny, what we find here is not a real anthropological dichotomy, such as characterised Greek thought. For in the Jewish view it is only death (cf. Assumption of Moses 13:6, etc.), rudely intervening in man's life as the consequence of his sin, which separates soul and body, and the separation is neither natural nor desirable. Hence the common Jewish notion of their necessary reunion in the resurrection.

The picture of the soul's life in these verses may also have owed much to developing notions of the intermediate state. And certainly the emotional existence of the soul,

as here depicted, is less than life-size. It is a pre-Judgment, pre-consummation life, but a foretaste of the richer blessings yet in store for them at the final consummation (7:95).

There are two intimations to the righteous of what they shall yet be in that final day, which are of particular interest here. The sixth order of the righteous souls is that "it is shown unto them how their face is destined to shine as the sun, and how they are destined to be made like the light of the stars, henceforth incorruptible" (7:97). And the seventh order is that "they shall rejoice with boldness, be confident without confusion, be glad without fear, for they are hastening to behold the face of him whom in life they served, and from whom they are destined to receive their reward in glory" (7:98).

The notion of the righteous growing like the sun and the stars has been encountered already in Daniel 12:3, Apoc.Bar. 51:3, 10 and I Enoch 94:2, but it is there more intimately connected with the event of resurrection than here. It is true that he probably had resurrection in mind here, else how could he conceive the righteous as being thus elevated from their intermediate state? Yet it is not the act of their rising that he cares to express openly: he dwells rather upon the wonderful, shining form they will yet assume. The thought of all the righteous would yet become is evoked by his vision of the invisible, incorruptible

and celestial Age which they are to inhabit, its basic elements LIGHT and GLORY.

Gunkel⁴⁹ has concluded from this assimilation of the righteous to the stars, that faith in the resurrection was born among people who regarded the stars as gods, worshipped them as gods, and claimed to be assimilated to their gods and become like them, and that it was from notions like these that the higher religion received its first impulse. Grotesque and fantastic imaginations are not, it seems, alone the property of the apocalyptists!

IV Ezra 8:52-54.

This brier passage sheds further light upon 'Ezra's' notions of the Age to Come. It may be cited: (52) "For for you is opened Paradise, planted the Tree of Life, the future Age prepared, plenteousness made ready: a City builded, a Rest appointed; Good works established, wisdom preconstituted; (53) The evil root is sealed up from you, infirmity from your path extinguished; And Death is hidden, Hades fled away; Corruption forgotten, sorrows passed away; (54) and in the end the treasures of immortality are made manifest."

Reference has been made already to the notions of pre-existence occurring in places in the apocalyptic literature, the pre-existence of the Messiah in the Similitudes, of the heavenly Temple and the heavenly Jerusalem

(cf. I Enoch 90:29). In Apoc.Bar. there occurs the weird idea of the pre-existence of Behemoth and Leviathan (29:4); in IV Ezra there is the thought that Paradise was created even before the earth itself (3:6).

Here in IV Ezra 8:52 the Age to Come is pre-existent. When the Jew desired to describe something as predestined he spoke of it as already existing in heaven. It is quite unlikely that 'Ezra' intends any more than that. With him the Age to Come is ordained to the End; the concept is truly eschatological. He does not think of the Age to Come - unless it may be vaguely and dimly - imperceptibly invading the present and becoming something to be taken into custody here and now (contrast I Peter 1:4, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς, where the perfect participle probably does have that implication).⁵⁰

Nevertheless that he has received some illumination, however dim, regarding the relation of each individual to the incorruptible Age to Come, is clear from the assurances in the work of the most elaborate preparation which the Seer has to undergo through a long series of fasts, before he is permitted to contemplate that incorruptible Age. Men are forbidden from apprehending the invisible world by their present sinful condition, for they are deeply tainted with the evil inclination in their heart (the rabbinic notion of

the יצירה (). And according to 8:53 it is only after the evil root in him is subdued that a man can come to possess 'the treasures of immortality'.

Although therefore for 'Ezra' the Age to Come be not VITALLY present here and now, and is indeed the Eschaton of his vision, it is a REAL Age, near enough to require a present strict, moral self-discipline in all who would inherit it. It is a vastly different concept from the Platonic κόσμος νοητός .

In the four remaining Ezra Visions we are returned to diverse elements of the traditional Messianic hopes.

The Fourth Vision.

The Seer beholds a disconsolate, grief-stricken woman (9:38 ff.). She stands for Jerusalem, victim of a cruel fate. In 9:21 we read: "For thou seest how our sanctuary is laid waste, our altar thrown down; our Temple destroyed, our harp laid low", and there follows a prolonged dirge on Israel's unhappy destiny. Then suddenly the woman's appearance is transformed: she becomes bright as lightning (10:25). It is Jerusalem, builded a heavenly city, brilliant in glory and majestic in beauty (10:42 and 50). The New Jerusalem which he sees is the 'heavenly pattern' of the earthly (10:49).

Thus once more this vision represents the

fusion of Messianic ideals and transcendent Eschatology. The invisible world which should be essentially the world of retribution for individual souls, is instead the heavenly seat of the New Jerusalem with Israel at its centre.

The Fifth Vision.

This is the Eagle Vision. It is a reinterpretation of Daniel's prophecy of the fourth Kingdom (12:10). There appears here the familiar symbolic sketch of history. In 12:32 the Messiah is described as springing 'from the seed of David'. But this, the reading of the Syriac and other oriental versions (the Latin does not have it) is probably an interpolation.⁵¹

12:34 announces that the Messiah will deliver the survivors of his people, and procure for them all joy until the day of Judgment. Again G.H. Box regards this notice of a temporary Messianic Kingdom as an insertion in the primitive text, which originally recognised only the reign of the Messiah lasting without end.⁵² But the confusion that prevails in the apocalypses regarding the place and extent of the Messianic Kingdom in the scheme of the Eschata is so great as to forbid such conciliatory ushering out of parts of the text whose ideas are incompatible with the rest.

The Sixth Vision.

This is the vision of the Man from the Sea. This

figure of the Man from the Sea (it can here be glanced at briefly!) has affinities, H.Gressmann⁵³ proposes, with the Egyptian Sun-God. It is improbable that its origin can be thus specifically traced. But some primitive myth of the cosmos was no doubt the background of the figure, the Urmensch⁵⁴ who engaged the monster of chaos in combat and won the victory.

But in this instance, as always in apocalyptic, the casket has to be first opened before the jewel is found - the Seer has selected these legendary traits for his description here to emphasise the transcendental nature of the Messiah of his portrait. It is apparently the Messiah who stands upon Mount Zion and judges the nations (13:35-37).

Verses 28-39 (Chapter 13) are to a degree illogical and incoherent. The writer seems to waver between assigning the Judgment to the Messiah, or making the Messiah vanish and leaving the Judgment to God alone. Lagrange has affirmed categorically that Judgment in the writer's view belongs only to God, so that he introduces the COMPROMISE of a Messianic time, instituted by God's final Judgment, which closes history without inaugurating the World to Come, whereas other passages depict only a transitory Messianic Kingdom, succeeded by the eternal Age to Come. Quite aside, however, from the probability (as against Lagrange⁵⁵) that it is in fact the Messiah who judges here, it is rather the

idea of a temporary Messianic Kingdom which constitutes a compromise, whereas what occurs here is a reversion to the normal view which, in looking into the future, envisaged nothing beyond the limits of Messianic restoration.

Charles has recognised that in this vision no limit is assigned to the duration of the Messianic Kingdom.⁵⁶ He infers therefore that since there is no mention of a general resurrection and final Judgment these events are probably regarded as still future and as coming at the close of the Kingdom. But the ideas embodied in one vision need not be accommodated to other visions: it should rather be frankly recognised that the 'Ezra' writer made numerous essays in schematizing the Eschata, and that in the present vision the omission of the resurrection and final Judgment betokens a hesitation on his part where to place them in his scheme, rather than that he must here be postponing them to the beginning of the ~~great~~ Age to Come, as he did in other places. There is no sign that, in the disposition at least of this present vision, he saw anything at all beyond the Messianic horizons.

The Seventh Vision.

This vision presents little fresh for comment. The Seer is to be translated to the heavens to be with the Messiah, designated 'My Son' (14:19), until the times are at an end. The Messiah is again a transcendental figure, the

heavenly 'Son of God'. The end is already near at hand (14:11 and 12).

The poverty of the resurrection teaching of a work of the nature and scope of IV Ezra is indeed remarkable. The belief in resurrection seems to be marginal, and takes second place to other pre-occupations. The 'Ezra' writer could not well and concisely have defined his resurrection faith: he experienced considerable difficulty in fitting the resurrection into his eschatological schema. These things are clear from that bare intimation of resurrection in 7:32.

The description of the sixth order of the souls' existence after death ("their face is destined to shine as the sun", and they will be "made like the light of the stars", 7:97) may imply the notion of a resurrection from their intermediate dwelling-places (promptuaria), but the compelling factor here is not the article of resurrection, but the glorious, luminous qualities of the beyond Age to Come which shall require a like luminosity in its participants. But as 7:32 shows, either with the Seer the resurrection idea is secondary enough not to require a real adaptation and expansion, or he has failed fully to disentangle it from its early associations with Messianism.

Indeed R. Niebuhr has most tersely caught the genius of the book in his statement that while the Seer has succeeded by the extent of his vision in asking the

correct spiritual questions, the answers bestowed are taken from the customary Messianic hopes.

The Age to Come and Messianic Fulfilment.

The relation of the ideal of the Age to Come and the Messianic ideals constitutes the fundamental problem of Jewish Eschatology and has the profoundest bearings upon the notions of resurrection in the intertestamental period. It has figured largely in the preceding pages. A separate note on the subject must now be included.

It was not until Apoc.Bar. and IV Ezra that there arose a radical opposition of 'this age' and the 'Age to Come'. "In pre-Christian products of Jewish literature", writes G. Dalman⁵⁷, "there is as yet no trace of these ideas to be found". There is, it is true, in the Similitudes of Enoch, 48:7 and 71:15 a tentative dualism, but these passages may well be later interpolations. The tendency reaches its fullest development only in Apoc.Bar. and IV.Ezra. The various relevant passages in both works may here be set down together. In Apoc.Bar. 'this age' is set over against 'the promised age' (14:13), against the 'Age to Come' (15:7 f., 44:15), 'this passing age' against 'that endless age' (48:50). In IV Ezra there is the idea that God has made not one world but two (7:50); and the 'present age' is set over against the 'future age' (4:2,27; 6:9; 7:12,47, 112; 8:1 f.).

The distinction between the two ages occurs also in early rabbinism. Abot II:7 attributes to Hillel the saying: "He who acquires for himself the word of the law, acquires for himself the life of the Age to Come." The notion is therefore established in thoughts of the future by the end of the first Christian century. "This reservation should probably be made", according to Dalman, "that for that period the expressions characterised the language of the learned rather than that of the people". And it is probably true that the mass of the people, haunted still by the earthly Messianic dream, even after the catastrophe of 70 A.D., found the separation of the two ages hard to make.

The concept of the Age to Come is not then to be regarded as having been born through a logical inference from the historical situation after 70 A.D., when the present world came to appear utterly dark and hopeless to the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem⁵⁸. For the plain fact is that side by side with the new dualistic notions of the two ages there survives the cherished Messianic hope of an earthly restoration for Israel, making it extremely difficult for later Jewish speculation on the future strictly to maintain the distinction between these two ages.

J.H. Holtzmann had contended that "the earlier representation simply makes the world to come to coincide

with the days of the Messiah, or at least to be inaugurated by that period (Daniel, the 'Similitudes' of Enoch, Psalms of Solomon, Targum and Mishna); a later view, on the other hand reckons those Messianic days as part of the present world, and in this way distinguishes them from the final world-renovation (IV Ezra and Apoc.Bar., Midrash and later Theology)". Schürer⁵⁹ followed the same line - that the older view is that which identifies the days of the Messiah with the future $\square\text{ל}^{\text{ב}}\text{ל}^{\text{ג}}$, and that it was not till the prophetic proclamation of a new heaven and a new earth eventually led to the expectation of a higher heavenly happiness after the close of the Messianic Kingdom, that the Messianic period became a temporary phase, and the Age to Come took place only after it.

G. Dalman also believes that the concept of the Age to Come is in its origins closely connected with the prophetic Messianism, but feels that its evolution should be explained in much less precise and absolute terms. His account may be briefly set forth, and thereafter those of G.F. Moore and E.de Faye, for they are all at one in regarding the notion of the Age to Come as primitively connected with the Messianic expectation.

1. Dalman.

Dalman is concerned primarily with terminology. He regards the comprehensive idea of $\square\text{ל}^{\text{ב}}\text{ל}^{\text{ג}}$ (Isaiah 2:12; Amos 5:18; Joel 1:15; Zephaniah 1:7,14; Malachi 3:23)

as the real historical precursor of the idea of the future age. As the messages of the prophets concerning the future underwent doctrinal development, the need was felt in teaching the people for comprehensive terms. The imperfect present was thus in general very readily contrasted with the perfect future, and moreover the Jews became acquainted with the Greek $\alpha\iota\omega\nu$, equivalent to 'lifetime', 'the age', and being aware that the Aramaic equivalent of $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha$ was $\square\text{ז} \text{ז} \text{ז}$ they took the next step and employed $\square\text{ז}$ as a designation for both 'future' and 'present'.

2. But the distinction is not merely a matter of terminology.

In Moore's⁶⁰ view, the prophets predicted, often in idyllic imagery an era of temporal felicity and peace. Yet there occur also in the prophets predictions of a greater change of existing conditions, of a catastrophe in which all nature is involved, a new heavens and a new earth, a cataclysmic transformation of the world. For the new order of things that comes into being after this bouleversement the Jewish name is the 'Age to Come', in contrast to 'this age', the world we live in. Then the biblical imagery of the national golden age is carried over into this Age to Come, while the convulsions of the final crisis are regarded as ushering in the days of the Messiah. That is to say, not only was the idea borrowed in its origins from the traditional Messianic expectation,

the latter lent it by way of a bargain some of its own traits.

The great merit of Moore's exposition is that it shows well the very close and intimate subsequent relations of the ideas of a Messianic golden age, and the Age to Come, and how each borrowed the distinctive features of the other.

3. De Faye⁶¹ most thoroughly of all considers the idea of the Age to Come to be but a projection of the popular Messianism upon a wider heavenly canvas. Religious sentiment, de Faye has it, desiring satisfaction for itself, elevates the objects which it cherished most dearly - the Messiah, the New Jerusalem, Paradise - into the invisible world above the vicissitudes of earthly existence. The Jewish conception of a supernatural world is already to be found in germ in the popular apocalyptic in the idea of pre-existence.

On the other hand M.-J. Lagrange⁶² considers the concept of the Age to Come, as in origin quite distinct from the Messianic expectation - what confusion there was came only later, probably in the period of the Tannaim. Lagrange considers it remarkable that Eleazar of Modein accepted the term 'new world' (עולם החדש) for the Messianic Age, but reserved the expression 'Age to Come' for another idea. The opposition of age to age, Lagrange suggests, is extremely radical, and could present itself

to the mind when men dreamed of the world where the dead are, in opposition to the world of the living. The expression 'Age to Come', was therefore created for a new idea, which does not appear to have sprung from Messianism. It is therefore inaccurate, says Lagrange in effect to regard the Age to Come idea as merely an embellishment of the popular Messianic ideals as Jewish Eschatology grew more spiritual, although there is this much truth in it, that at a certain time the Jews did in fact become discontented with the traditional Messianism, since it resolved only the question of the national future, and knew nothing of the destiny of the individual after death. Now it was the problem of individual destiny which imposed itself imperiously upon Judaism from the time of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. This is the true lineage of the concept of the 'Age to Come'. From its very beginning it is the world of individual retribution. It is not a transformation of the hope of salvation for Israel: it is an answer to the problem of individual destinies.

And Lagrange maintains further that Pharisaic Judaism, a century before Jesus Christ and a century after is much more pre-occupied with this sanction of the individual moral life than with the Messianic expectations. He therefore greatly tones down the part played by Messianism in Jewish hopes as exhibited by the Ap. and Ps.,

and holds that the apocalypses did very little to spread and excite the Messianic hope; they are a false genre unable to move people of composure. Lagrange looks with favour upon Baldensperger's application of the words of I Enoch 14:13 to the apocalypses in general: "And I entered into that house, and it was hot as fire and cold as ice: there were no delights of life therein."

The true evolution of the concept of the 'Age to Come' and its relations with expectations of a Messianic restoration lies between the course mapped by Dalman, Moore and de Faye on the one hand, and the course suggested by Lagrange on the other. Lagrange is assuredly right in recognising in the advancing individualism of the post-Exilic age a vast potentiality towards exalting Jewish hopes into another world in the beyond, heavenly, and a life with God in the realms of light. But in the sequel he has overstressed this aspect of the Jewish 'forward look', separated the notion of the Age to Come too distinctly from the Messianic ideals, and underestimated the power and the permanence of the Messianic hope. G.F. Moore, while connecting the Age to Come idea in its origins too closely with Messianism, is undoubtedly correct in focussing attention upon their subsequent intricate interrelationships. The Messianic Kingdom and the Age to Come, so to say, run into each other like the dyes on a cheap two-coloured

flag, on a day of too much rain.

J.J. Bonsirven⁶³ has suggested that they were ultimately completely separated only among the rabbis; but even that statement has to be accepted with much caution, for a real vagueness is reflected in the continuance even into the rabbinical literature of a very real confusion in terminology - the name אֲבֵרָה is there applied alike to the Messianic Age, the Intermediate Stage and the Age to Come.

The confusion between the two types of ideals can be fully appreciated only by the recognition of the great dynamism of the popular hope of a Messianic restoration upon earth. It seems likely that eschatological speculations of the apocalyptists, far from leaving their compatriots cold, fanned the flames of nationalism to a fire of fanaticism, so that all were in a state of collective expectancy. The apocalyptists were themselves ardent nationalists and patriots - W.O.E. Oesterley⁶⁴ is then far from getting to the root of the matter when he writes: "It seems hardly possible to believe that the Apocalyptists, with their wider spiritual horizon, could themselves have had any faith in those narrow nationalistic expectations so dear to the bulk of their people; but EXPEDIENCY demanded that they should mention them in their writings. That will account for the orthodox Jewish element in the Apocalyptic writings."

The silence of the oldest rabbis, Hillel and Shammai, and also of Josephus is frequently brought forward to prove the eclipse of Messianism at the beginning of the Christian era. J. Klausner⁶⁵ explains the silence of the early rabbis thus: 1) The silence is a measure of prudence to avoid exciting the people further in order to safeguard the political independence that did remain to the Jews; 2) the importance that the rabbis attached to the Law perhaps led them to pay little attention to political aspirations.

But in any case it is striking that we find the Messianic hopes not only in the apocalypses, but also in a history like Jubilees or an ethical treatise like the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, indicating how they prevailed in all classes of the people. And Messianic pretenders at the beginning of the Christian era could, we know, very quickly win a large following the moment they raised the banner of revolt.

Even Philo the Hellenist owed allegiance - though earlier Philonic scholars such as Drummond⁶⁶ found no trace at all of such allegiance - to a true Messianism. Lagrange⁶⁷ even admits it. And most recently H.A. Wolfson⁶⁸ has convincingly shown that Philo saw the solution to the Jewish problem of his day in a revival of the ancient promises made by the prophets of a return of the Diaspora.

Without mentioning the term Messiah, Philo deals in great detail with what is known in Jewish tradition as the Messiah and the Messianic Age - 1) a reunion of the exiled, 2) national prosperity in the homeland, 3) a reign of peace between men and men and beasts and beasts, 4) divine punishment of the unrepentant enemies of Israel.

There is therefore abundant evidence, authenticating the prevalence and pervasiveness of Messianic hopes of a national restoration throughout the inter-testamental period. These hopes were not superseded by the newer ideals of an Age to Come, utterly divorced from the present world, but the two were fused together: on rare occasions only (e.g. IV Ezra) brave, but merely moderately successful attempts were made completely to separate them.

The primary concern of Jewish Eschatology was with the national destiny and corporate fulfilment - the individual came only second. But so long as the visionary saw not beyond the terrestrial Messianic stage, national destiny and individual destiny were thoroughly enough and logically enough blended together, so that the individual Jew craved for himself a part in the communal life of the Messianic golden times. It was as an adventitious preserver of a complete and whole social fulfilment for Israel that the resurrection first appeared to and won Jewish thought.

But when the Jew continued to cling to these primitive remembrances of resurrection and national consummation long after a few rare Seers had opened up to his view, in so far as the new ideas had popular appeal, a new world in the beyond, to which the INDIVIDUAL must stand related, confusions and illogicalities were bound to arise, especially around the resurrection doctrine. National and individual destinies were no longer easily integrated. It is difficult to ascertain whether the hardship that was apparently experienced in trying to fit the resurrection event exactly into the eschatological pattern, has led in many places in the apocalypses to an uneasy silence concerning this very event. Certainly the silence itself is noteworthy.

It frequently appears, however, that the Jewish apocalyptist could not easily adapt the resurrection idea to newer notions of an other-worldly Age to Come by introducing into the resurrection the personalisation or the immediately efficacious spiritualisation (without the intervention of a process of Judgment between the resurrection and the final state of the departed) which alone might have completed that adaptation.

The resurrection idea in the Ap. and Ps. is more SOCIAL than individual and purely personal in its connotation. We shall see in the Conclusion that this emphasis upon its SOCIAL aspects was a permanently valuable contribution to eschatological thought.

CHAPTER IX.IN DIASPORA JUDAISM.

Colonists and settlers in distant foreign places, travelled far from the homeland, carry with them into their new life and environs all that lay deepest in their native thought and culture. And even where to some extent the identity of the émigrés has been merged by the passing of the years with that of the people or nation of their settlement, they bear with them still the marks of what was fundamental and peculiar to their own racial origins. That was of course particularly true of the 'dispersés' of Israel, since they were bound by the closest links of religious faith and practice to the home community.

Surrounded by the tremendous influence of great alien cultures, the Jews yet contrived to retain a very great deal that was normal in the Judaism of Palestine. The stamp of authentic and indigenous Palestinean Judaism, that can often be detected in the Jewish literary products emanating from Alexandria, therefore bears the imprint of those things which really lay at the very heart and centre of the thoughts of that native Judaism. The study of the Eschatology of Diaspora Judaism which will follow in this Chapter serves to throw into high relief much that was truly central and essential in the Eschatology of the Jewish writers of the homeland

in the intertestamental period.

Bousset has argued cogently that "a sharp distinction between Alexandrian and Palestinean eschatology does not exist".¹ The fallacy which supposes a very clear demarcation between the two should be discredited therefore.

Charles cites the Book of Wisdom, the Book of the Secrets of Enoch and 4 Maccabees, probably all of Alexandrian provenance, as representatives of Diaspora Judaism (together with the works of Philo). But he adds cautiously regarding the Eschatology of the Secrets of Enoch, that it is in some respects "more nearly related to Palestinean than Alexandrian Judaism".²

With these books, however, with the possible exception to some extent of 4 Maccabees, it is not a question of their far or near relationship to the Eschatology of Palestinean Judaism: their Eschatology IS in the main that of Palestinean Judaism worked over with a veneer of Greek philosophy. Thus Jewish writers, working far from their native land, help to punctuate the inability of Jews everywhere, and particularly the home Jews, to disengage themselves from the abiding expectation of a Messianic restoration to an earthly Kingdom with Jerusalem as its centre.

Wisdom of Solomon and the Secrets of Enoch embody the old Palestinean traditions in unmistakeable form, the latter in its millenⁿarianism and the former in its picture of the Messianic Judgment. 4 Maccabees, a diatribe after

the Greek fashion and adorned in a very Greek dress, is less Jewish than either, but even he cannot entirely conceal his Jewish antecedents.

There falls to be examined first the Wisdom of Solomon, which "in some respects represents the high water mark of the apocryphal literature".³

Wisdom of Solomon.⁴

The authorship of Wisdom has long presented a perplexing problem - is it a unity or the work of two writers? Grimm was one of the earliest in the field with a detailed defence of its unity. Kohler⁵ (following Eichhorn) claims a composite authorship. Toy⁶ (in the Encyclopaedia Biblica and Encyclopaedia Britannica) thinks the question admits of no certain answer. Goodrick⁷ thinks of only one writer, with the qualification that 6:24-9:18 is an anomalous section. Holmes⁸ divides the book into two sections, 1-11:1 and 11:2 to the end. Recently Torrey⁹ has strongly supported the composite authorship and advanced this account of it - the first half was originally a Hebrew poetical composition, the second half an essay in Alexandrian religious philosophy: the author of the second half translated the first half into Greek, and made it the introduction to his own elaborate composition.

Torrey has a way of making his own particular theory appear extremely neat and cut-and-dried: but when a numerous list of arguments (the statistics of linguistic usage) have been proposed in favour of unity (Grimm), and

an even more numerous list in favour of composite authorship (again mainly linguistic, based most of all on the contrasting usages of particles in the two sections) (Holmes), it is safe to suspend judgment. The problem touches this investigation, however, only remotely, for the present interest is largely in the first part of the book.

The proneness in many quarters to set in too rigid antithesis the Eschatology of Palestinean Judaism and that of Alexandrian Judaism has already been criticised (pp.268 and 269). It appears even more perniciously in the specific instance of the Wisdom of Solomon. Scholars of great and widespread repute for long lent the weight of their authority to the opinion that the writer of Wisdom was steeped in Stoic and Platonic philosophy, and that his Jewish roots were forgotten - Zeller, Schürer, Edmund Pfeiderer, Siegfried, Farrar and Toy. The alarming consequence has been a series of miscalculations and misrepresentations of Wisdom's Eschatology. This way Torrey has lately fallen in making the palpably inaccurate statement, that, "it is noticeable that there is in the book no allusion to the Messianic hope, a fact which certainly suggests that the authors wrote in one of the lands of the Dispersion rather than in Palestine"¹⁰ - inaccurate in both of its branches. Also it has been suggested that there existed in Wisdom "a conception of the soul after death, free from old traditional influence, believing that the soul after death went immediately to heaven In Alexandria it was the

common Jewish view".¹¹ Or again it is claimed that in Wisdom "we see the conception of the Kingdom already passing into that of eternal life".¹²

What we really see in Wisdom is the affiliation of Greek notions of the immortality of the soul (and even these may be less purely Greek than is commonly supposed!) with the old Jewish ideas of restoration to an earthly Messianic Kingdom. And so all attempts to minimise obvious variances in the book's teaching in the light of a pre-formed theory of the writer's Eschatology, with a view to establishing that there is promulgated either a purely Hellenist doctrine of the soul's immortality or a purely Jewish doctrine of the resurrection of the body, are to be deprecated.

An under-estimation of the Jewish elements in Wisdom's Eschatology.

That famous and here most relevant passage in Wisdom 3:1-8 must be quoted in full: (1) "But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, And no torment shall touch them. (2) In the eyes of fools they seemed to die; And their departure was accounted to be their hurt, (3) And their going from us to be their ruin: But they are in peace. (4) For though in the sight of men they be punished, Their hope is full of immortality; (5) And having borne a little chastening, they shall receive great good; Because God tested them, and found them worthy of himself.

(6) As gold in the furnace he proved them, And as a whole burnt offering he accepted them. (7) And in the time of their visitation they shall shine forth, And like sparks among stubble they shall run to and fro. (8) They shall judge nations, and have dominion over peoples; And the Lord shall reign over them for evermore."

R.H. Charles has recognised that the last two verses (7 and 8) prophesy "a Messianic or theocratic kingdom, in which the surviving righteous will judge the nations and have dominion".¹³ But beyond the passing reference to this relic of Jewish Messianism and the further admission that the fusion of Greek and Hebrew thought leads to a certain indefiniteness of conception in the author, Charles by his conclusion regarding the writer's doctrine of immortality, posits for him a fairly thoroughgoing Hellenism, thus precluding the possibility that he MAY have had in mind a resurrection of the body. "Souls immediately after death", Charles writes, "enter on their final award whether of blessedness or torment" and "this is the teaching most probably of Wisdom".¹⁴

In line with this conclusion, Charles is inclined to belittle the purely Jewish elements in other passages, as though eager to uphold a staunch Hellenism in the author. His treatment of the long passage 4:2 - 5:13, embodying strictly Jewish ideas, is somewhat disingenuous - "the writer gives a dramatic representation of the final judgment in

4:2 - 5:13, but it can hardly be taken literally. The judgment of the individual sets in at death (4:10 and 14)."¹⁵ But a forty-verse long description, replete with traditional Jewish ideas, cannot be so cavalierly dismissed. Charles had probably not highly enough evaluated the irresistible impact of normal Jewish Messianism even in a great centre of the Diaspora.

Moreover, by his interpretation of certain passages supposed to be purely Platonic in their ideas, Charles has definitely and emphatically (even more definitely than by his conclusion that Wisdom teaches only the soul's immortality) excluded from Wisdom all possible thought of a resurrection of the body - "owing to the evil nature of matter, there can of course be no resurrection of the body; the soul is the proper self: the body is a mere burthen taken up by the pre-existent soul, but in due season laid down again".¹⁶ He lays much stress upon the eternity of matter, the Platonic notion expressed in 11:17, and it is on the basis of 1:4 that he supposes that an ineradicably evil nature attaches to the human body.

F.C. Porter¹⁷ has produced the most weighty arguments for rejecting such opinions concerning Wisdom as these of Charles. Porter maintains that the doctrine of pre-existence in Wisdom is founded not upon Greek speculations, but upon Hebrew beliefs, and denies that Wisdom contains a Platonic dualism of soul and body.

Porter's views of Wisdom's idea of pre-existence

are important for an understanding of Jewish notions of the after life in general. They can be summarised here. There must be a distinction held, Porter claims, between the idea of the body as a mere prison of the soul, and the idea that it is positively the curse of the soul, defiling it by its own evil passions. The passages generally employed to support the latter contention really imply the opposite - that the body may be good (1:4 and 8:21). Porter starts from a view of Hebrew psychology radically opposed to that of Charles, who thinks of a Hebrew trichotomy of the body, soul and spirit. Porter on the other hand will not recognise even a dichotomy and thinks that the Hebrews could not separate in their thinking body and soul.

Pre-existence therefore in Wisdom, according to Porter, is not the pre-existence of the person himself, the 'I' or the אני , but of the two elements of which man was composed (Genesis 2:7). Dust out of the earth returns to earth (Genesis 3:7); God's breath (רוח or נשמה) which makes man a living אדם is withdrawn at death and goes back to God. The breath or spirit of God was for long thought to belong so closely to God that it was not connected with each man individually. And so the pre-existing 'I' is the body in the earth. But the idea arises in course of time that the breath of God also was in some sense for each man a direct entity.¹⁸

Porter's is a convincing account. If it be true,

no argument towards a doctrine of the immortality of the SOUL ALONE in Wisdom can be based upon Wisdom's ideas of pre-existence. There would rather be expected some concern about the resurrection of the body - and further there is no trace in fact in Wisdom of that asceticism (could he have chosen Solomon as his eponymous hero, if he himself had been an ascetic?), which resulted in Greek circles from their notions of the antagonism of flesh and spirit.

Moreover the three passages in Wisdom commonly understood clearly to embody dualistic ideas of flesh and spirit, body and soul, can best be understood in other ways.

1. 8:19 and 20, (19) "Now I was a good child by nature and a good soul fell to my lot; (20) Nay rather being good I came into a body undefiled."

παῖς δὲ ἤμην εὐφυῆς | ψυχῆς τε ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς, |
μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον.

The clause introduced by μᾶλλον δὲ adds another side to what has been said already in the previous clause. In the first clause the 'self' ($\psi\delta\lambda$) and the soul ($\eta\mu\psi\lambda$) or $\eta\lambda\eta$) are referred to; and in the second the $\psi\delta\lambda$ ('I') and the body ($\gamma\psi\lambda$) are mentioned.

Here in Greek garb is a perfectly sound Hebrew idea, namely that the body ($\gamma\psi\lambda$) came separately from the earth just as the soul ($\eta\mu\psi\lambda$ or $\eta\lambda\eta$) came separately from God, and both were combined to form the child or self ($\psi\delta\lambda$). There is thus a type of pre-existence,

but a pre-existence of the body (רֶשֶׁת) in the form of lifeless earth and the soul (נְשָׁמָה or נִשְׁמָה) as a part of God, but there is no pre-existence of the נְשָׁמָה or personal entity.

2. 9:15, "For a corruptible body weigheth down the soul, And the earthly frame lieth heavy on the mind that is full of cares." Φθαρτὸν γὰρ σῶμα βεβρύνει ψυχὴν, καὶ βρίθει τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος νοῦν πολυφρόντιδα.
Wisdom does not here expressly say that the body is necessarily corrupt and sinful, that evil is inherent in it. Although this verse of Wisdom is remarkably parallel to Phaedo 81c¹⁹ (and although indeed in many places Wisdom employs technical terms of Greek philosophy, 6:7; 14:3; 17:2; 7:23; 8:7), the writer never gives the impression that he has truly assimilated the Greek thought, but only that he has borrowed its expressions while his own thought remains profoundly biblical and attached to the national Israelite tradition.²⁰

Bousset has, however, gone too far in calling 9:15 a mere obiter dictum.²¹

3. In 11:17 there occurs the phrase 'formless matter' (ἀμορφος ὕλη), but the phrase by itself does not inevitably imply that matter is in fact evil: on the contrary 1:14, "For he created all things that they might have being: And the products of the world are healthsome", seems expressly to deny that.

Thus then has the radically Hebraist nature of Wisdom's doctrine been rehabilitated. It would consequently be far less than just to come to the book with a prejudice against finding in it any allusion to notions of a resurrection of the body in its ideas of the after life. It is good to approach the crucial passage in 3:1-8 with mind thus open.

An over-estimation of the materiality of Wisdom's doctrine of the future life.

Perhaps even more unwarranted than the desire to minimise Jewish elements in Wisdom's teaching is the strenuous effort that has been made to pare away the traces of Hellenism in the work, and to accredit to the Wisdom writer purely Jewish conceptions of the resurrection of the body. C.F. Burney²² has confuted Charles' verdict that there is in Wisdom 'only an immortality of the soul'. According to Charles, as Burney writes, the righteous who are to judge the nations and have dominion, are not the faithful departed, but those who live on until the establishment of the kingdom upon earth.

Such a view, Burney has it, is inconceivable. The whole passage, 3:1-9 is speaking of the same people. This is clear, Burney maintains, even from the passage standing by itself; but it is clearer when the writer's dependence upon the Book of Daniel is recognised. The writer has in mind Daniel 7:18, "The saints of the Most High shall take the Kingdom, and possess the Kingdom for ever", and also Daniel 7:22; this is clear from Wisdom 3:7a, "In the time of thy visitation they shall shine forth", which can hardly be anything else than a

reminiscence of Daniel 12:3. There it is the righteous that are to "shine forth as the brightness of the firmament", and these are identical with the righteous of whom the author of Wisdom is speaking. In the light of all this Burney concludes that Wisdom looks forward to a theocratic Kingdom on earth in which the saints are to have dominion. These saints probably include those who survive to the institution of the Kingdom, but also certainly the blessed dead who are to be raised so as to have their part in the Kingdom, and therefore, it may be assumed, to be raised with their bodies. Thus Burney.

But it is much less easy and much less important to establish Daniel as the source of Wisdom's teaching in 3:1-9 than Burney imagines. Parallel notions in both, of the righteous shining like the brightness of the firmament do not prove a direct connection, for the idea occurs in several places in the Ap. and Ps. (I Enoch 91-104; etc.); and in general the ideas of 3:7 and 8 and 4:2 - 5:13 are common enough throughout the Messianic traditions. The supposed relation of Wisdom to Daniel cannot therefore be used to support the contention that Wisdom, as Daniel, teaches only a theocratic Kingdom upon earth, and a resurrection of the dead in the body to that Kingdom.

But a very great deal hinges upon 3:1, "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God". If this refers to the future destiny of the same people who are to

participate in the earthly theocratic Kingdom, there is clearly some confusion and inconsistency in the writer's thought. The inconsistency has been hopefully enough eliminated by the suggestion that the phrase ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ indicates rather that the righteous are under the protective care of God in this present life²³, and it is true that [] would have conveyed primarily the sense of 'protection'.

Nevertheless the 'Wisdom' writer could hardly have drawn a fine line of distinction between the notions of the righteous being 'under the protection of God', and 'in close proximity to God', and there is nothing to preclude the phrase ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ from implying both. Moreover the whole passage 3:1-9 is a prophecy of the future state; it seems therefore most natural to believe that the present description of the souls of the righteous as being 'in the hand of God', is in line with some other of his delineations of endless blessedness in communion with God, for which the writer has recourse chiefly to the language of the Psalms. The delight in the presence of God in Psalm 73:28 is the delight also of 'Wisdom', and he seems to find in the permanent presence of the soul with God the true reward of the righteous.²⁴ This is further borne out by 2:22, where he says of the wicked: "And they knew not the mysteries of God, Neither hoped they for wages of holiness, Nor did they judge that there is a prize for blameless souls", and also in 6:19 as one of the stages of a sorites there occur the words, "And incorruption

bringeth near unto God".

Goodrick has proposed with regard to 3:1 that "the whole point of the author is to prove that the death of the righteous, however untimely, does not mean misery"²⁵ - in fact the writer's conception is that the righteous do not really experience death at all: it is encountered only by those who rally to the side of the devil: for the righteous, death is merely a stratagem on the part of Providence to remove them from all contagion of evil (cf. 4:7-17 and 5:4). Now it is possible to take this from 3:2, but 3:1 is assuredly a positive intimation of what the righteous shall hereafter be, and not merely a notice of what death does not mean for them.

Charles²⁶ has correctly recognised then that 3:1 refers to the final state of righteous souls already judged and approved. It is far less likely that in this verse the ἐπισκοπή or inspection or Judgment²⁷ is still to come, and that until then they are simply under God's protection: for according to 3:2, 'they seemed to have died', the hurdle of death appears already to be passed and the final state entered.

Endeavours to prove that the same set of people are consistently held in mind throughout the prophecy of future destinies in 3:1-9, and generally to accommodate 3:1 with the materialist, Messianic strain of 3:7 and 8, are futile. We are confronted here rather with the naive coupling of thoughts of two quite different destinies, a heavenly

immortality for the righteous souls, and the life hereafter of an earthly Messianic (theocratic) Kingdom.

Verses 7 and 8 refer certainly to the Messianic Judgment, 7b more especially to the triumph of the righteous over the wicked in that great Day, and verse 8 (testimony to the writer's Jewish nationalism!) to the victory and mastery of righteous Jews over the Gentiles.

Speculation on the meaning of verses 7 and 8 has frequently been extravagant. The words of 7a, "shall shine forth", are scarcely to be regarded here as an allusion to the final glorification of the souls of the righteous²⁸, or of their risen bodies. These words are preferably to be connected with the succeeding description, "they shall run to and fro as sparks" a graphic figure for the complete and terrible conquest the righteous will achieve on the Day of Judgment. In this sense the metaphor is a very frequent one in the Old Testament describing the Day of Jahweh - "like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble" (Joel 2:5); "the day cometh, it burneth as a furnace; and all the proud, and all that work wickedness, shall be as stubble" (Malachi 4:1). Verse 8 then in Wisdom would be merely the complement of verse 7.²⁹

There is a gulf of difference between the language of 3:1 and that of 3:7 and 8. The rigoristic and consistency-loving attitude which will insist that 3:9, "They that trust in him shall understand truth, And the faithful shall abide with him in love", is the final step in

Wisdom's eschatological schema, implying that the righteous, after judging the wicked, will abide with God in heaven: issues from a precision and exactitude which belong not to 'Wisdom' himself.

3:9 is a reversion to the standpoint of the first verse of the Chapter, and is an eloquent witness to the uneasy juxtaposition in Wisdom of material and spiritual, earthly (Messianic) and heavenly images of the life to come. Something of the same illogicality can be detected in the contiguity elsewhere in the work of beautiful spiritual ideals with the old materialism. In 5:15 and 16 there falls the pronouncement, "But the righteous live for ever And in the Lord is their reward, And the care for them with the Most High. (16) Therefore shall they receive a glorious kingdom, And a diadem of beauty from the Lord's hand; Because with his right hand he shall cover them, And with his arm shall he shield them", and then in 5:23 there is a declension to a somewhat gross and vindictive Messianism in the pronouncement of the fate of the wicked: "A mighty blast shall encounter them And as a tempest it shall winnow them away: So shall lawlessness make all the land desolate, And their evil-doing shall overturn the thrones of princes."

There is obviously a clash of different ideals of the future as between 3:1 and 3:7 and 8. Do these latter verses convey the idea of the resurrection of the body? That would be a perfectly natural inference. But the writer has

not openly expressed any doctrine of a resurrection of the body. He seems to have been content to keep the part to be played by the body in the life hereafter in the background, and has shrunk from too openly committing himself upon this score. The one thing for the interpreters of his book to avoid is the temptation to fix too precisely just what his thoughts were on this very subject. However, the Wisdom writer is undeniably a Jew, reared upon the Scripture, and we may be sure that he was not (in spite of 3:1, for we have seen the clash of 3:7 and 8 with the announcement of that verse) in opposition to the traditional views of the importance of the body in the human compound. Still he does not insist upon it, either by a discreet and judicious choice, or through the leavening influence of Hellenistic thoughts of a spiritual immortality, linked together with his own affection, to some extent sporadic for there is his Messianism, for the saints of post-Exilic Judaism, who leapt out towards a true individualism and spirituality in their thoughts of man's relations with God,

It is also important to remember that as poet, philosopher and patriot, 'Wisdom' is little interested in defining the details of his view of the future life - he rests satisfied to have urged with some forcefulness that the triumph of the wicked is brief, and that the vindication of the righteous is certain, and their happiness unending. There is a further valid reason why, if he believed in a

resurrection of the body (as appears likely), he should press the point only very slightly - he is addressing pagans as well as his fellow-Jews, pagan Greeks for whom the doctrine of the resurrection was a strange imagination.

It is demonstrably erroneous therefore to propose, as de Faye seems to do, that such as 'Wisdom' substituted for the resurrection of the body and the Messianic Kingdom, immortality of the soul and eternal life.³⁰ The impression of the work is rather that he has superimposed the idea of immortality upon current forms of a Jewish eschatological belief in a Messianic Kingdom upon earth, and has himself experienced no feeling of inconsistency in the process, for he lived in a thought-environment where strange medleys of different ideas were inescapable. Racially inherited ideals were in conflict with ideals partially appropriated from the new cultural surroundings, and the strong tug and pull of each produced a great tension. "It is a consequence of these antecedents", writes G.F. Moore, "that the representation oscillated between the destiny of the individual after death, and the triumph of the Lord in the day when he arms himself for war with his adversaries (5:17-23)".³¹

The expressions employed then in 3:7 ff; 4:18b ff; and 5:17 ff. are not to be explained as survivals of a previous method of thinking which he had now discarded.³² They are too much in the forefront of the stage in Wisdom for that: upon the traditions embodied in these passages

he has built. It is the inharmonious combination of Hebrew and Greek ideals that makes it impossible to give a definitely connected account of Wisdom's doctrine of the future life - and the writer himself could hardly have chiselled away rough edges to fit all his diverse thoughts together into a perfect product. C.F. Burney's³³ claim that immortality, which hitherto had been a hope and nothing more than a hope, a vague aspiration on the part of individuals, appears in Wisdom as a developed dogma, is a little too emphatic. The previous hope was neither so vague (cf. II Macc.), nor the 'dogma' so developed in Wisdom as to merit Burney's ascription.

The necessity to avoid prejudging Wisdom's doctrine of the after life as purely Greek and spiritual from a foreknowledge of the book's Hellenistic provenance, has already been insisted upon, and the probability observed that the author may well have had in mind resurrection of the body, but calmly curbed the free mention of it for a variety of reasons. There is, however, in the latter part of the book an interesting passage which may possibly allude to a resurrection of the body. The passage 16:13 and 14, is certainly worthy of mention: (13) "For thou hast power over life and death, And thou leadest down to the gates of Hades, and leadest up again. (14) But though a man can slay by his wickedness, Yet the spirit that is gone forth he bringeth not back, Neither giveth release to the soul that Hades hath

received."

After recalling the marvellous cure of the Israelites stung by serpents (16:11), the author extols the divine power which can bring men down to the gates of Hades and restore again. Much depends on what is meant in the context by the phrase εἰς πύλας ᾧδου . Does he intend by it merely 'towards Hades?' If so, then verses 11 and 12 (and notably the latter, "For of a truth neither herb nor mollifying plaister restored them to health, But thy word, O Lord, which healeth all things") would imply the use here of a metaphor common enough in the Psalms to describe God's resuscitation of those seriously ill (Psalm 9:14; 107:18, etc.), so that what is meant here is simply that the Israelites were brought back from seeming death, or from its very threshold.

Yet the words here may have a more real, or less figurative sense, and several considerations lend weight to that opinion of them - 1) In Isaiah 38:10 the phrase 'go into the gates of the grave' means 'die'; 2) the expression is linked with others which mean actual death, I Samuel 2:6; 3) verses 13 and 14 contrast the respective powers of God and man - whereas man has the power to murder, he cannot restore to life by bringing back again the soul of the dead. The contrast then implied in verse 13 is that God CAN bring back those actually dead.³⁴

There is no reason to suppose that if the writer is here thinking of a real resurrection, it is even then only a miraculous resurrection such as that associated with the saints of Israel, like Enoch and Elijah. It is feasible that in this section, where the recollection of the plagues of Egypt leads to an invocation of the direct punishment on impenitent sinners (16:6 ff.), the tremendous contrast of these with the great benefits accorded to Israelites should summon forth the mention of but one more blessing reserved for the righteous of Israel - the resurrection.³⁵ Nevertheless the allusion is most cautious and veiled, whether through deference on the writer's part to Greek sentiments, or from the sheer uncertainty of his own thought, we cannot tell exactly. Probably both of these factors contributed to a certain suppression of that resurrection belief, all traces of which he has not yet succeeded in totally erasing.(v.p.306.)

Slavonic Enoch.

From the same milieu as Wisdom, the work probably of an Egyptian Jew³⁶, Slavonic Enoch is variously called Book of the Secrets of Enoch or II Enoch. It is known to us only in a Slavonic Version, and may possibly date from the first half of the first century A.D.³⁷ In the field of Eschatology Slavonic Enoch is the merest eclectic: many and varied notions of Things to Come are brought together in the work, yet from the ensuing 'mélange' the writer himself

seems curiously aloof. He is an artist engaged in trying to bring upon his canvas as many colours as he can, rather than a preacher on fire with a single theme. Rowley has written with justice that his book affords "an excellent example of the type of apocalyptic work that betrays no consciousness of crisis, but that is written in calm detachment".³⁸

Slavonic Enoch speaks always of the blessedness of the saints as of a very distant future which will be realised only in the last age, in the Paradise situated in the third heaven. There are, however, clear signs that the older national Jewish Messianic hope is too firmly rooted to yield its place to the newer transcendental outlook, and from the great urge to survive that belonged to the old temporal expectations, there emerge, 1) the compromise of an earthly Messianic Age as an interregnum, that hybrid presentation, already encountered in this survey, and 2) the transference of features always associated with the earthly Messianic Age to Paradise as described in 8:1 and 9:1.

1) The temporary Messianic Kingdom in Slavonic Enoch.

The history of the world is delineated according to the plan of the Creation. One thousand years of world history represent a day in God's work of Creation. As God rested on the seventh day, so will the world have rest at the end of six thousand years. The rest of the seventh thousand years is the temporary Messianic Kingdom

(32:2 - 33:2), in which no Messiah figures, and of which no detailed description is offered. This millennium³⁹ (in the strict sense of the word) passes over at its end into eternity - "a time of not-counting, endless, with neither weeks nor months nor weeks nor days nor hours" (33:2). To claim that the Messiah has disappeared from the scheme here because his figure was too much compromised with the old bigoted nationalist hopes is to misplace completely the emphasis. For the outstanding fact is not the disappearance of the Messiah - for that was indeed very usual with the apocalyptists - but the surprising favour shown to the fond Jewish longing for an earthly Kingdom. And in any case we could hardly expect the Messiah to be introduced in a picture of the successive phases of the End, so little specific or particular in its points.

2) Paradise described in terms borrowed from the earthly Messianic hope.

Paradise, situate in the third heaven, has sweet-flowering trees, and sweet-smelling fruits (8:2). There are in it springs which send forth honey and milk and oil and wine (8:5). Charles speaks of the passage 8:1 - 9:1 as "naive and worth quoting"⁴⁰, but he has not drawn sufficient attention to the ease with which the apocalyptist combines material and spiritual, terrestrial and transcendental, in his delineations of the future.

There is, it must be noted, a tremendous contrast between the sensuousness of the description in 8:1 - 9:1, and allusion to the future life in brief, but generous and spiritual terms, in such passages as 42:3, "And I saw there a blessed place, and all blessed creatures and all there living in joy and in infinite happiness in eternal life", or 50:2, "Now therefore, my children, in patience and meekness spend the number of your days, that you inherit endless life".

In Slavonic Enoch, as in Apoc. Bar. and IV Ezra, the juxtaposition of material and spiritual, earthly and heavenly befalls the more quaintly in the face of a certain dualism between this present age and the Age to Come. In 18:7 and 8 we read: "The Lord has condemned them (i.e. the 'Grigori' or 'fallen Watchers') to be under earth till heaven and earth shall end together." There are several passages more explicit still, e.g. 50:5, "Whoever of you spends gold or silver for his brother's sake, he will receive ample treasure in the world to come"; 61:2, "I know all things how in the great time (sc. to come) are many mansions prepared for men, good for the good and bad for the bad, without number many". Finally in this connection 65:6-10 is worth citing at length, since it indicates the writer's concept of the Judgment, and fills out what we have already learned of his dualistic separation of the two ages, (6) "When all creation visible and invisible, as the Lord created it, shall end, then every

man goes to the great judgment, (7) and then all time shall perish, and the years, and thenceforward there will be neither months nor days nor hours, they will be stuck together and will not be counted. (8) There will be one aeon, and all the righteous who shall escape the Lord's great judgment, shall be collected in the great aeon, for the righteous the great aeon will begin, and they will live eternally, (9) and then too there will be amongst them neither labour, nor sickness, nor humiliation, nor anxiety, nor need nor violence, nor night, nor darkness, but great light. (10) And they shall have a great indestructible wall, and a paradise bright and incorruptible, for all corruptible things shall pass away, and there will be eternal life".

It appears clearly enough from the above passage that in the view of the Slavonic Enoch the Judgment falls at the close of the Messianic Kingdom and preceded the incorruptible Age to Come (cf. 7:1, "the boundless judgment", and many other passages). Judgment dominates the horizon once again. There are, however, several passages where the terms are too general to admit of certainty regarding the type of Judgment to which they refer, e.g. 48:8; 50:5; 51:3; and 52:15, and one passage, 18:6 ("And on account of this God judged them (the Grigori) with a mighty judgment. And they weep for their brethren, and they will be punished on the Lord's great day"), where two different acts of Judgment seem to be adumbrated.

Aside from the dominant notions of Judgment, the eclecticism of Slavonic Enoch does not conduce to a coherent doctrine of the future life. The writer's own indefiniteness on the subject is well brought out by a recent statement of C.V. Pilcher's that Slavonic Enoch holds a view that SEEMS TO IMPLY a doctrine of life in the beyond.⁴¹

Slavonic Enoch has dabbled also in ideas of pre-existence. In 23:5 he has written: "all souls are prepared to eternity before the formation of the world". From this it might be inferred that he held a more purely Platonic view than 'Wisdom' did, of the soul's pre-existence. But again there is the possibility that what we have here is the voicing of a current Greek phrase, embodying a notion which formed part of the stock-in-trade of Alexandrian philosophical discussion, and that the Enoch writer has only very partially assimilated the idea. And from 49:2 the true reason for his interest in pre-existence appears - for him it is but the other side of pre-destination ("And I swear to you yea, yea, that there has been no man in his mother's womb, but that already before, even to each one there is a place prepared for the repose of the soul, and a measure fixed how much it is intended that a man be tried in this world. Yea, children, deceive not yourselves, for there has previously been prepared a place for every soul of man").

It is remarkable that in Slavonic Enoch ideas of

predestination of the soul are without scruple combined with Jewish ideas of a Judgment, of a temporary Messianic Kingdom, and an underworld of pain and punishment for the wicked. The writer has himself been attracted by the material aspect of the coming Kingdom so dear to the popular Jewish expectation, and yet in one point at least, 56:2, it is as though he were making an effort to renounce this very materialism - "Enoch answered to his son Methosalam and said: 'Hear my child, from the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, there has been no food in me, and my soul remembers not earthly enjoyment neither do I want anything earthly". From his own eschatological surveys, however, it is apparent that he wavers between acceptance and renunciation of the cherished Jewish ideals.

The work is overlaid with a Greek veneer: the writer through the Greek influence has become concerned with the future life of the soul. Nevertheless there can be no absolute declaration that to the Slavonic Enoch resurrection of the body could only have been inconceivable.⁴² In the knowledge of his Jewishness in other respects, and in spite of the absence of any forthright mention of such resurrection, the case is to be left open here. He may not have rejected the resurrection.

The passage 22:8-10 is not, however, to be used as proof of a real resurrection doctrine in the author ("And

the Lord said to Michael: 'Go and take Enoch from out his earthly garments, and anoint him with my sweet ointment, and put him into the garments of My glory'. (9) And Michael did thus as the Lord told him. He anointed me and dressed me, and the appearance of that ointment is more than the great light, and his ointment is like sweet dew; and its smell mild, shining like the sun's ray. (10) And I looked at myself and was like one of His glorious ones".

The words have been frequently considered to refer to the clothing of the blessed dead in the garments of God's glory, that is with a heavenly body, and to be parallel therefore to I Enoch 62:15; IV Ezra 2:39,45; etc. But it has to be noted first that 'Slavonic Enoch' is using in these verses a collocation of words that do not lend themselves to definite interpretation, and secondly that ENOCH is the subject of the heavenly drama of enrobing with glorious raiment - what in the imagination of the folklorist is true of the heroic legendary figure, is not to be predicated of all the blessed dead among ordinary mortals. The passage therefore cannot carry much weight.

The over-all impression given by Slavonic Enoch is that the writer is a collector who has time to spend in gathering straws of the apocalyptic traditions, and that he is not moved by any sense of urgency - lively faith in a better life to come is lacking from the book.

IV Maccabees.

IV Macc. is generally accepted as the work of an Alexandrian Jew.⁴³ It is unique in the Ap. and Ps. as being a homily or diatribe of the Greek pattern, and addressing an audience (1:1; 18:1). Though it is poles apart from I and II Macc., it has won its own name from its use of material from the story of the Jewish martyrs in II Macc. 6:18 to 7:42. At the heart the author is no less a Jew than the writers of Wisdom and Slavonic Enoch. "The great purpose of the book is to stimulate faithfulness to the Law, and to show that the Greek ideal of virtue can be realized only by Judaism."⁴⁴ His preaching is Jewish all through, and although some of his ideals have been transformed by Greek thought, he remains loyal to the faith of his fathers. He displays the most ardent patriotism (9:18, "I will show you that in behalf of virtue the sons of the Hebrews alone are unconquerable"), and his work is a fascinating example of how a Jewish sermon on the Jewish faith could decorously wear a Greek garb.

It appears that his doctrine of the after-life is more Graecised than that of either Wisdom or Slavonic Enoch. Nothing is more striking than the gulf of contrast between the materialist resurrection faith of II Macc. and his own account of the martyrdom of the seven sons, for he has laid all emphasis not upon a resurrection-promise, but upon the heroic performance of duty for duty's sake (12:12 ff., 5:16 ff.,

62:22 and 23) - a type of Jewish Stoicism. The writer almost seems to be revising the teaching of II Macc., and is anxious to proclaim a different expectation than the resurrection of the dead, as it appears, in the present work: he wishes, it seems, to make prominent a more spiritual doctrine of immortality, and first leaves the room swept and garnished of the normal Jewish resurrection doctrine by recommending in the above passages a Stoic bravery for bravery's sake.

There are in IV Macc, as in most other books of the intertestamental literature, passages which are too indefinite⁴⁵ to be probative of the exact nature of the future life envisaged, being precise only in the firm conviction they reveal of an after life, e.g. 17:12, "For on that day virtue, proving them through endurance, set before them the prize of victory in incorruption in everlasting life"; 10:15, "By the blessed death of my brethren, by the eternal doom of the tyrant, and by the glorious life of the righteous, I will not deny my noble brotherhood"; 9:8, "For we through this our evil entreatment and our endurance of it shall win the prize of virtue"; 15:2, "The mother, having two choices before her, religion and the present saving alive of her seven sons according to the tyrant's promise, loved rather religion, which saveth unto eternal life according to God"; 15:5, "Not so majestic stands the moon amid the stars in heaven as thou, having lit the path of thy seven starlike

sons unto righteousness, standest in honour with God; and thou art set in heaven with them." These are exactly the type of texts in the Ap. and Ps. into which it is very easy to read too much and to assert their exact reference by themselves to an immortal life of the souls in communion with God.

The need to eschew dogmatism regarding such texts can best be sharply focussed by a consideration of Charles' interpretation of two texts remarkably parallel to each other from II Macc. and IV Macc, II Macc. 7:36 ("These our brothers, after enduring a brief pain, have now drunk of everlasting life"), Charles roundly assumes, refers to participation in the Messianic Kingdom upon earth.⁴⁶ IV.Macc. 17:17 and 18 ("The tyrant himself and his whole council admired their endurance, whereby they now do both stand beside the throne of God, and live the blessed age"), he takes as alluding to the blessed immortality of the soul with God.⁴⁷ But if the former be related to the terrestrial life of the Messianic Kingdom, it is by no means clear that the latter MUST relate only to the immortal life of the soul. The wisest verdict on such texts is one of 'not proven': as it is, Charles' opposite interpretations of these two passages proceed from the tendency to impose consistency upon the eschatological ideas of each of these works.

Now while the writer of IV Macc. has banished

completely from his perspective the Jewish ideas of a Judgment at the End and an intermediate state, there remain at least two passages conveying that deep Jewish sense of community, which had the most powerful impact upon normal Jewish views of the Hereafter. The words of 7:18 and 19, ("But as many as with their whole heart make righteousness their first thought, these alone are able to master the weakness of the flesh, (19) believing that unto God they die not as our patriarchs, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob died not, but that they live unto God"), go hand in hand with 13:17 ("After this our passion, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob shall receive us, and all our forefathers shall praise us") - the departed Jewish martyrs are to be reunited with the sainted dead of Israel, this the crown of martyrdom! The very last words of his homily bespeak the same faith: "But the sons of Abraham, with their victorious mother, are gathered together into the place of their ancestors, having received pure and immortal souls from God" (18:23). And the same words incidentally reveal how little definite it is possible to be that 'IV Macc.', Hellenized partially as he was, preaches a PURELY Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

It has to be remembered that Josephus, who undoubtedly would not have been prepared to deny the resurrection of the body, made, concerning the beliefs of the Pharisees, who certainly accepted the resurrection of the body, two brief statements resembling the teaching of IV Macc.

- "All souls are imperishable, but only the soul of the good passes into another body, while the souls of the bad are castigated with everlasting punishment" (Bell. Jud. 2, 8, 14 § 63); and at greater length (Antiq. XVIII. 1, 3 § 14): "Their belief is that souls have a deathless vigour, and that beneath the earth there are rewards and punishments according as they have been devoted in life to virtue or to vice. For the latter everlasting imprisonment is prescribed; for the former capability of coming to life again." Josephus was giving a retouched rhetorical exposition adapted to the needs of cultured pagans. 'IV Macc.' had in view a like aim and object. It was not to be expected that either - even if each believed it sincerely enough - would announce a doctrine of a resurrection of the body to an audience who must always find it loathsome: for the belief had to pass from being merely a speculation, into the glowing resurrection assurance of the early Christian Church, before those who had apprehended it might have the intrepidity to challenge with it the pagan world.

Such passages as 7:18 and 19, and 18:23 in IV Macc. exhibit perfectly clearly that here also in this work Jewish doctrines and ideals lie in close proximity to Greek views of the immortality of the soul.⁴⁸ The thinking even of 'IV Macc.' really falls far behind the Jewish lines. For the points of contrast with the Platonic system, occurring in a passage like 18:23 are much more

notable than the similarities. Plato's ideal world (*κόσμος νοητός*) is perceptible only to the pure intelligence⁴⁹; the Jew describes even the spiritual world in much more concrete terms and with a much less unrestrained individualism.

Commenting on the words of 18:23, Townshend writes: "These words point to an original difference between good and bad souls before their incorporation in the body."⁵⁰ Thus he understands the phrase, "having received pure and immortal souls from God", as an allusion to the pre-existence of the soul and its union with the body at the very beginning of their earthly life, and he cites Wisdom 8:19 for comparison. But as with Wisdom, so here it is unlikely that for 'IV Macc.' pre-existence and immortality stand or fall together, as they do in the Platonic system. The receipt of pure and immortal souls, vouchsafed to the sons of Abraham, according to the Jewish apprehension of it, does not absolutely preclude the possibility of a belief in an embodied existence hereafter.

The Jews of the Diaspora were in no sense 'arrivistes', adapting themselves with a perfervid zeal and coat-turning facility to the new society and the new culture into which they are entered - Jews they remained, particularly in their fundamental eschatological convictions. Living in daily contact with Greek thought and philosophical debate

concerning man's present and future state, they yet regarded his future in basically Jewish fashion, retaining in their scheme of things indigenous Palestinean notions of Messianism, Judgment, and an embodied existence for men hereafter, and grafting on to the parent stalks Hellenistic ideas that were new to them. Their allegiance to the Jewish ideals stands as unimpeachable evidence of the enormous influence which Messianism and the beliefs concerning the future concomitant with it must have exerted in the homeland, since now they are radiated even thus far in the Diaspora.

Even in Alexandria the Jewish man of letters never appears to have arrived at anything like an assurance of the inalienable right of each human soul by virtue of its own inherent properties to immortal life - whereas therefore the Greeks always asked, 'Is the soul immortal?' the question ever spontaneously put by the Jew everywhere was this, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' Hellenist Jews, it is true, asking this latter, sometimes illogically sought to make the answer to the first.

A quite different account of the relation of Jewish ideas of resurrection and Greek ideas of immortality has been recently given by H.A. Wolfson, the distinguished Harvard historian of philosophy. Writing of Philo, Wolfson says: "It is quite evident that all the references to resurrection found in the traditional literature of his time

were understood by him as being only a figurative way of referring to immortality. It is on account of this, we imagine, that he constantly draws upon the traditional vocabulary of resurrection to express his view of immortality".⁵¹ Now something of the same active intent is suggested for IV Macc. in that very passage (18:23) just discussed. The expression, 'gathered together unto the place of their fathers', it is proposed, is certainly an interpretation of the expression, 'thou shalt go to thy fathers' in Genesis 15:15 - a proof text from Scripture is being used to support belief in the immortality of the soul.⁵²

Such open intention can be readily accredited to

Philo, for his own account on this verse in Genesis is:

"He here clearly indicates the incorruptibility of the soul, when it transfers itself out of the abode of the mortal body and returns as it were to the metropolis of its fatherland, from which it originally migrated into the body."⁵³ It is also true to say that what to the Pharisees was the highest conceivable good (bodily existence hereafter) was to Philo the greatest imaginable evil. Yet there is no good reason to suppose that all the Jewish writers of Alexandria were Philos, even in miniature: at least in the minute detail with which Philo sought to assimilate Hebrew ideas with Greek philosophical teaching, he was probably much 'sui generis'.

As far as concerns the works of Alexandrian provenance in the Ap. and Ps. we are permitted to judge

only on the limited evidence offered by the books themselves as we possess them, and prohibited from surmising that, because their surroundings are the same as his, their WHOLE outlook is Philonic. It is indeed apposite here to notice Emile Bréhier's contention that it is impossible to recover traces of an Alexandrian school of which Philo's work is representative.

The fleeting hints and traces in Wisdom, Slavonic Enoch and IV Macc. of a continued belief in some form of bodily existence hereafter have stealthily intruded - such is the impression - under the power of their own impulse, to stand beside new and far more spiritual ideals: the inconsistency in ideas of the future that has resulted is too naive to make it easy to believe that the writers themselves, particularly the 'Wisdom' writer, have included references to the resurrection in their system by a conscious process, and have bound together the old resurrection terminology and intimations of the immortality of the soul, hoping by the former to corroborate the latter. Slavonic Enoch is in large part a tissue of reminiscences from the native Jewish Eschatology, and reveals the long arm which these extended rather than any desire on the part of the writer to use them to support his newer Greek ideals of the future life. And finally it would be strange if 'IV Macc.' in his parting words, introduced thus subtly a Scripture text

(which points the way rather to normal Jewish views of a Kingdom to come for the risen, and which would continue to suggest to Jews at least just that association of ideas in spite of HIS use of it) to PROVE immortality of the soul.

Wolfson further extends his general suggestion that "a restatement of the immortality of the soul in scriptural terms of the resurrection of the body is common in all the writings which consciously turned corporeal resurrection into something incorporeal", to I Enoch.⁵⁴ I Enoch, he holds, uses the language of bodily resurrection when it says that 'the righteous shall arise from their sleep' (91:10), for it really means rather a new disembodied life, since it is only 'the spirits of you who have died in righteousness' which 'shall live and rejoice' (103:4). Apart from the fact that the Enoch writer had probably not attained such nicety in his employment and interpretation of scriptural expressions, and that Palestinean Judaism was little affected thus early by the influences which made themselves felt in Alexandria, it is reasonable to believe that the allusions to resurrection of the body which appear in such as I Enoch are neither a compromise with the traditional language, nor yet a skilful use of it to prove immortality of the soul: they issue rather from deep-seated Jewish presuppositions about the nature of man, as he is now and shall be hereafter, in some kind of bodily form - presuppositions which are not

effaced anywhere in Judaism by advancing spiritual ideals.

APPENDIX ON WISDOM OF SOLOMON (v.pp.270-288).

R.H. Pfeiffer in his recent work, 'History of New Testament Times' (1949, New York), treats in some detail Wisdom's doctrine of the after-life. He warns against any futile attempt to seek in Wisdom a definite time-table of the future life (v.p.339). Moreover he clearly recognises Wisdom's twin Judaeo-Hellenistic heritage (v.p.337).

Pfeiffer criticises those who have maintained, more or less positively, that a resurrection is implied in Chapters 3-5, and alluded to in 16:13 f. (e.g. W.Weber, F.Focke, R.Schütz, and less categorically M.J.Lagrange), and himself asserts: "in reality the revivification of the body seems to be utterly alien to the author's thought" (p.339). He therefore describes 4:16, 5:1, and 3:8, usually taken at least to hint at resurrection, as "rhetorical outbursts intended to show how the tables will be turned and eventually the oppressed righteous will dominate over their oppressors." And of 3:8 he says that it does imply for the pious dead a future life on this earth, but that it "may be a mere echo of Dan.7:14,27, penned without a realization of its far-reaching import." (v.p.339).

Now while it is true that 'Wisdom' is a poet, fond of 'poetic justice', rather than an 'eschatologist', it does not follow that verses implying resurrection are mere lyrical effusions, and verses proclaiming the immortality of the soul, though still poetry, embody his true philosophy of the after-life.

He would be brave who would define which love was first in this poet's heart, the Greek ideal of immortality or the popular Jewish notion. Might we not be satisfied to believe that he cherished both together? That, with the licence the poet justly claims, he never sought logically to fuse or combine them in one coherent system?

And finally it always was true, as A.Bentzen has noted, (Introduction to the Old Testament, Vol.II, p.71, note 2) it always was true that "Oriental thinking can place ideas which seem to us to exclude one another, at the side of one another."

CHAPTER X.RETROSPECT.

The resurrection to the Jews of the intertestamental period was never a miraculous and distinct phenomenon.

Guignebert has caught the point well: "The resurrection was not preached for its own sake as a single unrelated fact, but as an integral part of a system which considered man's fate as bound up with the fate of the world, and connected the future of humanity with the eschatological transformation of the world."¹ Jewish thought had not attained in Gospel times to a definite doctrine of the Last Things, as Johannes Weiss and Schweitzer mistakenly believed: the contemporaries of Jesus had not evolved a fixed eschatological schema.

Schweitzer maintained that "the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra do not simply take over traditional expectations of the future, but seek also to make out a logical satisfying whole".² Their eschatological representations are, however, variegated enough to suggest that 'a logical whole' was not their avowed object, and more assuredly not their achievement. The Ap. and Ps. are in fact characterised rather at every level, and not alone in those advanced apocalypses, by a lack of arbitration on the many facets of the Eschata, by the fluidity of their conceptions and the UN-dogmatic manner of their propositions. This literature makes it plain that

Jewish eschatological speculation throughout the intertestamental epoch was not dogmatic, but imaginative, often vague, greatly varied and changing. Confusion reigned concerning the destiny of the world, and the destiny of man as bound up with it - it was impossible that the resurrection, affecting the fate of man, should become a fixed point in this unstable and volatile setting.

The attempts in the Ap. and Ps. to introduce a resurrection into the Final Picture are in consequence often lame and halting, so that in several writers their resurrection doctrine - with features indistinct and lines obscure - limps along tamely beside their other fundamental eschatological convictions of surpassing strength. Frequently in their schemes the Last Judgment far surpasses the resurrection in importance and effectiveness: in I Enoch the Judgment is mentioned precisely and definitely in fifty different passages, whereas the resurrection receives the barest mention in only one or two places. Nor does there appear throughout the Ap. and Ps. the slightest trace of any endeavour to secure uniformity of belief regarding the resurrection - it is, it will be remembered, often enough defended against the attacks of its opponents - that does not appear till the occasion of Mishnah Sanhedrin X:1 which, by its pronouncement, excludes from the World to Come any who refuses to accept the resurrection faith.

Paul E. Davies has stated in an essay in "The Study of the Bible To-day and To-morrow" that "the idea of resurrection receives extensive development in these writings (i.e. the apocalypses), and the New Testament emphasis upon it cannot be explained apart from this literature".³ But the New Testament emphasis upon the resurrection is so radically different from anything we find in the Ap. and Ps. that Davies' contention is prone to mislead. Christianity brought an absolute centralisation of the resurrection faith. In the Ap. and Ps., while it is true that the resurrection idea is to some extent developed there, interest in the resurrection notion appears only upon rare occasions, and then it has nothing of the character of a central, vivid and victorious faith, or of a stimulus to moral betterment in men's life here and now. To this and kindred contrasts we shall revert in the last Chapter. Enough here to state that while the Resurrection is the beginning of the Christian Gospel and the central confirmation of the Christian message, and while in the New Testament the Resurrection is so all-embracing as to deliver not only men, but to free the whole world of nature (Romans 8:21), in inter-testamental Judaism the primary interest is in the world's fate, and when and if the resurrection notion is at all included in eschatological presentations, its scope is limited, and it is, as it were, tagged on.

There can be detected from the Ap. and Ps. three consummations, with which (before the resurrection idea) Jewish Eschatology was chiefly concerned - 1) the old prophetic notions of an earthly Messianic Kingdom, 2) a new Age instituted by a cataclysmic overthrow of this world, and 3) the Rewards and Punishments of individual souls immediately after death in places removed from the earth.⁴ But one stage does not succeed the other in a steady evolutionary progress - and all attempts to compartmentalise the documents of the Ap. and Ps. in such wise as to convey the impression of a gradual and somewhat inevitable upward historical growth from one stage to the other, has to be deprecated. All that can be claimed for the Ap. and Ps. is that the tendency is revealed, according to the insight of each writer to pass from one stage to another - but it is only a TENDENCY. The most highly significant fact is that although the apocalypses by and large incline towards the portrayal of a great cosmic transformation and the introduction of a totally 'other' Age at the End, and although Apoc.Bar. and IV Ezra exhibit fleeting intimations of an individual immortality upon death - the Talmud records that the rabbis, with whom these works have affinities, were principally concerned with this third stage - yet the primitive ideals of a glorious restoration to an earthly kingdom remain always popular and pervade every level of development. The survival of the lowest form at the highest

stage of doctrinal evolution is a trait common to all religious systems. But this particular survival in inter-testamental Jewish Eschatology is profoundly significant and far-reaching in its consequences, since it colours all Jewish thinking on the hereafter.

The early Jewish dream was of a culmination of the racial history rather than of individual biography⁵, and that dream always contemplated the restored glories of Israel upon this present earth. The popular imagination was more stirred by the material forms in which the announcement of God's Kingdom was expressed than with spiritual ideals - and so it was all the way through. The advancing spiritual hopes were always tempered with expectations of a brilliant future in the world, of Israel's material victory over the Gentiles, expectations which penetrated into the highest reaches of the apocalyptic literature, in IV Ezra, and even into Hellenistic Judaism, which while it came to appropriate in large degree the external forms and terminology of pagan culture, continued to be at one with the inner spirit and ideals of traditional Judaism.

It was the traditional Jewish Messianism which gave birth to the resurrection hope in Israel. Harnack, while placing the rise of the belief too late, indicates clearly enough his opinion that the resurrection of the body - 'diese irrationale Hoffnung'⁶ he calls it - was connected with

the expectation of a Messianic Kingdom upon earth.⁷

Schwally may also to some extent be correct in claiming that it had a certain political motive behind it.⁸ (It is interesting to observe here that E. Bickermann in 'Der Gott der Makkabäer' considers that the calm and sober record of I Macc., a Hasmonaeen work, gives the true Jewish orientation of events in the second century B.C., when it indicates, largely between the lines, that the 'Seleucid' persecution was produced by a Jewish party that contemned Jewish particularism: II Macc., on the other hand is a rabid anti-Seleucid, breathing political fanaticism and burning patriotism upon the foreign foe. Now, as we noticed, there is absolutely no resurrection belief in I Macc., whereas that belief is nowhere stronger than in II Macc. This lends some weight to the claim that in its primitive form the resurrection belief may have had a national or racial bias.) The moving factor certainly appears to have been the need experienced to extend the prerogative of participation in the Messianic Kingdom to the righteous dead of Israel. But the resurrection hope in Israel was not merely political, nor attained by a rational inference from the events and circumstances of the Maccabaeen Age - its roots strike deep into the very heart of the Hebrew religion, to a somewhat mechanical conception of the Covenant relationship of Israel and Jahweh, the basic idea of all Jewish theology.

When the true nationalist origins of the

resurrection belief are comprehended, it is seen to be an indigenous Jewish growth, there is nothing like it in Zoroastrianism. The idea of the revivification of the body to a share in the life of the earthly Kingdom still in the society of Israel, "as it was the original conception doubtless continued to be the popular notion"⁹: its permanence was indeed assured not only by the intensity of Jewish hopes of Israel's future earthly grandeur, but by ingrained Jewish notions of the nature of man as a unity of body and soul. In its primitive Messianic setting, the resurrection of the body idea occurred in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in much more shadowy form was hinted in I Enoch 1-36 and I Enoch 83-90.

There were, however, at work in Judaism various influences which led to a different and more spiritual view of the resurrection. It is not necessary with Bousset and others to go to the Iranian religion to find the germs of the development of the universal resurrection idea. For Jewish Eschatology tended to move, as we saw, from the primitive Messianism to the pronouncement of a vast cosmic transformation, stimulated no doubt by a prophecy like that of Isaiah 65:17, "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth". Thus a certain hesitant drifting away from the present earth as the scene of the Fulfilment combined with other causes which lay deep in post-Exilic Judaism to produce a universalising and a spiritualising of Jewish expectations of the future life.

The rising individualism of Job and certain Psalms rendered easy the ultimate concept of a final transcendent divine retribution for the individual. For when as in these Psalms, 'communion with God', and 'life' became equated, the way was open for a belief in immortality, a life with God, eternal in the heavens.

This goal - the concept of an other-worldly Age to Come, to which the individual rather than the nation stood related - was reached by a different route than along the way of the popular Messianic hope: it betokened rather a profound and prolonged reflection upon the destiny of the individual in a realm beyond death. Yet so persistent were the naive Messianic hopes of an earthly Kingdom for Israel at the last that they could never be quite forsaken: and many adjuncts of these hopes were taken and translated, often instinctively more than by conscious design, into this new world of thought of a heavenly Age to Come, so that in their novel surroundings they assumed different hues and tones. The Messianic Judgment, hitherto nationalist and military, became the world - Judgment in which the ultimate fates of men are decided: the resurrection became universal and spiritual in its mode, since it must now introduce men to an order of existence other than this present, for which the body as it now is would be crass and cumbersome and ill-adapted. The subsequent story of Jewish Eschatology is taken

up with the confusion of the old Messianism, which died so very hard, and the newer transcendental Eschatology. M.J. Lagrange accurately distinguished the separate origins of the two, but too rigidly isolated them each from the other in the later development. For the confusion is perpetuated even into the rabbinical literature.

The eschatological conception of a resurrection of the righteous and the wicked to Judgment did not displace the belief in the resurrection at the inauguration of the Messianic Age - thus the double resurrection as it figures in the New Testament Apocalypse - the two walked together without being agreed. There ensued therefore the indefiniteness of conception regarding the resurrection in I Enoch 91-104, and even more strikingly in Psalms of Solomon, Jubilees and the Assumption of Moses, oscillating rapidly as they do between the earthly and the heavenly, the material and the spiritual, the national and the universal. "The line of demarcation", writes Driver, "between the earthly and the heavenly ideal was not always clearly or consistently drawn, so that it is not always easy to be confident in particular passages which of the two ideals the writer means to express."¹⁰

The third consummation envisaged by Jewish apocalyptic was the entry of the individual soul immediately upon death to final blessing in a heavenly sphere (or to final punishment) - but it appears only tentatively and

falteringly in some places in IV Ezra, and to a lesser degree in Apoc.Bar. Its appearance there may owe something to the touch of Greek influence; but it would in truth have been the logical culmination of the spiritual quest of the poets of the 16th and 73rd Psalms, finding its foundation in a profound sense of the justice of God and a conviction of an inviolable communion with him. The teaching of our Lord, St.Paul and St.John all contain elements pointing in this same direction (cf. Luke 23:43; Philippians 1:23). It seems particularly that Paul might have expanded the notion that at death the dead are at once removed to heaven and assume a heavenly glory. But the idea never became prominent or predominant - Judaism, as also early Christianity, here very closely allied to its Jewish origins, could not give its allegiance to the more mystical, Hellenist viewpoint to the detriment of its apocalyptic outlook. Both Judaism and early Christianity continued to regard the resurrection as bound up with the Messianic Kingdom, and always then had in mind the necessity for an intermediate period of waiting before the Last Day when the dead, asleep in the grave, would be awakened. A precious stubbornness on their part in the face of clamorous Greek insistence to affirm a purely 'spiritual' salvation immediately upon death, and have done with resurrection!

And 'IV Ezra', while erecting signposts towards

the concept of immediate immortality of the soul, has not himself followed the road. Instead, under the limitations of his own thought-heritage (transcended alike by Paul and John) he had recourse to the old concern with Israel and the national destiny. Though he grants that Israel has deserved her fate (he is writing after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.), he ventures to ask whether heathen Babylon is any better, so that even here the old Messianist pre-occupations have reared their head and with them traces of the original materialist ideas of resurrection, and the clearest reference in this literature to a temporary Messianic Kingdom, that "compromise between the ancient hope of the prophets which belongs to this world, and the modern, Jewish transcendental hope".¹¹

There is, it is clear, in the writers of the Ap. and Ps. no gradual and steady scaling of the heights, from the denser air of the lower slopes of the primitive and materialist Messianism, to the rarefied atmosphere of a universal and completely spiritual Eschatology. They could never quite outreach the original ideals of an earthly Messianic consummation, and in their thoughts of the final fate of men were always returning to the conviction that such a Messianic restoration requires a restored earthly body - even when they had visualised an 'other' World to Come, heavenly. True, in places their vision of that new Age, far removed from this world in kind, wonderfully

changed from the present, forced them to the conclusion that it demands a radically different form of existence, an UN-earthly, a spiritual. The basic element of the 'other' World, as they see it, is LIGHT, and so its denizens must possess 'Light' as the substance of their bodies. The concept is no abstraction: the Jewish imagination, loving the concrete, rather than the ethereal, visualises a REAL World of 'Light' and real bodies of 'Light'.

But the continuing confusion of Messianism and transcendental Eschatology always led to the circulation, alongside of such spiritual conceptions of the resurrection (I Enoch 51:4; 104:4,6; Apoc.Bar. 51:10; cf. Luke 20:36), of the older, more materialist ideas according to which all emphasis fell upon the thought of this earthly corporeity. The Baruch passage 49-51 offers the most interesting instance of this juxtaposition of material and spiritual, for there the body is said to rise in its present form, nothing changed, and only subsequently to pass from glory into glory and light into light. By putting forth the reminder that in such a view as 'Baruch's' the resurrection is only one stage in the attainment of immortality, Hillel and Shammai have helped to focus the truth, that in intertestamental Jewish Eschatology, the resurrection was not, as a particular event of the Eschata, itself decisive and central, but have shed no light upon the logic, or lack of logic, which compelled 'Baruch' to his strange disharmony - the strong urge he

feels to cling to the hope of an earthly consummation, while all the time he is attracted also to that 'other' world of his vision.

By all the prevailing confusion in Jewish Eschatology, and by the general difficulty of deciding how far the material terms employed in portraits of the Eschata, are an endeavour to express spiritual realities, it is extremely difficult to calculate from the Ap. and Ps. exactly what was the nature of the common resurrection hope of the Jewish people about the beginning of the Christian era. But the probability can be inferred from a nexus of other circumstances that it was material, and stressed the present earthly corporeity, rather than spiritual. It was the physical aspect of the resurrection that was extended to extravagant lengths in the rabbinical literature, to the comparative neglect of more spiritual views: Paul, as observed already, felt constrained to dematerialise the resurrection, obviously in the face of very carnal Jewish notions: and there contributed to the persistence of material ideas of resurrection the burning hope of an earthly Messianic restitution, with which these were traditionally connected - even the disciples who stood nearest to our Lord were slow to learn that the Messiah's Kingdom is not of this world. Schürer maintains that the numerous popular disturbances of a politico-religious

nature in the time of the Procurators show sufficiently the feverish expectation with which the people looked forward to a miraculous intervention of God in the course of history and to the dawn of His Kingdom upon earth. How else could men like Theudas and the Egyptian have found believers in their promises by hundreds and thousands?¹² Jesus' second temptation in the wilderness, as R. Niebuhr has it,¹³ is presumably an account of His rejection of the political-nationalist conception of the Messianic task (Luke 4:5), and shows that purely nationalistic versions of Messianism were still powerful in His day.

If it is difficult to define from the available evidence just what was the real shape and form of the resurrection hope among the Jewish people about the time of Jesus Christ, it is no less so to determine how far it was truly apprehended and grasped (and by how many of the populace) as a true and living faith at all. A crumb of information, which sheds an interesting ray of light on the subject, has been offered by Theodore Reinach¹⁴ - in a study of the Jewish inscriptions at the Jewish cemetery of Monteverde he shows that the resurrection is rarely mentioned. That at least leads to the recollection that the works of the Ap. and Ps. surveyed in the preceding Chapters, as having some bearing upon the resurrection, represent a remarkably small proportion of the whole literature.

The almost sudden appearance of the new hope in the midcourse of post-Exilic Judaism does not mean that immediately it won all hearts. From the first there must have been opposition. The Jewish treatise Pirqê 'Abôth preserves a tradition attributed to Antigonus of Socho: "Be not like slaves who serve the master on condition that they receive a reward, but be like slaves who serve the master on condition that they receive no reward, and let the fear of heaven be incumbent upon you". Antigonus, preaching virtue for virtue's sake, is probably representative of a proto-Sadducean school who opposed the growing belief in a blissful future life. He is therefore the prototype of those early books of the Apocrypha, Wisdom of Ben Sira, Judith, Tobit and I Maccabees - which Bousset¹⁵ thinks must have mentioned the resurrection in 2:49-68 if he had believed in it, a suggestion dismissed by Bonsirven¹⁶ with the comment, 'cela n'est pas évident' - which are content with the ancient notions of Sheol. Ben Sira by the very emphasis of his promulgation of the orthodox doctrine implicitly rules out the resurrection faith - death is the destiny of all mankind. Opposition was lively then before almost the new idea of resurrection was fully born.

It is, however, doubtful whether Moore is justified in saying that controversy^S between Pharisees and Sadducees arose on the resurrection of the body at the time of the

immediate Eschatology represented in Daniel and parts of Enoch¹⁷, for we may wonder whether embryonic tendencies had so far assumed definite shape and form at this stage. For our knowledge that there was dissension on the subject of life after death between Pharisees and Sadducees we are indebted to Josephus, the Gospels, the Book of Acts, and the Talmudic treatises - but much about the nature of the controversy is enveloped in the mists of obscurity. And here the Ap. and Ps. have little illumination to impart, for while, it is true, there are many clear indications of controversy^s on the resurrection in the documents, it is now certain that these documents of the Ap. and Ps. cannot be rigidly distinguished as of Pharisean or Sadducean provenance.

The attempts to classify the books of the Ap. and Ps. by sects or parties, and to claim thereafter that this party held this doctrine and the other that, have notably failed - and the reverse process must now also be eschewed, the jumping hastily to the conclusion that since a doctrine we know from other sources to be Sadducean or Pharisean appears in the page of a work, the work must be Sadducean or Pharisean. Of these methods hitherto readily followed none has been more rigorous in his denunciation than Travers Herford, who will not have it that the Pharisees wrote any of the Ap. and Ps. Classification of the books of this literature after this fashion is far too simple: it is much

nearer the truth to say that these writers represent other types of Judaism to which indeed no specific names can be attached, unless perhaps in the case of the Apocalyptists, but which all united to make up along with those whose names are known, the complex whole of Judaism as it was in the period before us.¹⁸

Herford has done yeoman service in stressing that Judaism in the intertestamental period was a living organism, expressed in very many moods and blending many diverse patterns of thought: two or three parties, stable in their thought and with a homogenous body of beliefs, cannot adequately picture for us the flux and complexity of Judaism in that era. In a Palestine, seething with groups and cliques subject to swift changes of mood and temper and sudden transitions of thought, and forming the meeting-place of many winds of doctrine, it was natural that eschatological speculations were varied and fluctuating and conspicuously lacking uniformity - a new eschatological conceit, such as the resurrection, seeking to make a way for itself, must have encountered many vastly different receptions in that epoch among groups and individuals. A.M. Hunter has reminded us with regard to the resurrection doctrine in the early Christian community, that we do not know what precise form the preaching of it took - "nor is it likely that, say Peter

and Apollos or James and Paul, held precisely similar views on the mode and scope of the resurrection".¹⁹ Yet they were informed with the thrill of the experience of a risen Christ, and however otherwise they differed in their thinking, they regarded present and future alike in the light of the event of His Resurrection. Jewish speculations on the resurrection, instinct with no such common certainty, were consequently of variety more infinite.

It is therefore singularly difficult to define from the Ap. and Ps. what views on the fashion and scope of the resurrection were held by the generality of the people towards the Christian era, and equally difficult to determine even whether the generality of the people held any emphatic beliefs on the resurrection at all.

Sweeping generalisations concerning the extent of allegiance given to the resurrection hope or concerning the scope envisaged for the resurrection in the intertestamental era, depend upon inference from the historical events of the period, rather than upon the direct evidence of the sources - it may be reiterated that in the Ap. and Ps. the resurrection received scant mention. It is felt, however, that popular imagination, in that time of persecution which produced the Maccabaeian revolution, must have been stirred and captured by a new faith which offered such consolation

and such hope - Schwally²⁰ thus held that the resurrection hope originated as a popular belief and then only gradually penetrated to the more learned classes, free from the hysteria and excitement which early caught the mob.

The plebeian nature of the resurrection belief in early Judaism was unduly emphasised by Louis Finkelstein²¹ with that extremism which characterises his whole sociological method and his rural-urban theory of the Pharisean-Sadducean schism. His account - already little more than an interesting relic - is in fact an entertaining example of that inclination previously decried to be clearer than the source-books warrant, and the epitome of all politico-social theories of the origin and growth of the resurrection belief, which take no notice of its religious roots. Finkelstein asserts that the writers of the different sections of Enoch, and 'Daniel' belong to the class of the אֲנָשִׁים , the unprotesting, the non-resisting and unambitious, the social opposites of the wealthy who have great difficulty in entering the Kingdom of Heaven: it was the democracy of the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection which prepared the way for its spread throughout the world. "All remaining doubts", he writes, "that the plebeians were the first adherents in Israel to the doctrine of resurrection must be set at rest by a study of the actual events of the war" (i.e. the Maccabean War) - and on not very convincing grounds he is

for including 'Daniel' also among the □']] ,
 as we saw, in pursuance of his theory. Opposition to the
 doctrine was, in Finkelstein's view, set up by the
 patricians, eager to deny the blessing of future felicity
 to the oppressed poor, as they were anxious to forbid them
 a decent life here and now.

But beside his hazardous effort to establish
 'Daniel' as one of the □']] on insufficient evidence,
 Finkelstein did not either recognise that the Enochic
 writers - who were in fact either of the number of the
□']] , as he claims, or at least championed their
 cause - have staked very little upon the resurrection hope,
 have rarely mentioned it openly and emphatically, have not
 given the impression that they have firmly apprehended it
 as a vital faith, and have subordinated it to the great
 Judgment.

It is hard indeed to overlook the fact that
 very few of the writers of the Ap. and Ps. mention the
 resurrection with any degree of certitude - it may have been
 that they considered the other aspects of the Eschata, the
 Judgment, the world's transformation of far greater moment,
 or that men, in these days of sudden crisis and tremendous
 challenge, when the End seemed about to break upon them at
 any moment, felt that they would be alive to share in the
 coming Kingdom without even passing through the portals of
 death: it seems in fact from IV Ezra 13:24 that Jewish

preaching was prone to stress the idea of a greater

blessedness for those who survived to the inauguration of the Messianic Kingdom. Apparently some of Paul's Thessalonian converts shared a standpoint evidently typically Jewish, an assurance that blessing was in store for those who survived till the dawning of the Messianic Kingdom (or, as the Christians saw it, to the time of the Parousia), and a restless anxiety about those dead before that day - and that was the standpoint of men who had not as yet won through to a steady, burning resurrection faith. Hence was elicited Paul's exhortation to his Thessalonians to comfort one another with the certainty of the coming resurrection of the dead in Christ! (I Thessalonians 4:13-18).

But of the Ap. and Ps., II Macc. alone (and to a lesser degree Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) expressly hold forth the resurrection faith as real solace and stimulus, and, notably, neither work is an apocalypse. The apocalyptists for their part assume too much the rôle of speculators - in their eschatological portraits the resurrection appears most frequently to have remained a rather mechanical event, a relatively unimportant concomitant of the great Judgment - and they may be less far from giving a true indication of the prevailing religious temper of the age than has often been supposed.²² The apocalypses reveal only that thought was active upon the theme of resurrection; each one took up

new ideas, and remoulded his picture of the End in his endeavour to find for them a place in it.

It was, however, only when Judaism had finally and definitely turned its back on apocalyptic - it turned the broad of its back, for Louis Ginzberg informs us that "in the entire Rabbinic literature there is not one quotation from the now extant apocalyptic literature"²³ - that the resurrection faith truly crystallised and became dogmatic, only when the apocalyptic background of unceasing speculations had been shed as a cast-off garment.

While rabbinic Judaism adopted a bitterly hostile attitude to the apocalyptic literature, Christianity thrived in its atmosphere and accepted its main viewpoints. But in Christianity the resurrection of the dead became a lively faith - not certainly because of its inheritance of the speculations of apocalyptic - through everything Jesus Christ Himself had done.

That the resurrection hope was neither extensively stimulating nor comforting to Jews in the intertestamental age seems likely from the truth that great events were required to achieve vitality for the belief in both Judaism and Christianity, in the former to dogmatise it, and in the latter to render it central to the whole religion.

Guignebert may then be speaking too absolutely when he concludes: "The opinion must be rejected that the

idea of the resurrection was unknown to the majority of Jews in the time of Jesus. I believe on the contrary that the great mass of the Jewish population already adhered strongly to it, and only the somewhat sceptical aristocrats of the Temple staff, who professed to hold strictly to the Teachings of the Torah openly denied it. The fact that the later Apocryphal books are well aware of the resurrection idea while the earlier ones are silent on the subject proves that it was about the time of the birth of Jesus that the new teaching came into its own".²⁴

Widespread awareness of the ideas of resurrection and firm faith in the effectiveness of the event of resurrection are of course two different things - and the first has not been and cannot be called in question. The later books of the Ap. and Ps., as Guignebert indicates and as the present enquiry has shown, are in fact concerned with the notion of resurrection²⁵: The Pharisean - Sadducean controversy must have lent to the whole topic of resurrection a certain notoriety: it was finally the subject of high debate in the early rabbinic schools.

But what these later books of the Ap. and Ps. have to offer is not so much a sure and steady resurrection faith, but a variety of conceptions concerning the belief, and numerous earnest enough endeavours to fit it in with their schemes of the Eschata - they present no semblance

of uniformity, for sometimes the resurrection embraces all men, sometimes it is only for the righteous, sometimes it is physical, sometimes spiritual, and often a strange and inconsistent combination of all. Their contribution to the evolution of the Jewish religion lies, not therefore in their founding of the article of resurrection in any precise form, but "in the definitive establishment of retribution after death".²⁶ And that, as Montefiore indicates, made a tremendous difference - "the growth of a belief in retribution, and in a life of glory or of pain beyond the grave changed everything. Between the Old Testament and the rabbinic literature it put a huge gulf".²⁷

Yet though for the later works of the Ap. and Ps. the resurrection, where it is in any wise taught, may have been for them a lesser luminary in their eschatological firmament, what they had to say on the subject specifically was not therefore inevitably valueless. They bequeathed to Christianity, it is true, some of their illogicalities and uncertainties regarding the resurrection. Thus we can account for many puzzling corners of the New Testament on the theme of resurrection, such, for example, as the fourth Gospel's pronouncement of a crassly physical resurrection from the tomb (5:28 and 29), in the midst of far more spiritual and elevated ideals.

But they bequeathed besides much that was precious and indispensable, a stirring emphasis upon the social aspects of the resurrection, and

a hearty refusal to abandon their ever profound respect for the body and its place in the final scheme of things, and line up with Hellenistic assertions of the survival of the spirit only. They posed also, and handed down a problem which Christianity alone was able to solve.

The problem comes first. The Old Testament was characterised by a terrific tension which seemed impossible of resolution. On the one side there was Israel's certainty of God's faithfulness to His people to the End: on the other there rose the cries of the righteous and the sufferings of the afflicted. While the nation was marked out for triumph at the Last through the sovereignty of her God, why should the righteous individual suffer now? And so in the Ap. and Ps. the tension between national and individual destiny is prolonged; one is quickly aware of it - for in thought the writers of the Ap. and Ps. were the lineal descendants and the devoted progeny of the men of the Old Testament.

At the noblest levels of the Ap. and Ps. the tension appears profoundest - in I Enoch there are interpolations stressing the need for mercy as well as for the Judgment of God, ensuring the triumph of Israel over its national foes. But most notably 'IV Ezra' experiences the deepest heart-searching on the problem of individual destiny - are there in fact any who deserve to be saved?

he asks. The question receives no answer, for he cannot succeed in completely individualising and personalising his Eschatology: in the last resort he returns to the nation, Israel: Israel is the axis upon which God's work in effecting the consummation turns. Inharmoniously conjoined with a restless uneasiness about his own and other individuals' present and future lot, is the unshakeable conviction that there is in store for ISRAEL, or at least a righteous nucleus of Israel, a great salvation.

H.A. Wolfson has recently stated: "In Judaism with the firmly established belief in individual providence and individual reward and punishment, both resurrection and immortality are considered as acts of individual providence, coming to each individual as a reward or punishment for his action".²⁸ Of intertestamental Judaism that is at once true and not true. It is true in so far as on that plane of Jewish Eschatology which visualised a 'bouleversement' of the present order, and the irruption of an 'other' Age to Come, there is represented the ultimate individualizing of religion, since now every man is to be brought individually by the resurrection to the bar of Judgment, and saved or condemned thereat by his own deeds. It is not true in so far as even at this level, when Judaism was in process of individualising its Eschatology, when it was asking profound questions about the destiny of every man which far transcended the pristine concerns of

the less exalted Messianic outlook, it was still continuing to put Israel, the Messianic nation, first; it was still holding views of the resurrection, physical and carnal, proper to its primitive Messianic context; and it was most frequently unconsciously and instinctively merging the fate of the individual with the communal destiny of the People of God.

Nowhere in the Ap. and Ps. is the resurrection primarily or purely considered as an act of individual providence. While in truth the resurrection idea could not have arisen in isolation in the field of purely Messianic ideas, without some assistance from that other non-Messianic line of thought, the deepening individualism of the post-Exilic age, it was never in that epoch, so far as concerned resurrection, so much a question of individual providence as of the fate of Israel. The destiny of the individual after death never in fact attained in Judaism the same place as it occupied in the mystery-cults of the Graeco-Roman world. When the Jew of the intertestamental period looked forward to the future, he craved a part in the national time of felicity that was to come: thought centred upon the nation.

In its earliest chrysallic form in the allegorical representations of Hosea and Ezekiel, the resurrection assured the restoration of the Messianic nation. When in the Maccabaeon age the idea of resurrection

assumed a more realistic form, its *raison d'être* was still the preservation of the solidarity of Israel in the Messianic Era - the Maccabaeen martyrs, to vindicate God's honour, would, having died for Israel's sake, rise again for Israel's sake, that her society might in the End be complete. It is right to stress this feature of the Ap. and Ps. - their resurrection-emphasis lies upon its character as a national and social blessing. It is greatly tempting to deride the Jewish obsession with the nation and with nationalist Messianism whenever it turned its thoughts to the future, and to belittle the stress of the Ap. and Ps. on the communal connotation of the resurrection, - and in the Jewish religion they had their obvious limitations - and easy bitterly to criticise such as the Psalms of Solomon and Enoch, as betraying an unworthy primitivism and a singular naiveté in their assumption that national repentance alone was required to redeem the people. Notwithstanding, the dependence upon collective national repentance was of inestimable value, for the conduct and character of each man was recognised to be not purely an individual concern, but the concern of the whole Jewish people. So everywhere did intertestamental Judaism put the whole nation first. Thus also the connection of the resurrection with Messianism, and the emphasis upon its social nature checked all forms of unbridled individualism and selfish resurrectionism, and helped to prevent men from

the egocentric desire for a future of bliss for themselves apart.

This much of Jewish treasure Christianity took over, but, having escaped the bounds and trammels of the Jewish particularist and nationalist outlook, elevated it to the rank of a universal truth. Berdyaev writes: "True heavenly bliss is impossible for me if I isolate myself from the world-whole and care only about myself Salvation is the reunion of man with man and with the cosmos through reunion with God".²⁹ This is what Christianity brought! It is in the Resurrection of the dead in Christ that the goal of the redeemed society and of the individual perfectly coincide. The individual can only attain his destiny in goodly union with all who share with him in the love of God and the body of Christ. And all who are already raised must wait the coming of the last day before they shall enter into the fulness of their joy, when they together with us all shall be made complete and perfect. The synthesis, never very perfectly achieved anywhere in the Ap. and Ps. nor apprehended there with a joyful awareness, is now completed.

And the tension between the certainty that God, by His sovereign righteousness, would save His people Israel, and the distressing uncertainty instigated by the problem

of suffering individuals in Israel here and now,
is at last resolved, for Christ has Himself suffered and
Himself been raised from the dead.

CHAPTER XI.THE NEW TESTAMENT .

It is convenient and helpful to open this closing Chapter with a lengthy quotation of the words of R.H. Charles: "When we pass from Jewish literature to that of the New Testament, we find ourselves in an absolutely new atmosphere. It is not that we have to do with a wholly new world of ideas and moral forces, for all that was great and inspiring in the past has come over into the present and claimed its part in the formation of the Christian Church. But in the process of incorporation this heritage from the past has been of necessity largely transformed; it no longer constitutes a heterogeneous mass of ideas in constant flux - a flux in which the less worthy, quite as frequently as the more noble, is in the ascendant, and in which each idea in turn makes its individual appeal for acceptance, and generating its little system, enjoys in turn its little day. When received, however, within the sphere of the cosmos of Christian life and thought, all these forces and ideas gradually fall into their due subordination to its centre, and contribute harmoniously to the purpose of the whole. For the Messiah now assumes a position undreamt of in the past, and membership of the kingdom is constituted, firstly and predominantly, through personal relationship to its divine Head."¹

Charles' words are most apposite; Christianity wrought amazing changes in the Eschatology of the inter-testamental Jewish literature, not by sweeping the boards, but by taking up and enshrining in its message what its immediate Jewish predecessors had themselves discovered to be of value, and imparting simultaneously and inevitably to them a quite new emphasis in the light of all that Christ had done. We have dwelt upon the Jewish respect for the body in all their meditations on the after-state, and their close grip of the truth that a real salvation must always be a social salvation: these were recognised by the New Testament and were not allowed to slip away, even when the early Christian preaching was running the danger of lining itself up with its Hellenistic environment, whereby it might have succumbed to an egoistic individualism - laying aside its preoccupations with social fulfilment - and to assertions of a salvation of the soul, pusillanimous and infinitely less daring than its pronouncement of Resurrection, its legacy from Judaism. But no! The apostolic writers refused to exclude the body - the body, they believed rather was divinely created, and would also be divinely redeemed (II Cor. 5:4; I Cor. 6:13-14; Romans 8:10-11); moreover they clung to the Jewish sense of the need for a communal consummation, and knew well that 'they without us shall not be made perfect'.

So was that which was of permanent worth in the Jewish Eschatology, as it affected the resurrection, preserved in the New Testament, preserved and made new, for now the limited and particular (Jewish notions of the resurrection had sometimes been only of a resuscitation of human relics to a renewed life on the present earth, sometimes they had been spiritualised but rarely unmixedly so, and always their chiefest hope had been for the salvation of the community of Israel) are become through Christ the endlessly rich ideals of a resurrection life, which, yet keeping the body, transcends in quality everything we know here, and are become also universal, embracing all of every nation and each.

There is, however, to be found also in the New Testament, illogically and inconsistently, the dross of purely Jewish ideas of a baser stamp - less serious, because it received its own Christian enrichment (Luke 16:19-31), was the survival of the popular doctrine of Hades; more serious the existence of dark hints of the entirely Jewish notion of eternal damnation. But these things are marginal to the Christian Eschatology and by no means of its essence: and to a large extent their anomalous appearance in the midst of refined and transcendent ideals was inevitable - the Eschatology of a nation, as Charles has pointed out, "is always the last part of their religion to experience the transforming power of new ideas and new facts"²;

the feet of Christianity were indeed very firmly planted upon the soil of Jewish Eschatology; notions so alien to the heart of the Christian message as these lingered on in theory, while in the practice, the heart-feelings, in the daily life, of the young Christian community, they had been far outmoded and surpassed. And how could they other with men captivated first by the love that was in Christ for all humanity!

But far more important than the residue of these lower Jewish notions on the perimeter of the Christian Eschatology was the importation into the New Testament of the typical Jewish varieties of conception regarding the Kingdom to come, and ensuing nuances in beliefs on the resurrection. At different levels of the New Testament the truth 'in Christ', differently apprehended, is differently applied to the inherited body of Jewish speculations. There are in Luke's Gospel some passages implying an earthly Kingdom (cf. 13:35; 14:25): in Mark 8:38 (cf. 12:25) the scene is supernatural, and the Kingdom appears to be a strange blend of earth and heaven (cf. the Similitudes of Enoch): in John 14:2 and 17:24 the Kingdom is heavenly: Paul combines many ideas, but his view of the glorified risen body implies in the main his notion of a spiritual Kingdom: Hebrews teaches a heavenly Kingdom (11:10; 12:18-27), and the Apocalypse, more Jewish than all the rest, combines a temporary earthly Messianic Kingdom with a final heavenly

state (cf. IV Ezra). Certainly the New Testament is dominated always by the viewpoints current in intertestamental Jewish apocalyptic - even the fourth Gospel's doctrine of 'eternal life' is a slightly Hellenised version of the Synoptic 'Kingdom of God' - rather than by the Hellenistic and mystical standpoint.

In this connection it is interesting to observe that our Lord's teaching on the Resurrection has often been represented as far less Jewish than it probably was. R. Otto³ maintained that in the mind of Jesus the concept of resurrection simply combined with that of a life with God generally, a life renewed from death, so that no room at all was left for a real resurrection. It has also been claimed that Jesus did not look for a great Assize at the End of the World.⁴ But all relevant passages must be estimated equally, and none elevated to higher status than the rest - then caution will take the place of categorical pronouncements on Jesus' teaching here. It seems, for instance, that there is nothing in the Parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) to indicate that the award which follows death at once so far anticipates a final Judgment Day as to leave no place for the latter: is it not possible that such award was to take place pending the final recompense, as in the common view of Jewish apocalyptic? Further, over against Luke 23:43 there are passages (cf. Matthew 6:33; Luke 12:31; Matthew 19:29; Mark 10:30;

Luke 18:30) which show the relative esteem, a Jewish esteem, which Jesus had for the body. All in all, it is unlikely that He had so far relinquished His Jewish antecedents as to leave the body out of account in His own thought and teaching of the future blessings - yet He has preferred to accentuate the spiritual element in these, for by His dialogue with the Sadducees (Mark 12:18-27) He has made it thoroughly clear that it was quite wrong, after the Jewish habit, to introduce into the Resurrection the conditions of this present life.⁵ But here what He has done is of greater moment than what He has said, for having Himself taken upon Himself our flesh, He is raised in glory - living pledge that the whole of us, all our human nature, will 'in Him' be raised, immeasurably enriched, to that other life with Him.

This pledge of Christ, Himself risen, infused the whole apostolic teaching, as touching the Resurrection, with a certainty and triumph and vitality utterly foreign to the intertestamental Jewish speculations on the subject: it meant that, whereas the intermediate Jewish Eschatology had ended with the resurrection in the lowest place in its catalogue, the Christian Gospel truly began with the Resurrection. It was Paul who gave the most incisive and expansive teaching on the resurrection of the dead through the pledge of the risen Christ.

Into the vast subject of the Pauline Eschatology

it is impossible here to enter: some brief mention can be made of a few salient features, such as bear not only upon Paul but also upon the Eschatology of the Jewish literature of our study. And first a striking and important contrast between Paul and the Jewish literature - it is well expressed in the words of Joh. Weiss: "It is characteristic of Paul that the hope set up for the individual is more often and more strongly expressed than the expectation of the great world catastrophe. The thought of the Kingdom of God as something to be realised by all falls into the background because of his concern for the salvation of the individual. This feeling of the importance of the individual may perhaps be designated as Hellenistic. The Jewish 'messianic' hope is applied first to the people of God, secondly to the victory of God over the world, and only thirdly to the participation of the individual in the Kingdom of God. The devout Hellenist would ask first of all, how do I gain life, how do I overcome death?"⁶

Weiss's statement of this Pauline reversion of the normal Jewish order of precedence is well conceived: his assertion of its Hellenistic derivation invokes inevitably the reminder that Judaism had too as one of its own lines of thought a certain individualism (subordinate it is true to Messianism), and adumbrations of the doctrine of individual salvation, and that Paul never of course abandoned Jewish ideas of a social salvation at the End

for a purely Hellenistic individualism - it is a question of stress.

Into the lists of the controversy on the extent of the Hebraic or Hellenistic elements in Paul's Eschatology there is no need here to go hastening: but the fringes of that highly significant topic, the difference between Paul's teaching in I Cor. 15 and II Cor. 5 - it is frequently contended that in the latter he has substituted purely Greek notions for the Jewish views of the former - can be lightly touched. Let it suffice to state the conclusions we have reached.

Paul, it seems evident, as C.H. Dodd has declared, "started with eschatological beliefs of the type best represented by such Jewish writings as the Book of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Apocalypse of Ezra (II Esdras), especially the last named".⁷ Thereafter his beliefs underwent a progressive Christianisation in the light of his experience in Jesus Christ - it was a 'reconciliation to experience'. Paul begins where the Jewish speculation left off - in I Cor. 15 (here W.D. Davies⁸ has offered fruitful suggestion) he is concerned about the impending advent of the Lord when the general resurrection would be consummated. His mind is centred on the Age to Come as the End of all history, and he can argue eloquently, but nevertheless dispassionately, about the nature of the body. Thus dispassionately had the Jewish apocalyptists,

their mind yet more entirely concentrated upon the Age to Come, with a far lesser urgency and immediacy than Paul even at this earlier stage of his pilgrimage, treated the resurrection. In II Cor. 5:1 ff., on the other hand, it is not resurrection as characteristic of the End which interests him, and here the apocalyptists are left trailing far in the rear - there had intervened his experience in Asia, the vexing fear that he might die before the Parousia, the strain and stress of his ministry, so that thoughts of death crowded constantly upon him. And through these haunting thoughts and the waking hours, he has arrived at the certainty that 'in Christ' he is being already raised and transformed. Dodd has recognised that in the Epistles which follow I Cor. "the advent hope is in the background rather than in the foreground of his thought"⁹, and Paul is more concerned with defining more clearly the full meaning of the coming of the Age to Come in his present experience. A.M. Hunter represented substantially the same view: "the hope of glory yet to come remains as a background of thought, but the foreground is more and more occupied by the contemplation of all the divine riches enjoyed here and now by those who are in Christ Jesus".¹⁰ Death, everywhere present, and sin, everywhere present, are now overcome through resurrection 'in Christ'.

It was not then that at the first level (I Cor.15) Paul was an 'able and advanced expositor of

current Jewish views', and at the higher level (II Cor. 5) a devoted Greek, having forsaken his Jewish eschatological heritage. Rather he accepted that heritage, and in him the power of the risen Christ in his growing Christian experience transformed it and changed it wonderfully. When it is appreciated how Paul became convinced that with Christ the great drama of the End was already being enacted here and now, it is not in fact possible to affirm that his Eschatology is simply Jewish Messianism rechauffé - it is the Eschatology of the later Jewish literature informed and infused with what he knew increasingly to be true 'in Christ'. And that is at once to assign a more exalted station to the intermediate Jewish Eschatology; its worth is authenticated, for it was capable of thus being taken up, and thus ennobled and enriched.

Paul held emphatically to the resurrection of the body; - a 'spiritual' body, for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom" - the fundamental Christian creed declares unequivocally for the resurrection of the 'flesh'; - unhappy word, yet in its Hebraic sense (גשם), indicating the whole of human nature, proper and precious as stressing the necessity for the redemption of the whole man - and traditional Christianity has held fast to a doctrine of Resurrection to the exclusion of the Platonic belief in the immortality of the soul. The whole emphasis has Jewish origins.

Christians in many places have inclined to interpret the Resurrection and their own hereafter physically despite Paul's efforts to dematerialise them: on the other hand liberal Christian theology has sought to abolish the clause, 'the Resurrection of the body' or to take it as meaning the immortality of the soul. The alleged crudities of the popular tendency are less reprehensible than the philosophical refinements of the learned, for these latter completely miss the message of the Gospel, with its ringing proclamation that by resurrection in Christ Jesus the whole man is to be redeemed.

R. Niebuhr¹¹ has well expressed the preciousness of the symbol of the resurrection of the body, thus preserved by traditional Christianity. It is both more individual, Niebuhr tells us, and more social in its connotations than the alternative idea of the immortality of the soul. It is more individual because it asserts eternal significance, not for some impersonal part of man, the Platonic $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, but for the self as it exists in the body. The idea of the resurrection is more social because it implies that the historical elaborations of the richness of creation in all their variety, will participate in the consummation of history - it gives the struggles in which men engaged to preserve civilisations and to fulfil goodness in history abiding significance, and does not relegate them to

a meaningless flux, of which there will be no echo in eternity.

It was intertestamental Judaism which first set the stage for the protracted struggle with Hellenistic and mystical views of the soul's immortality, first itself boldly engaged in the conflict, and bequeathed to Christianity its artillery. It may in fact be hoped that this investigation has shown that in the narrower field of eschatological ideas, as also in other spheres of thought and belief, the Ap. and Ps. ring with the clashing noise generated by the intense internal strains, which Judaism (at least until the time of the crystallisation and formulation of 'normative' Judaism' in the 2nd century A.D.) experienced, not only through the conflict of its own inward beliefs, but through setting itself to resist the external, superimposed ideals of Greek life and culture.

NOTES AND REFERENCES.

CHAPTER I.

1. E.R. Bevan, *The Hope of a World to Come*, p. 28.
2. The nationalist hope can of course be described as Messianic even when there is no thought of a personal Messiah. The 'Messianic' nation is that which regards itself as the centre or instrument of the coming salvation.
3. *The Book of the Dead*, Chapter 68, shows that the dead were conceived as awakening to a new life in full possession of body and mind.
4. E. Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 209.
5. H. Gressmann, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1924, "Die neugefundene Lehre des Amenemope", p. 286.
6. cf. O.S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*, pp.164 ff.
7. D.F. Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p.152.
8. A. Lods, *Israel*, p.319.
9. Alfred Jeremias, *Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode* (1887), p.46,
cf. also p. 2.
10. Morris Jastrow, *The Civilisation of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 207.
11. cf. W.L. Wardle, *Israel and Babylon*, pp.94-102.

12. cf. Wisdom of Ben Sira, 14:16 ff. and several other passages.
13. The prolongation of the Hebrew Sheol and the Babylonian Arallu beliefs would be even more remarkable if we could follow Jeremias' interpretation of certain Babylonian texts, which appear to attribute to the gods the power of raising to life. Marduk is called "the merciful who loves to restore the dead to life". Gula, the goddess of healing, is "she who gives life to the dead". Jeremias (Hölle und Paradies, pp. 21-23) takes these literally, but they are almost certainly metaphors for the interposition of the deities in giving the sick man recovery from his illness, (thus M. Jastrow takes them, op. cit. pp. 576 f., cf. also P. Dhorme). And further the persistence of the Sheol and Arallu doctrines would be still more singular if we could accept the evidence of an early Sumerian poem, translated by E. Ebeling (Tod und Leben I (1931) pp. 22 f.), in which he finds the idea of retribution beyond the grave.
14. Kautzsch in H.D.B. (Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, ed. J. Hastings), P. 669.
15. O.S. Rankin, op. cit., pp. 175 ff.
16. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian or A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life (1899), pp. 51 ff.
17. E.F. Sutcliffe, The Old Testament and the Future Life,

18. Charles, op. cit., p. 36.
19. C.G. Montefiore in Record and Revelation (ed. Wheeler Robinson), p. 447. Jesus rejects the principle of 'eye for eye and tooth for tooth' (Matthew 5:38).
20. E.F. Sutcliffe, op. cit., p. 192.
21. Louis Finkelstein, The Pharisees, vol. I, p. 151.
22. R.H. Charles, op. cit., p. 77.
23. T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 177.
24. Kittel, Die Psalmen, p. 272.
25. I Enoch 1:8, "they will all belong to God", and Wisdom of Solomon 5:15, "their recompense is in the Lord", are almost unique passages in the Ap. and Ps.
26. N.H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 120.
27. E. Levine, Judaism (1913), v.J.N.Schofield, The Religious Background of the Bible, P. 233.
28. O. Eissfeldt, The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah 40-55, Expository Times 44, p. 264. cf. C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, p. 106.
29. C.G. Montefiore, The Old Testament and After, p.151.
30. R.B.Y. Scott, The Relevance of the Prophets, pp.150,151.
31. E. Schürer, The Jewish People in the Time of Christ, (English Translation, 1890) Division II, vol.II, p.175.
32. Charles, op. cit., pp. 124 ff. cf. S.W. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, vol.I, p. 168.
33. E.F. Sutcliffe, op. cit., pp. 128-130.

34. G.W. Wade, *Isaiah*, in the *Westminster Commentary*, p.169.
35. E.J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, vol.I, p.298.
36. G.F. Moore, *Judaism*, vol.II, p.296. Moore writes:
 "The author's interest is in the renaissance of the people, multiplied by the revival of generations dead and gone, rather than in the return to life of individuals".
37. E. Sellin, *op. cit.*, p.137.
38. T.K. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895)
 p. 158.
39. cf. S.R. Driver, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 9th edition (1913), p. 221.
40. cf. Oesterley and Robinson, *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, p. 253.
41. Orelli, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, p. 154.
42. G.B. Gray, *Isaiah 1-27* in the *I. C. C.*, p. 446.
43. The Septuagint text used in the present essay is that of Alfred Rahlfs, 1935, Stuttgart.
44. G.B. Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 446 f. Interestingly Gray instances לְדָוָד = an untimely birth, and בְּנֵי in the Arabic, also meaning 'to be born'.
45. cf. S.R. Driver, *Daniel* in the *Cambridge Bible Series*, *Introd.* p.91, "rather the object of a hope or a prayer than a fixed dogma", says Driver.
46. Charles, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 ff.
47. H.H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*,
 p. 161.

48. A.A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel, p. 201.
49. J. Skinner, Isaiah I - XXXIX, Cambridge Bible Series, p. 197.
50. R.H. Charles, Commentary on Daniel, p. 327.
51. Rowley, op. cit., p. 161.
52. J.A. Montgomery, Daniel, in the I.C.C., p.84
(Introduction).
53. E.F. Sutcliffe, op. cit., pp.138-140. Sutcliffe is eager to find in Daniel intimation of a universal resurrection. He dismisses, however, the grammatical grounds (that the ן in ןִּיָּאֵן is equivalent to the Arabic 'min lilbayani', the min of apposition, i.e. many of those = many, namely those) sometimes advanced for the universalist interpretation. He suggests for comparison rather Romans 5:15, "For if by the transgression of the one, the many died, much more the grace of God and the gift abounded unto the many by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ."
54. R.H.Charles in Ap.and Ps. (ed.Charles), vol.II, pp.9
and 10.
55. cf. O.S. Rankin, op. cit., P.137.
56. Hertzberg, Der Prediger (Qoheleth), 1932, in Kommentar zum Alten Testament, herausgegeben von Dr.Sellin,p. 95.
57. E.F. Sutcliffe, op. cit., p.144.
58. H.H. Rowley, Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel, p. 175.

cf. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 39 ff.
 There are several other cogent reasons for denying a sixth century date to Daniel - a 6th century person could not have made so gross an error as our author made in introducing Darius the Mede between Belshazzar and Cyrus. Nor could he have supposed that a Median Empire stood between the Babylonian and the Persian.

59. T. Francis Glasson, *The Second Advent*, p. 14.
60. H.H.Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p. 36.
61. C.C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature*, P. 114.
62. G. Hölcher, *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion* (Giessen), 1922.
63. E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*,
 (Stuttgart) 1922.
64. cf. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*,
 p.13.
65. Hugo Gressmann, *Der Messias* (1929), p. 407.
66. R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, p.390.
 Beside the suggestion of Bousset and Reitzenstein here mentioned, there are many others - Saoshyant, Marduk, etc. Recently W.F. Albright (in 'From the Stone Age to Christianity', p. 273) has found 'Son of Man' traits in the neo-Assyrian mythological epic called 'Ea and Atrakhasis'.
67. C.R. North, *op. cit.*, p. 201.
68. Hölcher, *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*, p. 137.

69. E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, (1922) vol. II, pp. 174-199.
70. Reitzenstein, Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium (1921) p. 122.
71. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism (Hibbert Lectures for 1913):
Söderblom, La vie future d'après le Mazdéisme.
72. Gressmann, Die Hellenistische Gestirnreligion, p.31; Anz, Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus (Leipzig) 1897; Bousset, Religion des Judenthums; Reitzenstein, op. cit.; Cumont, After-life in Roman Paganism. - Dieterich, Liturgy of Mithras; J.Kroll, Lehren d. Hermes Trismegistos.
73. O.S. Rankin, op. cit., p.142, footnote 3.
One is reminded of the caustic comment by W.A.L. Elmslie recently in 'How Came Our Faith' on the syncretistic religions of the Graeco-Roman Empire - "an indigestible pudding of pious confusion". The whole enquiry is of course immensely complicated by the obscurity of the data for the history of the Zoroastrian or Chaldaean religion.
74. Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian, p. 134-136.
75. Much of the information in this Chapter has been helpfully brought together in Essays by J.Coert Rylaarsdam (pp.32-51) and Ralph Marcus (pp.190-208) in The Study of the Bible To-day and Tomorrow, edited by H.R. Willoughby. The Chicago Society for Biblical

Research, 1947.

CHAPTER II.

1. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol.I pp.125-127.
2. Weber, Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften.
3. C.G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul (1914).
4. J.Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth; M. Elbogen, Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer, p. 8; Travers Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha; J.J. Bonsirven, Le Judaïsme Palestinien.
5. Maldwyn Hughes, The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature, p. 21.
6. Edwyn R.Bevan, The House of Seleucus, vol.II, p.174.
7. Herbert Danby, The Mishnah, Introd. p. XIII.
8. cf. J.N.Schofield, The Religious Background of the Bible, p. 227.
9. J.J. Bonsirven, Le Judaïsme Palestinien, vol.I, p.XV,
see also p. XXII.
10. V.H. Stanton, The Jewish and Christian Messiah, p. 40.
11. C. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, p. 24 and p. 133.
12. M.-J. Lagrange, Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, p.53.
13. C.C. Torrey, Jewish Encyclopaedia, vol. I, p. 673b.
14. Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p. VII.
15. E-de Faye goes so far as to say that the apocalypses

display the most characteristic features of Judaism as it developed during the two centuries preceding 70 A.D. cf. De Faye, *Les Apocalypses Juives*, *Introd.*, p.5.

16. cf. Travers Herford, *Talmud and Apocrypha*, p. 221. G.F. Moore, *op. cit.*, Vol.I, p.129 ff., "the apocalypses represent groups outside the main current of thought and life." Moore adduces these arguments for rejecting the Ap. and Ps. as source-books of importance, 1) the prime interest of almost all scholars has been in the beginnings of Christianity. Christianity of course adopted apocalyptic - therefore such scholars emphasise the apocalypses. 2) great elation was felt at the time of the discovery of the documents so that they were given an exaggerated importance. 3) The Christian era is taken as if in some way it marked an epoch in the history of Judaism. But it is purely arbitrary, says Moore, to draw a line there in the development of Judaism, and to regard whatever falls before (apocalypses) as all-important, and whatever falls after (Tannaim) as secondary.

Herford's denunciation is more bitter (on p.221): "The relation of Apocalyptic in general, and Enoch in particular to the true essential Judaism can only be fitly compared to the relation of the diseased and misshapen branch to the sound trunk of the tree on which it grew."

17. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 46.
18. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 52.
19. cf. I.T. Beckwith, *The Apocalypse of John* (New York, 1922), *Introd.* p. 25.
20. W. Baldensperger, *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums*, p. 173, posits that anti-thesis, arguing that in the apocalypses "the Messianic expectation of the Jews was detached from the earthly political ideal and elevated to the supernatural order". Lagrange refutes this, op. cit., p. 51.
21. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 3 vols., 1933-39, Leipzig.
22. Moore, op. cit., vol. II, p. 280.
23. E. de Faye, *Les Apocalypses Juives*, pp. 17 ff.
24. In the popular category de Faye includes the *Eagle Vision* and the *Vision of the Man from the Sea* in IV Ezra, Apoc. Baruch 36-40, Enoch 83-90. He finds also a group of apocalypses in IV Ezra (5:1-13a, 6:11-30, 7:26, 8:63 - 9:8), which seem to come from a rabbi or theologian, but which he feels must be designated popular.
25. In this category are Apoc. Baruch 6-32, and 53-75. De Faye is not of course alone in finding rabbinic affinities in these sections. G.F. Moore (op. cit., vol. II, p. 285) maintains of Apoc. Baruch and IV Ezra in general that the authors had the learning of the schools. Baruch has a wealth of haggadah which in almost

every point is verifiable in the Midrash.

cf. Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p. 473.

26. In this category are Apoc. Bar. 48-52:7, 41-43:2, 76:1-4, and the Salathiel Apocalypse.

27. Excessive devotion to tradition in this age no doubt helped to make it destitute of men of great creative genius like Moses or Samuel, or Origen and Augustine.

Bonsirven, (op.cit., vol. I, p. 355) remarks that there existed in Judaism a large group of Messianic traditions, constituting a deposit which was transmitted from generation to generation, and on which each drew at will. The traditions, it need hardly be added, would be passed on orally, as well as in written documents, cf. S.Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, passim. (Oslo, 1946).

28. Paul Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba (1903).

Lagrange's classifications are -

- 1) Cosmic temporal Eschatology without a Messiah.
- A 2) Cosmic transcendent Eschatology without a Messiah.
- 1) historico-Messianic Eschatology.
- B 2) transcendent Messianic Eschatology.
- C Cosmic transcendent Eschatology with a less transcendent historic Messiah.

Bonsirven's classifications are -

Messianism, eschatological Messianism, transcendent Messianism.
cf. M.J.Lagrange, op.cit. and Bonsirven, op.cit.

29. cf. Charles, op. cit., p.182, p.189 and p.203.
30. C.C. Torrey, op. cit., p. 114.
31. Charles, op. cit., p.245. Torrey, op. cit., p.128.
Albright, op. cit., pp.266 f. Zeitlin, Jewish Quarterly Review, XXX, 1939-1940, pp.1 ff. Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, p. 85.
32. cf. Zeitlin, in the article just instanced.
33. cf. Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol.II, pp.474-476.
Also Kabisch, Die Quellen der Apokalypse Baruchs, in Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, XVIII, 1892, p.p. 66-107 (Braunschweig).
E.de Faye, op. cit., pp.76 ff.
34. Torrey, op. cit., p. 126.
35. Charles, op. cit., p. 168. In Charles' view further, 105 is an independent fragment, 106-107 part of the Book of Noah, and 108 is added by a later writer than the editor.
36. Torrey, op. cit., p.110.
37. G.H.Box in Ap. and Ps. (ed.Charles) vol.II, pp.551 ff.
38. H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, Preface, p.8.
39. F.C. Porter, The Messages of the Apoclyptical Writers,
p. 336.

CHAPTER III.

1. K. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 323 (New York, 1918).
2. cf. R.H.Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol. II, p. 169.

3. This materialist view of the Tree of Life is found also in Revelation 2:7, 22:2 and 14, IV Ezra 8:52.
4. cf. J.H.Leckie, The World to Come and Final Destiny, pp. 28-31.
5. I.T.Beckwith, op. cit. Introd., p.57
cf. Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, p. 51.
6. cf. Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p. 203.
7. In IV Ezra the seven days given to the departed after death may offer opportunity of repentance. cf.II Macc.12 where Judas prays for the Jews who have died sinning by the wearing of amulets. Nowhere else than in these two not very precise passages is there clear evidence in the Ap. and Ps. of the possibility of change between death and Judgment. The matter is discussed at length later.
8. C.F.Burney, Israel's Hope of Immortality, pp. 94-95.
9. Lagrange takes this line in his account of Jewish Messianism in the work cited.
10. Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p. 170. O.Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (1934), p. 675. Schürer, op. cit., Div.II, vol.III, p. 66. Bousset, Religion des Judenthums, p. 12. Beer in Kautzsch, Apokrypha und Pseudepigrapha, II, p. 232 (1900). Baldensperger, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit, pp. 8 ff. (1892). A. Causse, Les 'pauvres' d'Israel, p.143 note

(1922), cf. Rowley, op. cit. pp. 75-80.

11. Charles, Eschatology, p. 193.
12. R.H. Charles, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, (1908), Introd. pp. XXII ff.
See also pp. 23 f. for commentary on the text.
13. Ibid., p. 95.
14. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol. II, p. 308. cf. J.J. Bonsirven admits the lack of harmony in the writer's different ideas of the future, but believes that the resurrection and the Judgment occur at the introduction of the Messianic Kingdom.
cf. C.V. Pilcher, The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought (1938) p. 144 - in Test. XII, says Pilcher, the view of the resurrection is that of a restored life on a renewed earth - but it is upon the EARTH that the Kingdom seems to come.
15. According to Jubilees 3:28 Hebrew was the original language of men and animals.
16. M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., pp. 123 and 124.
17. E.J. Sutcliffe, op. cit., p. 169.
18. Charles considers (Test. XII Patriarchs, p. 123) the Armenian to be corrupt here, rendering ἀλλεγησόμεθα, probably a mistake for ἀναστησόμεθα : the Greek and Slavonic, Charles believes, are correct in reading the 3rd person plural.
19. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol. II, p. 308.
20. Charles proposes that אחר המות חיי העולם יקומו

cf. J.J. Bonsirven, who in the table (facing page 424, vol. I of the work cited) depicting the eschatological schema offered by each writer, excludes the resurrection from Enoch 83-90, but on a subsequent page (vol. I, p. 475) he mentions (footnote 1) Enoch 90:33 as possibly containing the idea of the receptacles of the souls of the dead giving up their deposit for the resurrection.

31. M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 126.

32. E. de Faye, op. cit., p. 32.

33. It is clear from both I Enoch 83-90 and Test. XII Patriarchs that in them the nationalist sentiment is strong, and they look primarily for a 'Messianic' salvation from the particular locus or centre of Israel. That is true in spite of the completely minor and highly debatable role to be played by the Messiah in each. Lagrange (op. cit., pp. 69 ff.) finds the part of the Messiah in Test. XII particularly to be a small one - and argues that the fact may be due to the time of the book's emergence, a time which gave birth to a dilemma as to whether Messiah would issue from the Hasmonaeans or from the house and lineage of David: a not uncommon way out of the impasse was to regard the Maccabaeen triumphs as having to some extent instituted the Messianic culmination, and thereafter to mention the role of the Messiah hurriedly, as in Test. XII, or in obscure allegories (I Enoch 83-90).

9. It is worth adding brief mention of the curious rabbinic notion that in the re-formation of the dead body the foundation-piece was the small bone called Luz, which was indestructible. v. Leviticus Rabbah 18, also Genesis Rabbah 28:3 - the bone could not be destroyed by smashing it, by burning it or by putting it in water: so they got at it with hammer upon anvil: the anvil cracked and the hammer broke, Luz remained.
10. H.K. Luce, St. Luke, p. 366 (Cambridge Bible).
11. When the resurrection was less an object of speculation and more a vital faith, as here in II Macc., the nearness of the Messianic restoration inevitably brought conviction of the nearness of resurrection to it for the dead. But paradoxically, as we shall see, where men were wavering on the subject of the resurrection, it is possible that growth of a real resurrection faith may have been retarded by that very assurance of the close imminence of the Messianic Kingdom for naturally it induced such men to concern themselves only about the living at the time of the coming - and they themselves would, they felt, then be living.
12. It is at least incumbent upon the enquirer to make mention of this sentence and draw notice to its seemingly different quality. The passage is often allowed to pass unnoticed, the issue raised by it disregarded, and II.Macc. branded as entirely crude and

physical. v. H.A. Guy, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things*, p. 19.

13. M.-J. Lagrange, *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931) p. 352, says: "faith does not necessitate the belief, in spite of the evidence of the senses, that such a martyr had already been resurrected" (. i.e. to a restored earthly life), in reference to II Macc., 7:36.
14. O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*, p. 124.
15. E.F. Sutcliffe, *op. cit.*, p. 147.
- J. Moffatt in *Ap. and Ps.* (ed. Charles), vol. I, p. 131.
16. Moffatt in *Ap. and Ps.*, vol. I, P. 150.
17. E.F. Sutcliffe, *op. cit.*, pp. 124 f.
18. Sutcliffe has claimed also that the doctrine of a Purgatorial state is more developed and precise in IV Ezra 7:136 and 137, where we read that God is "of great mercy because he multiplies mercies so greatly to those who are in existence, and who have passed away, and who are to come - for if he did not multiply mercy the world with its inhabitants could not attain unto life".

But it is easy to fill out the content of the word 'life' too richly. G.H. Box (in *Ap. and Ps.* (ed. Charles), vol. II, p. 592), following Simonsen, may have been guilty of that here in regarding 'life' as the eternal life of the World to Come. Sutcliffe is therefore on too unstable ground in claiming that we have here a parallel to the teaching of the school of

Shammai (according to which the truly pious at death passed straight to bliss, the really wicked were consigned to Gehenna, and the vast majority of mankind, neither wholly good nor evil went to Gehenna for a time, whence by God's mercy they were eventually released to enjoy eternal life), and a fairly advanced doctrine of purgatory.

'Ezra' is too little assured of himself for us to deduce much from his teaching here. For whereas the seven days given to the departed after death in IV Ezra (7:101) might imply that opportunity of repentance is thereupon offered, IV Ezra 7:82 seems emphatically to rule this out, for there one of the torments of the wicked is that "they cannot now make a good returning that they may live", and the idea of a 'second chance' after death is nowhere else discovered in the Ap. and Ps.

19. E.F. Sutcliffe, op. cit., pp. 129 ff.
 20. cf. C.C. Torrey, op. cit., p. 78.
 21. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol. II, p. 322.
 22. cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol. II, p. 299, The restoration of the martyred lives "had in its origin", writes Moore, "nothing to do with a dramatic world-assize at the end of the age, as in the ultimate development of Jewish eschatology".
 23. E. de Faye, op. cit., p. 41.
-

CHAPTER V.

1. cf. Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion (1930),
pp. 343-344.

Oesterley and Robinson suppose that the cosmological and universal expectations which were ultimately combined with the Messianic hope in Judaism - they certainly did not supersede it - were not in fact indigenous to Israel, but were absorbed by Jewish thinkers from foreign religious systems.

But all that need be said is that the dualism of the Persian and other foreign religions may have hastened some in Judaism to a conclusion towards which certain trends in her own thought, and distressing circumstances of her history, had for some time been driving her.

2. It is E.F. Sutcliffe (op. cit., p. 167) who has pointed out this particular inconsistency in Charles' 1912 edition of the Book of Enoch. It does not occur in the 1893 edition, which I have used.
3. cf. R.H. Charles, The Book of Enoch (1893), p.260.
4. H.H. Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, p. 54.
5. cf. Lagrange, Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, p. 78.
6. cf. Charles, Book of Enoch, pp. 267 and 269.
7. E.F. Sutcliffe, op. cit., p. 167.
8. ibid., p. 168.

9. R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, p.238.
Otto maintains that there is evidence for the idea of bodily resurrection in only one uncertain passage in Enoch, and that the idea had penetrated the Book of Enoch from the East.
10. cf. de Faye, *op. cit.*, p. 149.
11. H.A. Wolfson, *Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (1948), vol. I, pp. 395-413.
12. M.J. Lagrange, *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, p.266.
13. W.V. Hague, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. XII 1911, pp. 57-98.

CHAPTER VI.

1. cf. C.G. Montefiore, *The Old Testament and After*, p.19.
2. cf. G.F. Moore, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 295.
3. J. Pedersen, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, vol.I-II (1926), p.171.
4. cf. Ryle and James, *The Psalms of Solomon*, (1891),
Introd., p.LX.
5. *ibid.*, p. LIX.
cf. also W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, (1916), p.215, "whether the hand of one or more writers is to be discerned is an open question".
6. Torrey, *op. cit.*, pp.106-108.
7. Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp.68-71.

8. G. Buchanan Gray, in. Ap. and Ps. (ed.Charles) vol.II,
p.628.
9. J.J.Bonsirven, op. cit., vol.I, p.332.
10. Lagrange, Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, p.161.
11. v. note 5 above.
12. Charles, Eschatology, pp.220-225.
13. ibid., p.224.
14. The figure in brackets, within the inner bracket,
thus (21), is the verse numbering in the text of
O. Gebhardt. The other is that of Swete's edition
in the Cambridge Septuagint which, in accordance with
the usual practice in English works, is followed here.
Rahlfs, whose text is most employed in this essay,
here follows, it should be noted, Gebhardt's numbering:
but since only the English in this instance concerns
us, I have thought fit to keep Swete's numbering.
15. cf. Ryle and James, op.cit., p.127.
v. also Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, p.70.
16. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p.223.
17. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol.II, p.309.
18. J.J.Bonsirven, op. cit., vol.I, p.470, footnote 6.
19. Charles, Eschatology, p.223.
20. cf. Ryle and James, op. cit., p.99.
21. G.B. Gray, Ap. and Ps. (ed.Charles) vol.II, p.643.
22. Ryle and James, op. cit., p.106.
23. ibid., p. 38.

24. M.-J. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*,
pp.160 and 161.
25. H.H. Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p.71.
26. W.V. Hague, *op. cit.*, p.62.
27. Ryle and James, *op.cit.*, p.113.
28. Is it on the basis of such a passage that Viteau,
Les Psaumes de Salomon, p.60, ventures the opinion
that, though we do not see clearly what is the life of
the righteous from his death until the general Judgment,
his soul surely continues its life, and it seems, rests
here below until God at last comes to take it for the
day of Judgment? v.again infra in text.

It is interesting to contrast with the Psalms' teaching on the Judgment, the New Testament doctrine, where it is on the one hand a great world-event, and on the other, a personal experience. Lagrange remarks that it has long been the problem of the catholic theology to combine the two.

29. v. note 28.
30. R.Kabisch, *Das vierte Buch Esra und seine Quellen untersucht* (1889) Göttingen, pp.167 and 168.
31. cf. J.J. Bonsirven, *op. cit.*, vol.I, p.470.
32. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 248.
33. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, p.67.
Lagrange more readily admits here in the author a view of the Messianic Kingdom endlessly evolving, since

there is no mention of resurrection in connection with it, and therefore his admission is not prejudicial to his theory that the resurrection is always bound up with the order of definitive Eschatology.

34. Baudissin, *Adonis and Esmun* (1911), pp.396 f.
cf. E.F. Sutcliffe, *op. cit.*, p.167.
35. Charles, in *Ap. and Ps.*, vol.II, p.49.
36. Lagrange, *op.cit.*, p.67.
37. H.H.Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p.87, dates it in the first 3 decades of the Christian era. Torrey, *op. cit.*, p.114, in the first years of the Christian era. Charles, *Eschatology*, p.247 f. in 7-29 A.D.
38. Beside the reason for this dating given in the text, there is a reference to the cruelty of Varus in the work; Varus crushed a Jewish revolt in 4 B.C.
39. The authorship is much disputed. Charles (*op.cit.*,p.249) believes that a 'Pharisaic Quietist' was the author. On the other hand the author has been regarded as a Zealot, violently denouncing the Pharisees. Lagrange (*Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, p.87) regards him as a fanatical believer - the intervention of God, the angel or messenger, are objects on which he abstains from reasoning.

It is well, however, to recall that documents of this literature are not to be RIGIDLY classed as belonging to one sect or another.

40. R.H. Charles, *The Assumption of Moses* (1897),
pp.97 and 98.
41. E. de Faye, *op. cit.*, p.73.
42. cf. Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p.89, "The scene is wholly supramundane, after the destruction of the material universe that will herald the foundation of the Kingdom of Heaven."
43. This enigmatic figure of Taxo has evoked much discussion. There have been 3 main lines of identification - 1) The name was a cipher for Eleazar: Charles .∴ takes = the Eleazar of the Maccabaeen revolt, Hölscher = an Eleazar of the time of Bar Cochba. 2) Taxo is a Messianic figure (Hausrath, Lattey): Taxo is a cryptogram for Shiloh (Genesis 49:10) which is itself taken to be a cipher for the Messiah. But Rowley finds nothing in the text to show that Taxo and his sons would play a part in instituting the Kingdom. 3) Taxo is a contemporary figure of the author's own period, obscure and unknown to us, exalted, however, by his fellows to an eminent place, but having "created no ripple on the surface of history".
cf. Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp.128 ff., for this information.
44. Charles, *The Assumption of Moses*, p. 43.
45. *ibid.*, p.44.

It should be noted that the Latin text has 'in terram', which Charles has rejected.

46. cf. N. Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, p.328.
47. R.H. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 251.
cf. W.V.Hague, *op.cit.*, p.62.
48. L.S.A. Wells, in *Ap. and Ps.* (ed.Charles), vol.II,
pp.128 and 129.
H.H.Rowley, (*Relevance of Apocalyptic*, p.92) has
mistakenly attributed to Charles the suggestions
proposed by L.S.A. Wells about the Jewish nature and
date of the work. No doubt Charles, as General Editor,
holds some of the responsibility.
49. H.H. Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp.92 ff.
C.C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature*, pp.131 ff.
50. cf. C.C.Torrey, *op. cit.*, p.131. L.S.A.Wells (in *loco*
cit.) thinks, however, of a Greek original, though
ultimately parts of the book may be based on Hebrew
documents.
51. A date near the beginning of that period has been
favoured. cf. Torrey, *op.cit.*, p.131, and L.S.A. Wells
in *Ap. and Ps.*, vol.II, p. 127.
52. The passage 29:3-10 is much in dispute. Wells (in *Ap.*
and Ps., vol.II, p.140) would exclude it as a
Christian interpolation. Charles wishes to retain it
(v. in *loco cit.*). Verses 6 and 7 are particularly
controversial. Verse 6 might reasonably be considered
the point at which history breaks into prophecy, were
it not for the words which immediately follow in

verse 7: "And once more iniquity will exceed righteousness". But these latter words lead some commentators to suggest (as against Wells in Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p.140) that verse 6 refers still to the events of past time and history, to the Temple of Herod and not the Temple of the Messianic Age (cf. Torrey op.cit., p.133).

Once again it is to be remembered that the apocalyptists were guilty of a curious disregard of the consistencies of time, and the pronouncement of verse 7 is not determinative.

53. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol.II, p.323.

CHAPTER VII.

1. A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, p.70 (1941).
2. P. Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, (1903), p.371.
3. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol.II, p.339.
4. cf. Sjöberg, Der Menschensohn im Äthiopischen Henochbuch (Lund) 1946, pp.33 ff.
cf. M. Black, art., "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature", The Expository Times, Oct.1948.

Charles on the other hand finds at least two sources, an 'Elect One' source and a 'Son of Man' source. cf. T.F. Glasson, op. cit., p.27., "the

work has a superficial appearance of order, but it is as though a pile of disjointed fragments have been tied in three bundles".

5. cf. the view of R.Bultmann (in a review of R.Otto's, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, in *Theologische Rundschau* (1937), denying Otto's claim that Chapters 70 and 71 are the dénouement of the whole work.

Charles also rejects the crucial verse 71:14, and indeed the whole chapter, v. *The Book of Enoch*, cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, p.89. p.183.

6. J.Y. Campbell, art., *The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man*, *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLVII, 146.

7. M.-J.Lagrange, op. cit., p.90.

8. G.F. Moore, op.cit., vol.II, p.304.

9. Charles (v. *The Book of Enoch*, p.149) rejects the whole passage as an interpolation - the superhuman figure (Messianic) of the Similitudes cannot be opposed by earthly world powers: the 'Son of Man' of the Similitudes is supernatural. But again complete consistency is not to be expected in the portrait. Torrey, op.cit., p.111, has taken the strange line that the 'Son of Man' concept of the Similitudes is the self-same doctrine which had been proclaimed in Hebrew Scripture for two or three centuries past.

He adds that "inability to recognise this fact has been the most serious failure of modern Biblical theology" (footnote 97). But few will concur with the suggestion that the Enochic description is so entirely traditionalist.

10. Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p.94.
11. cf. also 63:10 where the kings of the earth say: "Our souls are satisfied with the manna of unrighteousness, but this does not prevent us from descending into the flame of the pain of Sheol." Here it seems, Sheol = the final abode of the mighty (thus Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 69). But they speak rather of themselves as descending from the land of the living, from the midst of their unrighteous gains to Sheol. Then in verse 11, they are put to shame, and banished from the presence of the Son of Man, who is not in Sheol (cf. E.F. Sutcliffe, *op.cit.*, p.188).
12. Bonsirven, *op.cit.*, vol.I, p.330, maintains that it is a supernatural realm which is here envisaged.
13. cf. E.F. Sutcliffe, *op.cit.*, p.172.
14. cf. Bonsirven, *op.cit.*, vol.I, p.329.
15. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p.116.
16. Otto, *op.cit.*, p.179.
17. W.D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1948), p.315.
18. Otto, *op.cit.*, pp.39 and 40. The words SIMPLY and SOLELY, in this context, are operative for Otto, since

CHAPTER VII.

in the body of his work, he maintains a deep debt on the part of Judaism to Parseeism for many features of its Eschatology.

19. In Ap. and Ps. vol.II, p.235 Charles says that Chapter 71 "seems to belong to the Parables". v. his dating of the various elements of Enoch, The Book of Enoch, pp.107-108 and p.114.
20. Otto, op. cit., p.209.
21. Whether, however, the writer visualised anything at all after or beyond the Messianic Age is doubtful - the Messianic Age seems to be eternal, the concept being fused with a celestial Eschatology.
22. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p.315.
23. cf. E.F. Sutcliffe (v. supra) who actually takes it to refer to the intermediate state prior to the Messianic Kingdom.
24. Lagrange, Le Judaisme avant Jésus-Christ, p. 355.
25. There is here (Bab.Sanhedrin 91a-b) related the popular parable given by Rabbi to Antoninus, who believed that the body and the soul might separately be absolved in the Judgment - A king had a fine garden with rare-ripe figs. He set over them to watch them a lame man and a blind man. The lame man saw the figs and told the blind man: then he mounted on the blind man's back and the two together made their way to the rareripe figs and ate them. When accused the lame man

CHAPTER VII.

said 'Can I walk?' and the blind man 'Can I see?'
 So the king set the lame man on the blind man's back
 and punished both together. So God judges body and
 soul together.

24. G.F. Moore, *op.cit.*, vol.II, p.304, footnote 8.
 cf. Matthew 22:30.
27. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (1893) p.141.
 Contrast Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p.219.
28. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez Les Juifs*, pp.84-98.
29. Lagrange (*Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, p.355) also
 is inclined to whittle away what in such a passage as
 61:5 appear to be decisive references to the
 resurrection of the body. He holds that the
 resurrection must have had a very spiritual character
 for the elect are mixed with the companies of the
 angels.
30. v. supra.
31. cf. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 1893, p.166.
32. Paul had of course the profound conviction of the
inexpressibly different quality of the life 'with
 Christ' hereafter in His realm. He was also deeply
 aware of (and there is no such conscious awareness
 in the intertestamental literature) how the wonder of
 the Resurrection baffles human understanding and human
 language - "God giveth ... as he wills", "I tell you
 a mystery", etc.

CHAPTER VII - CHAPTER VIII.

33. R. Otto, op. cit., pp.195 and 196.
34. ibid., p. 238.
35. Charles, Eschatology, p.239.
36. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin 90b. cf. Pirque de Rabbi Eliezer XXXIII, p.245. R.Eliezer said: "All the dead will arise at the resurrection of the dead, dressed in their shrouds. Know thou that this is the case. Come and see from (the analogy of) the one who plants (seed) in the earth. He plants naked (seeds) and they arise covered with many coverings; and the people who descend into the earth dressed (with their garments) will they not rise up dressed (with their garments)?"

CHAPTER VIII.

1. Henceforth designated simply 'Apoc. Bar.'
2. E.de Faye, op. cit., p.145.
3. R.H.Charles, The Apocalypse of Baruch (1896), pp.170 ff. lists between 60 and 70 passages in Apoc. Bar. which have their counterpart in Shealtiel or Ezra.
4. E. Schürer, History of the Jewish People (English Transl. 1886) Div.II, vol.III, pp.89 ff.
5. Charles, in Ap. and Ps., vol.II, pp.474 ff.

CHAPTER VIII.

6. Besides Torrey's recent claim (p.126, op.cit.) that Apoc.Bar. makes the impression of a continuous composition, homogenous throughout, many noted scholars uphold its unity, e.g. M.R. James, Clemen, Lagrange, Violet, Rowley. cf. H.H.Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp.134 and 135.
7. G.F. Moore, op. cit., vol.II, p. 338.
8. Charles, Eschatology, pp.269 f., also Apocalypse of Baruch (1896) pp. LIII ff.
9. J.J. Bonsirven, op. cit., vol.I, p.104.
10. Charles, The Apocalypse of Baruch, p.52.
11. B. Violet, Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch, (1924), p.243.
12. Lagrange, Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, pp.130 and 131.
13. Bonsirven, op.cit., vol.I, p.470.
14. Charles, in Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p.498.
15. G.F. Moore, op.cit., vol.II, p.338.
16. Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, p.100.
17. Lagrange, op.cit., p.162.
18. In 42:7 there occurs the prophecy, "For corruption will take those that belong to it, and life those that belong to it". It is easy to read into the word 'life' more numerous and richer senses than the texts originally conveyed. This P. Volz (op.cit., p.326) has been inclined to do.
19. Charles, Ap. and Ps., vol.II, p.518.

20. Charles, *Eschatology*, p.273.
21. G.F. Moore, *op.cit.*, vol.II, p.285.
22. Charles, *Ap. and Ps.*, vol.II, p.503.
23. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, p.131.
24. Volz, *op. cit.*, p.241.
25. cf. T.C. Edwards, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (1885), p.438.
26. H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Relation of St.Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p.118.
27. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, p.82.
28. W.D. Davies, *op.cit.*, p.308, follows Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol.IV, pp.799 ff. (1928).
29. G.F. Moore, *op. cit.*, vol.II, p.339.
30. The book is variously entitled: the title 'II Esdras' is derived from the first verse of the first Chapter of the expanded book. Modern editions of the Latin Vulgate have the title 'Liber Esdrae Quartus', after which we call it IV Ezra. Torrey (*op.cit.*,p.116) suggests that a more suitable title would be 'Apocalypse of Shealtiel'.
31. Charles, *Eschatology*, p.283.
32. Moore, *op.cit.*, vol.II, p.283.
33. cf. Rowley, *op.cit.*, pp.132 and 133.
34. *ibid.*, p.94.
35. G.H. Box, in *Ap. and Ps.* (ed.Charles), vol.II, p.549.

CHAPTER VIII.

36. Torrey, *op.cit.*, pp.120 ff.
37. G.H. Box, *in loco cit.*, vol.II, p.614.
38. R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol.II,
p.35.
39. *cf.* Box, *in loco cit.*, vol.II, p.582.
cf. also B. Violet, *op. cit.*, p.73, and W.O.E.Oesterley
II *Esdra*s, p. 70.
40. According to Genesis 15:13 Israel's oppression in
Egypt would endure 400 years. Psalm 90 has the
prayer: "Make us glad, O Lord, according to the days
wherein thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein
we have seen evil". A combination of the two passages
leads to the inference that the Messianic Kingdom
would last 400 years.
41. Bonsirven, *op. cit.*, p.480. Box, *Ap. and Ps.*, vol.II,
p. 583.
42. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, p.129.
43. Contrast de Faye's view (*op.cit.*, p.39), v. *infra*.
44. *cf.* other passages, 7:102 - 106; 7:113.
45. Just as in nature, such is the Seer's figure, the
most precious things are rarest, so the possession of
the future felicity will be given only to a handful,
and over these God will rejoice as rare and precious.

Charles, *Eschatology*, pp.292 and 293,
contrasts the different attitudes of *Apoc.Bar.* and
IV *Ezra* (in the former many will be saved, in the
latter few) and suggests that they spring from their

respective views on the question of free-will.

(cf. Apoc.Bar. 54:15,19 and IV Ezra 7:118).

46. cf. Lagrange, *La Religion des Perses*, p.30;
Söderblom, *op. cit.*, pp.91 f.
47. Bonsirven, *op. cit.*, vol.I, pp.322 ff.
48. G.H. Box, in *Ap. and Ps.*, vol.II, p.557.
49. cf. Box, *in loco*, p.589. cf.also Lagrange, *Le Messianisme ...* p.129.
50. cf. E.G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St.Peter*, 1946,
p.124.
cf.also Dewick, *Primitive Christian Eschatology*,
p.253.
51. cf. Lagrange, *op.cit.*, pp.105 f., Charles, *Eschatology*,
p.289.
52. G.H. Box, in *Ap.and Ps.*,vol.II, p.614.
53. Hugo Gressmann, *Der Messias* (1929), p.407.
54. cf. P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp.214 ff.
55. Lagrange, *op.cit.*, p.102.
56. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp.288 and 289.
57. Gustav Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (English Transl.
1902) p.148. See for this whole discussion pp.147-162
of that work.
58. The issue is greatly over-simplified by accounting
(cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, p.242) for the trans-
ference of men's hopes entire to the supra-terrestrial
plane, alone by the dark and brooding pessimism of
the years succeeding the destruction of Jerusalem
in 70 A.D.
59. Schürer, *op. cit.*, Div.II, vol.II, pp.177 ff.

CHAPTER VIII.

60. G.F. Moore, op.cit., vol.II, pp.270 and 271.
61. De Faye, op. cit., p.116.
62. M.-J. Lagrange, op.cit., pp.174 and 175.
63. Bonsirven, op.cit., vol.II, p.318. v. footnote 2 also.
cf. especially vol.I, p.354.
64. W.O.E. Oesterley, An Introduction to the Books of
the Apocrypha,,p.65, (1935).
65. cf. J.J. Bonsirven, op.cit., vol.I, p.348. In this
section Bonsirven has depended much upon Klausner's
work in Hebrew, הרעיון המשיחי בישראל מראשית
! רעך התיומת המטונה (Jerusalem), 1927.
The explanations given for the silence on Messianic
topics among the rabbis are those of Klausner in that
work on 'Messianism'.
66. cf. J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus or the Jewish
Alexandrian Philosophy (London, 1888), vol.II, p.322,
"Of a distinctly Messianic hope I still fail to
discover any trace".
cf. also, Emile Bréhier, Les Idées de Philon
d'Alexandrie (Paris, 1908), p.10, "Il serait difficile
de trouver dans les Questions ou le Commentaire une
allusion à l'avenir historique du peuple juif; en
revanche Philon s'élève à diverses reprises contre
une doctrine qui voit les fins de la vie autant dans
les biens extérieurs comme la richesse et les honneurs
et dans les biens du corps comme la santé que dans

CHAPTER VIII.

les seuls biens de l'âme, la vertu..... Ainsi cette seule idée reste vivante chez Philon de toute l'eschatologie juive: l'avenir de la Loi qui doit devenir universelle."

67. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme*, p.30.

68. H.A. Wolfson, *Philo*, vol.II, pp.407 ff and pp.413-415 in particular.

Wolfson recognises that it is not clear that Philo believes that the final redemption will take place under the leadership of a particular person such as is known in Jewish tradition as the Messiah. But he finds two vague statements which may refer to such a Messiah - 1) Philo quotes from the prophecy of Balaam the verse (Numbers 24:7) which in the LXX reads: "There shall come forth a man", and then paraphrases the rest of the verse in his statement, "And leading his host to war he will subdue great and populous nations". In so far as in the native Jewish tradition, this verse, in its Massoretic reading is sometimes taken as referring to Messiah, there is no reason why Philo also should not be referring to Messiah here. 2) In his discussion of the ultimate return of the scattered exiles to their home, Philo says that they will be "guided by some vision, more divine than is compatible with its being of the nature of man, invisible indeed to everyone else,

but manifest only to those who were saved".
 (Praemium 29:165).

CHAPTER IX.

1. Bousset, Religion des Judenthums, p.260.
2. Charles, Eschatology, pp.251 and 252.
3. Torrey, op.cit., p.98.
4. Henceforth referred to as 'Wisdom'.
5. Kohler, Jewish Encyclopaedia, vol.12, pp.538-540
 (1901).
6. Toy, Articles, Wisdom of Solomon, Encyclopaedia
 Biblica and Encyclopaedia Britannica.
7. A.T.S. Goodrick, The Book of Wisdom, (1913), p.74.
8. S. Holmes, in Ap. and Ps. (ed.Charles), vol.I, pp.521
 ff.
9. Torrey, op.cit., pp.98 ff.
10. ibid., p.102.
11. B.D. Eermans, The Religion of Israel (1947), p.314.
12. W.V. Hague, Journal of Theological Studies, vol.XII,
 1911, pp.57-98.
13. Charles, Eschatology, p.255.
14. ibid., pp.253 and 254.
15. ibid., p. 258.
16. ibid., p. 255.
17. F.C. Porter, Old Testament and Semitic Studies in
 Memory of W.R. Harper (Chicago, 1908).

18. Porter, in loco cit., pp. 211 ff.
19. Phaedo 81c: Ἐμβριθεὺς δέ γε τοῦτο οἶεσθαι χρεὶν εἶναι καὶ βαρὺ καὶ γεῶδες καὶ ὄρατόν. ὁ δὲ καὶ ἔχουσα ἢ τοιαύτη ψυχὴ βαρύνεται τε καὶ ἔλκεται κ.τ.λ.
20. cf. A.-M. Durbarle, *Les Sages d'Israel* (1946), p.189. cf. also F.C. Porter, op.cit., p.229.
21. Bousset, op.cit., p.383.
22. C.F. Burney, *Israel's Hope of Immortality*, pp.70 ff.
23. cf. A.T.S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom*, p.390.
24. cf. E.F. Sutcliffe, op.cit., p.111.
25. Goodrick, op.cit., p.390.
26. in loc. cit., supra, notes 13-16.
27. cf. E.F. Sutcliffe, op.cit., p.110. Sutcliffe understands the allusion in ἐπισκοπή differently:
"The time of visitation of the just is the time when God visits them, namely at death, when 'they seemed in the eyes of the foolish to be dead'."
28. cf. Goodrick, op.cit., p.126.
29. This seems a better explanation than that which understands 7a and b as depicting the reward of the righteous after death, their splendour and agility in the life to come. cf. E.F. Sutcliffe, op.cit., p.110.
30. E.de Faye, *Les Apocalypses Juives*, pp.150 and 151.
31. G.F. Moore, op.cit., vol.II, p.294.
32. cf. S.Holmes, *Ap. and Ps.*, vol.I, p.529.

CHAPTER IX.

The impression in fact given by 'Wisdom' is that he has superimposed the idea of immortality upon current forms of Jewish eschatological belief in a Messianic Kingdom upon earth.

cf. O.S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*, p.124.

33. G.F. Burney, in *loc.cit.*, supra (p.76).

34. cf. Goodrick, *op.cit.*, pp.327 and 328.

35. cf. A.-M. Durbarle, *op.cit.*, pp.218 and 219.

36. Charles, *Eschatology*, p.261.

37. cf. Charles, in *loco*, and also Rowley, *op.cit.*, p.90.

38. Rowley, *op.cit.*, p.92.

39. This is the first appearance in Jewish Literature of an idea that was to become very familiar in Christian circles.

40. Charles, *Eschatology*, p.262.

41. C.V. Pilcher, *The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought* (1938), p.144.

42. Charles, *Eschatology*, p.266.

43. cf. C.C. Torrey, *op.cit.*, p.106.

The question of date is wide open: only a vague guess can be hazarded, and Torrey ventures a date early in the last century B.C.

44. Maldwyn Hughes, *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature*, p.111.

45. Torrey, *op.cit.*, p.104, is more exact and definite, at least on the score of the soul's immortality,

than the writer of IV Macc. probably was himself. Torrey writes: "what is emphasized by the writer is not the belief in the resurrection of the dead, as in Second Maccabees, but rather the doctrine that all souls, whether righteous or wicked, exist forever after death."

cf. Charles, Eschatology, p.268: Charles appears to take it that passages, such as are quoted, by themselves indicate the immortal life of the soul.

46. Charles, Eschatology, p.228.
47. *ibid.*, p.268. There is no escaping the fact that this whole passage in IV Macc. is lyrical and poetic. The immediate context makes it plain that closest to the poet's heart lies the nation Israel, i.e. he is here more a Jew interested in national destiny, than a Greek concerned with the immortality of the soul. In verse 19 he turns back to the Hebrew tradition and quotes Deuteronomy 33:3: πάντες οἱ ἠγαπήμενοι ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖρας σου.
48. cf. W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p.302.
49. To Plato the irrational soul is the corruptible and mortal soul, whereas the rational soul is the incorruptible and immortal soul. Timaeus 69c.
- cf. Charles, Eschatology, p.150; H.A.A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion (1919), p.140.
50. R.B. Townshead, Ap. and Ps. (ed.Charles), vol.II,p.685.
51. H.A. Wolfson, Philo, vol.I, p.404.
52. *ibid.*, p.398, and footnote 20 on that page.

53. Philo, Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesis, III, 11.
54. Wolfson, op. cit., pp. 405 and 406. Thus what in effect Wolfson has attributed to certain Jewish intertestamental writers of the Diaspora, is that tendency which has marked modern liberal theology to regard the resurrection of the body as equivalent to the immortality of the soul, and to oust the former in favour of the latter. cf. the statements of the principles of Reform Judaism put forward at the Rabbinical Conferences held at Philadelphia (1869) and Pittsburgh (1885) - "the belief in bodily resurrection has no religious foundation".

The Essenes, Josephus tells us (Bell. Jud., 2, 10, 11 v. Whiston's translation, p. 478), believed that "souls are immortal and continue for ever". But the Essenes were certainly not representative of normal Judaism here.

CHAPTER X.

1. C. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, p. 120.
2. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 75 f.
3. P. E. Davies, in The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, ed. H. R. Willoughby, Essay, Ch. XVI, The Relevance of Apocalyptic for Ancient and Modern Situations, p. 289.
4. cf. F. C. Porter, The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers, p. 336.
5. cf. J. Baillie, And the Life Everlasting, p. 249.

CHAPTER X.

6. A. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg, 1888), vol.I, pp.451-452, footnote 3.
7. A. Harnack, *History of Dogma* (English Translation from the Third German Edition, 1894), vol.I,p.196, footnote 1, where he asserts that the resurrection belief rose originally from the hope of sharing in the Kingdom with Christ. Harnack proceeds to claim in fact that as the Messianic hope declined, belief in the resurrection of the body receded. cf. *Dogmengeschichte*, vol.I, p.140.
8. F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode* (1892), pp.109-112: Schwally states the case in extremist fashion,holding that the reason for a resurrection of dead bodies was primarily to provide the Messiah with enough men to set up his Kingdom (p.116).
9. G.F. Moore, *op. cit.*, vol.II, p.315.
10. S.R. Driver, *Daniel* (Cambridge Bible Series),p.LXVIII.
11. Gunkel, in *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (ed.Kautzsch), Tübingen,1900, vol.II, p.370.
12. E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, cf. Div.II, vol.II,p.135, Div.I,vol.II,p.168 and Div.I,vol.II,p.180 (Engl.Translation).
13. R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol.II, p.28.
14. Th.Reinach, *Revue des Études juives* (Paris),1920,pp.113-126.
15. Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums*, p.273.
16. Bonsirven, *op.cit.*, vol.I, p.469, footnote 10.
17. Moore, *op.cit.*, vol.II, p.380.
18. cf.Travers Herford, *Talmud and Apocrypha*, pp.190 ff.

18. cf. also R.H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, 1949, New York: Josephus lists Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Zealots. The New Testament lists scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, Zealots, Galilaeans, Sicarii, Samaritans and the Disciples of John the Baptist: "but such a list is far from comprehensive. For Judaism in the period under consideration was so alive, so progressive, so agitated by controversies, that under its spacious roof the most contrasting views could be held - until a greater uniformity was reached after A.D.200". (p.53).
19. A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, p.134.
20. F. Schwally, op.cit., p.151.
21. Louis Finkelstein, The Pharisees, 1940 (Philadelphia), vol.I pp.145-159.
22. cf. G.S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, 1947, (London), p.71 - "it would be a mistake to assume that in the literary productions of the apocalyptic school we have a true indication of the prevailing religious temper".
23. Louis Ginzberg, Art. 'Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings.' Journal of Biblical Literature, XLI (1922) pp.115-136.
24. C. Guignebert, op.cit., p.120.
25. cf. I. Enoch, Apoc. Bar., IV Ezra, etc.
26. Moore, op.cit., vol.II, p.389.
27. C.G. Montefiore, The Old Testament and After, p.390.
28. Wolfson, op.cit., vol.I, p.408.
29. N. Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man, 1937 (London), p.372.
-

CHAPTER XI.

1. Charles, Eschatology, pp.308 and 307.
 2. ibid. p.310.
 3. R. Otto, op.cit., p.239.
 4. cf. T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, p.132.
 5. cf. A. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ, (2nd edit., 1946) London, p.103.
 6. Johannes Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity, (English Translation,1937), vol.II, p.530.
 7. C.H. Dodd, Rylands Bulletin, 1934, vol.XVIII, no.1, p.27.
 8. W.D. Davies, op.cit., pp.303 ff.
 9. C.H. Dodd, in A Companion to the Bible (ed.T.W.Manson), p.404.
 10. A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, pp.132-133.
 11. R. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, vol.II, pp.322 and 323.
-

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 1917; Second Series 1924, Cambridge.
- W.F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, 1940, Baltimore.
- J. Baillie, And the Life Everlasting, 1934, Oxford.
- W. Baldensperger, Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums, 1903, Strasbourg.
Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit, 1892, Strasbourg. (The above is the third edition of this work).
- S.W. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, 3 vols., 1937, New York.
- W.W. Baudissin, Adonis und Esmun, 1911, Leipzig.
- I.T. Beckwith, The Apocalypse of John, 1922, New York.
- N. Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man, 1937, London.
- A.A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 1892, Cambridge.
- E.R. Bevan, The Hope of a World to Come, 1932, London.
The House of Seleucus, 2 vols., 1902, London.
- E. Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabäer, 1937, Berlin.
- M. Black, Article, "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature", The Expository Times, Oct. 1948, Edinburgh.

- J.J. Bonsirven, Le Judaïsme Palestinien, 2 vols., 1934,
Paris.
- W. Bousset Die Religion des Judenthums im spät-
hellenistischen Zeitalter, 3rd ed., 1903,
Berlin, Revised by H.Gressmann, 1926,
Tübingen.
- G.H. Box, The Ezra Apocalypse, 1912, London.
Judaism in the Greek Period (Clarendon
Bible V), 1932, Oxford.
- E. Bréhier, Les Idées de Philon d'Alexandrie, 1908,
Paris.
- C.A. Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, 1886, Edinburgh.
- L.E. Browne, Early Judaism, 1929, Cambridge.
- F.C. Burkitt, Jewish Christian Apocalypses (Schweich
Lectures), 1914, London.
- C.F. Burney, Israel's Hope of Immortality, 1909, Oxford.
- J.Y. Campbell, Article, The Origin and Meaning of the
Term Son of Man, Journal of Theological
Studies, XLVII, 146.
- A. Causse, Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem,
Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie
Religieuses, XVIII, 1938, pp.377-414,
Strasbourg.
- Les 'pauvres' d'Israël, Les origines de la
Diaspora et son rôle dans la formation du
Judaïsme, 1922, Strasbourg.

- T.K. Cheyne, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, 1895,
London.
- F. Cumont, After Life in Roman Paganism, 1922,
New Haven (Yale University Press).
- R.H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on
the Revelation of St. John, 2 vols.,
International Critical Commentary, 1920,
Edinburgh.
- A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on
the Book of Daniel, 1929, Oxford.
- Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (ed. Charles),
2 vols., 1913, Oxford.
- W.R. Morfill and
R.H. Charles, Book of the Secrets of Enoch, 1896, Oxford.
- R.H. Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian,
A Critical History of the Doctrine of a
Future Life, 1899, London.
- Religious Development between the Old and
New Testaments, 1914, London.
- Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 1908,
London.
- The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the
Twelve Patriarchs, 1908, Oxford.
- The Apocalypse of Baruch, 1896, London.
- The Assumption of Moses, 1897, London.
- The Book of Enoch, 1893, Oxford.

- G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus (translated from the German by D.M. Kay), 1902, Edinburgh.
- H. Danby, The Mishnah, 1933, Oxford.
- P.E. Davies, in The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, ed. H.R. Willoughby, 1948, Chicago; Essay, Chapter XVI, The Relevance of Apocalyptic for Ancient and Modern Situations.
- W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1948, London.
- W.J. Deane, Pseudepigrapha, 1891, Edinburgh.
- E.de Faye, Les apocalypses juives, 1892, Paris.
- E.C. Dewick, Primitive Christian Eschatology, 1912, Cambridge.
- Albrecht Dieterich, Eine Mithrasliturgie, 1910, Leipzig.
- C.H. Dodd, in A Companion to the Bible (ed.T.W.Manson), 1939, Edinburgh; pp.390-417, The History and Doctrine of the Apostolic Age. Rylands Bulletin, 1934, vol.XVIII, no.1, p.27 Manchester.
- S.R. Driver, Daniel (Cambridge Bible Series), 1900, Cambridge. Introduction to the Old Testament, 9th edition, 1913, Edinburgh.
- J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus or The Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy, 2 vols., 1888, London.
- A.M. Dubarle, Les Sages d'Israel. 1946, Paris.
- G.S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, 1947, London.
- A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 2 vols., 1900, London.

- T.C. Edwards, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (2nd edit.), 1885, London.
- B.D. Eerdmans, The Religion of Israel, 1947, Leiden.
- W. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, 3 vols., 1933-39, Leipzig.
- O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen 1934, Tübingen.
- 'The Ebed - Jahwe in Isaiah XL-LV in the Light of the Israelite Conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real' - Expository Times, 44, pp.261-268, Exposit.Times, Edinburgh.
- Ismar Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, 2nd ed., 1924, Frankfurt-am-Main.
- J. Elbogen, Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Begriffe Gott und Mensch, 1904, Berlin.
- W.A.L. Elmslie, How Came Our Faith, 1948, Cambridge.
- W. Fairweather, The Background of the Gospels, 1920, Edinburgh.
- Louis Finkelstein, The Pharisees, 2 vols., 1938, Philadelphia.
- J.-B. Frey, "La vie de l'au-delà dans les conceptions juives au temps de Jésus-Christ", Biblica XIII, 1932, pp.129-168, Rome.

- L. Ginzberg, Article, 'Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings', Journal of Biblical Literature XLI, 1922, pp. 115-136, New Haven, Connecticut.
- T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent, 1945, London.
- M. Goguel, La Foi a La Resurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme Primitif, 1933, Paris.
- A.T.S. Goodrick, The Book of Wisdom, 1913, London.
- G.B. Gray, Isaiah 1-27, International Critical Commentary, 1912, Edinburgh.
- H. Gressmann, Die Hellenistische Gestirnreligion (Der Alte Orient Beiheft 5), 1925, Leipzig.
Der Messias, 1929, Göttingen.
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII, 1924, 272-296, "Die neugefundene Lehre des Amenemope und die vorexilische Spruchdichtung Israels".
- Ch. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus (English Transl. by S.H. Hooke), 1939, London.
- H.A. Guy, The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things, 1948, Oxford.
- W.V. Hague, Journal of Theological Studies, vol. XII, 1911, pp. 57-98, London.
- A. Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 3 vols., 1888, Freiburg.

- A. Harnack, History of Dogma, English Transl., 2nd ed., from the 3rd German Edition (of the above work), 7 vols., 1897, London - Edinburgh.
- A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, 1941, London.
- R.T. Herford, Talmud and Apocrypha, 1933, London.
- G.F. Hertzberg, Der Prediger (Qoheleth), Kommentar zum Alten Testament, herausgegeben von Dr.Sellin, 1932, Leipzig.
- G. Holscher, Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion, 1922, Giessen.
"Problèmes de la littérature apocalyptique juive", Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses IX 1929, pp.101-114, Strasbourg.
- H.M. Hughes, The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature, no date, London.
- A.M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors, 1940, London.
- International Society of the Apocrypha, International Journal of Apocrypha, published by the above Society, 1905-1916, Nos.1-47, London.
- Morris Jastrow, Article, 'Babylonian Religion', Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, extra vol., pp.531 ff., 1904, The Four Volumes of the work (preceding this extra vol.) range from 1898-1902.
Edinburgh,
The Civilisation of Babylonia and Assyria, 1915, Philadelphia and London.

- A. Jeremias, Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Hell.
(Ancient East Series, English Transl.),
1902, London.
Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen
vom Leben nach dem Tode, 1887, Leipzig.
The Old Testament in the Light of the
Ancient East, 2 vols. (Transl. from the 2nd
German edition by C.L. Beaumont, ed.
C.H.W. Johns), 1911, London.
- R. Kabisch, Die Quellen der Apokalypse Baruchs, in
Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie,
XVIII, 1892, pp. 66-107, Braunschweig.
Das vierte Buch Esra und seine Quellen.
untersucht, 1889, Göttingen.
- E. Kautzsch, Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen, ed. Kautzsch,
2 vols., 1900, Tübingen.
Art. in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible,
p. 669.
- H.A.A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion, 1919,
London.
St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things,
1904, Edinburgh.
- E.J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah, 2 vols., 1941, Dublin.
- R. Kittel, Die Psalmen, 5th and 6th editions, 1929,
Leipzig, (E. Sellin, Kommentar zum Alten
Testament.)

- J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth (English Trans. by H. Danby), 1929, London.
- R. Kohler, Art. 'Book of the Wisdom of Solomon, in Jewish Encyclopaedia, vol.12, pp.538-540: Jewish Encyclopaedia, 12 vols., ed. I.Singer, 1901-1906, New York and London. Jewish Theology, 1918, New York.
- M.-J. Lagrange, Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ, 1931, Paris. Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, 1909, Paris.
- J.H. Leckie, The World to Come and Final Destiny, 1918, Edinburgh.
- N. Levison, The Jewish Background of Christianity, 1932, Edinburgh.
- A. Lods, Israel (English Transl. S.H.Hooke), 1932, London.
- A. Loisy, The Religion of Israel, English Transl., 1910, London.
- H.K. Luce, St.Luke (Cambridge Greek Testament), 1933, Cambridge.
- T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, 2nd edit., 1935, Cambridge.
- R. Marcus, in The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, ed. H.R.Willoughby, 1947, Chicago, Essay on pp.190-208, The Future of Intertestamental Studies.

- N. Messel, Die Einheitlichkeit der jüdischen
Eschatologie (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für
die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 30),
1915, Giessen.
- E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, 3 vols.
1921-1923, Stuttgart.
- C.G. Montefiore, The Old Testament and After, 1923, London.
Judaism and St.Paul, 1914, London.
- J.A.Montgomery, Daniel, International Critical Commentary,
1927, Edinburgh.
- G.F. Moore, Judaism, 3 vols., 1927, Cambridge-Mass.
- J.H. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism (Hibbert Lectures),
1913, London.
- S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, 1946, Oslo.
- R. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, 2 vols.,
1943, London.
- C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah,
1948, London.
- W.O.E. Oesterley, An Introduction to the Books of the
Apocrypha, 1935, London.
Immortality and the Unseen World, 1921,
London.
II Esdras (Westminster Commentaries), 1933,
London.
The Books of the Apocrypha, 1916, London.
The Doctrine of the Last Things, Jewish and
Christian, 1908, London.

- W.O.E. Oesterley, The Evolution of the Messianic Idea,
1908, London.
The Jews and Judaism during the Greek
Period, 1941, London.
- W.O.E. Oesterley
and T.H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old
Testament, 1934, London.
Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and
Development, 1930, London.
A History of Israel, 2 vols., 1932, Oxford.
- W.O.E. Oesterley
and G.H. Box, The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue,
1911, London.
- G. von Orelli, The Prophecies of Isaiah, English Transl.,
1889, Edinburgh.
- R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man,
English Transl. by F.V. Filson and B.L. Wolf,
1938, London.
- J. Pedersen, Israel, its Life and Culture, vol. I-II,
1926, London.
- C.V. Pilcher, The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian
Thought, 1940, London.
- F.C. Porter, Old Testament and Semitic Studies in
memory of W.R. Harper, 1908, Chicago.
The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers,
1905, London.
- A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta, ed. A. Rahlfs, 2 vols.,
1935, Stuttgart.

- A.M. Ramsey, The Resurrection of Christ (2nd edit.),
1946, London.
- O.S. Rankin, Israel's Wisdom Literature, 1936,
Edinburgh.
- Th. Reinach, Revue des Études juives, 1920, pp.113-126,
Paris (1880 -).
- R. Reitzenstein, Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium,
1921, Bonn.
- H.W. Robinson, Record and Revelation, ed. Robinson,
1938, Oxford.
- The Christian Doctrine of Man, 1911,
Edinburgh.
- H.H. Rowley, Darius the Mede and the Four World
Empires in the Book of Daniel, 1935,
Cardiff.
- The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament,
1945, London.
- The Relevance of Apocalyptic, 1944,
London.
- J.C. Rylaarsdam, in The Study of the Bible Today and
Tomorrow, ed. H.R. Willoughby, 1947,
Chicago, pp.32-51, Essay: Intertestamental
Studies since Charles's Apocrypha and
Pseudepigrapha. -

- H.E. Ryle and
M.R. James,
ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΥΤΟΣ,
Psalms of the Pharisees, 1891, Cambridge.
- D.F. Salmond,
The Christian Doctrine of Immortality,
1895, Edinburgh.
- N. Schmidt,
"The Origin of Jewish Eschatology",
Journal of Biblical Literature, XLI, 1922,
p.p.102-114, New Haven.
- J.N. Schofield,
The Religious Background of the Bible,
1944, London.
- E. Schürer,
The Jewish People in the Time of Christ,
(English Transl., by J. Macpherson,
S. Taylor and P. Christie), 1890,
Edinburgh.
- F. Schwally,
Das Leben nach dem Tode, 1892, Giessen.
- A. Schweitzer,
The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle
(English Transl. by W. Montgomery), 1931,
London.
- R.B.Y. Scott,
The Relevance of the Prophets, 1947,
New York.
- E. Sellin,
Introduction to the Old Testament (English
Transl. by W. Montgomery), 1923, London.
- E.G. Selwyn,
The First Epistle of St. Peter, 1946,
London.
- J. Skinner,
Isaiah I-XXXIX, Cambridge Bible Series,
1896, Cambridge.

- N.H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, 1944, London.
- N. Söderblom, La vie future d'après le Mazdéisme (à la lumière des croyances parallèles dans les autres religions: étude d'eschatologie comparée), 1901, Paris.
- V.H. Stanton, The Jewish and Christian Messiah, 1886, Edinburgh.
- D.C. Steuernagel, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit einem Anhang über die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen, 1912, Tübingen.
- H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 5 vols., 1928, Munich.
- E.F. Sutcliffe, The Old Testament and The Future Life, 1946, Published by the Jesuit Fathers, Heythrop College.
- H.St.J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, 1900, London.
- C.C. Torrey, Article 'Apocalypse', Jewish Encyclopaedia, vol. I, 669a-675a, 12 vols., 1901, New York and London.
- The Apocryphal Literature, 1945, Yale.

- C.H. Toy, Article 'Wisdom of Solomon', Encyclopaedia Biblica (ed.T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Black, 1899, London), also Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- B. Violet, Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch, 1924, Leipzig.
- J. Viteau, Les Psaumes de Salomon, 1911, Paris.
- P. Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, 1903, Tübingen and Leipzig.
- G.W. Wade, Isaiah, Westminster Commentary, 1911, London.
- W.L. Wardle, Israel and Babylon, 1925, London.
- F. Weber, Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften, gemeinfasslich dargestellt, 2nd. edit., 1897, Leipzig.
- Joh. Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity (English Transl. by Four Friends, ed. F.C. Grant), 1937, London.
- A.C. Welch, Visions of the End, 1922, London.
- W. Whiston, The Works of Flavius Josephus (English Transl.) no date, Edinburgh.
- H.J. Wicks, The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature, 1915, London.
- A.N. Wilder, Article 'The Nature of Jewish Eschatology', Journal of Biblical Literature, L, 1931, pp.201-206, New Haven.

H.A. Wolfson, Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy
in Judaism, Christianity and Islam,
2 vols., 1948, Cambridge - Massachusetts.

S. Zeitlin, "The Book of Jubilees, its Character and
Significance", Jewish Quarterly Review,
XXX 1939-40, pp. 1-31, Philadelphia.

I have to add to this list:

G. Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen
Testament, 5 vols. (not completed), 1949,
Stuttgart.

R.H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, with an
Introduction to the Apocrypha, 1949, New York.

A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, 2 Vols.,
1948-1949, Copenhagen.
