

1921

The development of eschatology in the intertestamental period

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/44375>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ESCHATOLOGY IN THE
INTERTESTAMENTAL PERIOD.

##

Boston University School of
Theology.

.##

Submitted to-

Prof.A.C.Knudson.

By: -

C. A. McPheters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. .

- Charles -- Eschatology-Hebrew, Jewish and Christian.
- " -- Religious Development between the Old and
New Testaments.
- Oesterly--The Books of the Apocrypha; Origin, Teaching
and Contents.
- Knudson-- Religious Teaching of the Old Testament.
- Beckwith--The Apocalypse of John.
- Beet - - - Last Things.
- Salmond --Christian Doctrine of Immortality.
- Plummer --Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According
to Matthew.
- Hastings Dictionary of the Bible.
Articles on Eschatology.
- Jewish Encyclopedia--Articles on Eschatology.
- Schaff-Herzog -- -- - " " " .
- Encyclopedia Britannica- " " " .
- Knudson -- Beacon Lights of Prophecy.
- Charles -- Critical History of the Doctrine of Future Life.
- Jackson -- Eschatology of Jesus.
- Catholic Encyclopedia. Articles on Eschatology.

OUTLINE.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ESCHATOLOGY IN THE
INTERTESTAMENTAL PERIOD.

INTRODUCTION:

1. SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

1. Non-Canonical Literature.
 - a. Apocrypha. Names. Classification
 - b. Pseudepigrapha. Names.
2. Historical period represented by these writings. Brief survey of Israel's history-200 B.C.-100 A.D.
Foreign influences in Israel.

II. Development of Eschatology in the Intertestamental Literature.

1. Eschatology. Defined. Phases dealt with.

2. Bearing of the Doctrine of God on Eschatology.

3. ESCHATOLOGY of ISRAEL.

A. MESSIANIC HOPE.

1. As revealed among the early Hebrews in the Old Testament.

- a. Day of Yahweh. Judgment.
- b. The Golden Age.
For Israel. For the World
- c. The Personal Messiah.
Ideal Prince.
Suffering Servant.
Son of Man.

2. As revealed among the JEWS in the Apocryphal Writings.

- a. Day of Yahweh. Judgment.
- b. The Golden Age.
For Israel. For the World.
- c. The Personal Messiah.
Son of Man. Priest.

3. As revealed among the Christian Church--in the New Testament.
 - a. Jesus. Day of Judgment.
Kingdom of God.
The Messiah.
 - b. Paul. Day of Judgment.
Kingdom of God.
The Messiah.

B. Individual Immortality.

1. Beliefs of Foreign Peoples.
Influence of Hebrew Eschatology.
2. Rise of Individualism in the Old Testament.
 1. Beliefs concerning:-
 - a. The soul of man.
 - b. Sheol or life after death.
 - c. Resurrection. Limited.
Universal.
 3. Immortality as discussed by the Non-Canonical Writers.
 1. The Soul of Man.
 2. Sheol or life after death.
 3. Resurrection. Limited.
Universal.
 4. The Christian Views of Immortality.
 1. Jesus.
 - a. The Soul of Man.
 - b. Sheol or life after death.
 - c. Resurrection.
 2. Paul's views.
111. The Non-Canonical Writings as the Text-book of the Christian Era.
 1. Jesus' use.
 2. Paul's acquaintance.
 3. Their importance in developing the doctrines embodied in Christian Theology.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ESCHATOLOGY IN THE
INTERTESTAMENTAL PERIOD.

The word APOCRYPHA means HIDDEN THINGS. In relation to the books considered here it means "withdrawn from use". The connotation of the term is altogether unlike its meaning before the Hebrew Canon was closed. According to the Talmud only really offensive books were hidden. Here the word "ganaz" means rather to use drastic action in hiding certain books from the people. This could not be said to have occurred with the canonical books, for the Rabbis would not have allowed it. The books which the Rabbis hide and forbid are always such that they consider thoroughly objectionable and heretical. Such a book cannot obtain concerning the Apocrypha. Altho they contain much that is technical and of minor importance and interest to us, yet they contain much helpful and orthodox teaching.

The term Apocrypha in its technical sense is neither specifically Jewish nor Christian originally." It is derived from the practice common among sects, religious and philosophic, of embodying their special tenets or formulae in books withheld from public use and communicated to an inner circle of believers." (James in Enc. Bib.) Thus the term itself may have two meanings-first, "hidden things",

hidden teachings which the books contain; second, the book itself hidden from public use. Nowhere is the term Apocrypha applied to our books of that name. Origen and Africanus used the term referring to the Pseudepigrapha.

It was in the Latin Church, headed by St. Jerome that the distinction was first made between the "libri canonica" and the "libri ecclesiastici." The latter are the Books of the Apocrypha. Jerome was the first to call these the Apocrypha, and he used the name in the sense which we understand today, namely-sacred books of the second rank. This distinction arose at the appearance of a vast amount of literature from the Eastern Church "some of which was not good to read even tho it contained names hallowed and revered." Jerome used the Apocrypha Books as found in the Latin Vulgate, books carried over from the Septuagint.

The Apocrypha Books then are Sacred Books but of the second order. There is nothing hidden about them nor has there ever been.

We are not to confuse our that concerning the two groups of books, the one called the Apocrypha and the other called the Pseudepigrapha. The Apocrypha books contain orthodox teaching, but have been left out of the canon. The Pseudepigrapha are heretical books-"Outside Books". Altho the Rabbis bitterly condemned these heretical books as harmful, the early church freely used them.

Antipathy to the Pseudepigrapha arose in some cases over mere personal and class feelings. For instance, the Pharisees opposed and condemned the Apocalypses because they were of Sadducean authorship. The consequence has been that all the original manuscripts have been destroyed or lost and we only have the translations of these works.

It is of interest to note that all these books have false names in their titles, hence they are called the Pseudepigrapha. Some one remarks-"This was the natural outcome of a literary modesty that was naive."

The general purpose for which the non-canonical books were written was to expand some of the already existing books of Hebrew Scripture or to add to their number. Some such as the Maccabees, continue the nation's history; others are expansions of the canonical books-such as the Prayer of Manasses, Addition of Daniel, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremy, and The Rest of Esther, Ecclesiasticus, Book of Wisdom are additions to the Wisdom Literature.

The Apocryphal Books.

1. Historical. 1 & 2 Maccabees. 1 Esdras.
2. Legendary. Additions to Esther. Song of Three Holy Children, Bel and the Dragon, Tobit, Judith,
3. Prophecy. Baruch, Prayer of Manasses.
4. Apocalyptical. 2 Esdras.
5. Didactic. Sirach. Wisdom of Solomon.

(H.D.B.)

"From the time of the primitive church down to the last century it was generally accepted, except in the case of a few isolated scholars, that the Old Testament was closed in the fifth century B.C. and that in the interval between the 5th Century B.C. and the New Testament, no divine voice had broken the silence, and no divine message had been sent to the faithful remnant of Israel, and no development had been achieved by the righteous seekers after God in Palestine. Old Testament critics have lessened this period to two centuries. But modern thought accepts no silent period. In fact in these two centuries there was development and this is shown in the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha. (Charles-Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments.)

The Apocrypha, generally speaking, then, affords a criterion for the period B.C. 200-100 A.D. as to orthodox teaching. Also the Pseudepigrapha must be consulted.

In studying these writings, we must remember not only the Old Testament teachings, but as well the historical background of the Jew. Its suffering at the hand of the hand of the invader is of no small significance. For centuries this race had been the buffer nation for other great powers. Greece, Syria, Persia, Egypt and the tribes to the north were continually harassing them. Jerusalem was attacked and destroyed. The people were scattered into

Babylon and Egypt. The promise of the ancient prophets had been unfulfilled for Jerusalem had been violated. In 332 B.C Palestine was conquered by Alexander of Greece. There followed unceasing war between Egypt and Syria which worked the greatest hardships on the Jews. Along with the physical suffering, Jewish practices were in danger of being lost under Greek influence. What saved Judaism was the severe persecutions which Antiochus Epiphanes inflicted upon the people, The loss of Jerusalem, and the suffering due to war and captivity in no small degree affected the religious thought of the Jew.

Fairweather says, - "There have been two great streams of influence flowing in upon the Jewish Theology of this period, an Eastern and a Western; a Persian and a Greek. Of these, by far the stronger was the Hellenistic, tho the Persian is as distinctly traceable. The Persian was that of Zoroastrianism, the Greek cannot be associated with a single name, but of these two forces, which were new, or newly felt active upon the native Judaism of Palestine, which was old, was formed the third which we meet within the home of Jewish Theology of that period. But there was also a Jewish Theology outside of Palestine altogether. Not only did the foreign influence flow in upon Judaism, but Judaism now no longer confined to Palestine went out to meet them. Thus the hitherto unbroken river of Old Testament ideas and doctrine divided itself at this point into three separate streams. One, the

MAIN current, continued to flow out in Palestine while one the East and West of it ran two other streams-the one thru Persian territory and the other thru Greek. The tributaries of Persian and Greek ideas by which these streams were fed, necessarily caused their waters to be ~~confused~~ composite in character, exceedingly difficult to analyse so as to say definitely-'This is Jewish and this is Persian.'"(H.D.B. V.)

The two types of Judaism, that in Palestine and that in the Dispersion, are represented in the books of the Apocrypha.

There are many doctrines which we might with gain trace thru the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. In fact the Eschatological hope is more or less dependent on the ideas of God, Law, Sin, Angels, &c, but this paper will not allow for tracing the influence of one on the other.

PART 11.

The term Eschatology is inclusive of a broad scope of ideas. It is applicable to the nation, regarded as an organic whole, and also to the individual. "In its broader sense, the term denotes the doctrine of the End, whether the aspect be individual or general, national or universal, earthly or heavenly." (Beckwith)

In a more detailed way Hastings has outlined the points included in the study:—1. The Consummation of the Age. 2. The Day of Judgment. 3. The Second Coming of Christ. 4. The Resurrection. 5. The Millennium. 6. The fixing the conditions of ~~the~~ Eternity.

Our purpose in dealing with this subject is to trace to their origin, the ideas of the Consummation of the Age, the Resurrection and Immortality, and kindred subjects included in the Eschatological study. Having discovered their beginnings, then to trace their development defining those influences that tended to stimulate their progress and to note their effect on the peoples touched.

Our research is particularly interested in the literature of the period between our Old and New Testaments. Here are books and letters not allowed in our canon, but revealing theological thought that is profound, and as worthwhile as that in some of the canonized books. In this period is a gap in the development of theological thought that is not to be leaped, but rather is to be bridged. ~~The Eschatology of the~~

New Testament is an outgrowth of the Eschatology of the Old Testament as it was developed thru the non canonical writings.

In general, then, we must consider the Eschatology of the Old Testament; in greater detail, that of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; and in conclusion the consummation of the development in New Testament and Christian Eschatology.

It is not our purpose to trace the development of the Idea of God, but we must suggest its influence on Israel's Eschatology. In early Israel, God may have seemed some superman, of human form, and yet for all practical purposes, with supernatural powers and divine attributes. To the Hebrew mind there were no questions as to his existence nor his power. The philosophical questions did not concern them. On their practical ideas of God developed their loftier conceptions. His holiness, His power, His righteousness, His love, these left off their crude ideas and shaped themselves into ethical and higher spiritual conceptions. The prophets contributed much to this development, as they more and more moralised the idea of God.

God was not one among gods, but the only God. This places Him over all nations, and this gives Him place as the Judge of all the nations. As He was that of as a holy God,

a just God, a righteous God, a God of love, a God of omnipotent power, and an all-knowing God, his relationship to life was different. Man's worth was exalted by this exalted thought of Yahweh. The development is away from the national thought to the higher value of the individual; away from the earthly kingdom idea to the more spiritual thought of the kingdom of God; away from the selfish expectations of Israel to the altruistic thought of God blessing all the nations of the earth. Life means more. Death takes on different meanings. The hereafter loses some of its fearfulness. All this development and progress in thought among the Israelites follows along with and is influenced somewhat by the growing moralised conception of Yahweh.

"We are provided to a large extent with an eschatology that takes its character from the conception of Yahweh. If Yahweh's jurisdiction is limited to this life, a Yahwistic eschatology of the individual could not exist; but when at last Israel reached the great truth of monotheism, the way was prepared for the moralisation of the future life no less than the present." (Charles)

MESSIANIC HOPE.

The term "Messianic Hope" is almost synonymous with the Eschatology of the nation. It expresses the belief in the coming of the Kingdom of God. "The Messianic idea is consequently a complex one. It embraces at least four distinct elements. Primarily it is concerned with the "new age" and the "redemption of Israel!" But with these ideas is associated the thought of "judgment" and "personal Messiah." (Knudson) It is not for us to trace thru the Old Testament these ideas, but briefly suggest their development and origination here.

H.P. Smith would call "Ezekiel, the father of the Messianic expectation." In fact with him originated the Eschatology of the Old Testament. But there is a reaction against this belief, and scholars now claim that Eschatology is preexilic. It dates back to the beginning of the nation's history.

Israel had no monopoly on such a hope. Babylon, 2000 years before the Christian era, expected the return of a great king, Hammurabi. Egypt likewise had hopes of this nature. So Israel is not alone in her Messianic ideas. Nor does she borrow. But it seems that for a nation to have some form of Messianic hopes is natural and normal. "This hope in its primitive form is one that we should expect to arise among different peoples. It has its manifold psychological roots. It grows out of the ~~native~~ discontent of the human mind with existing conditions and out

of the natural tendency of one to idealise what is distant in time."(Knudson) No doubt the Egyptian and Babylonian influences affected Israel's hope, but "What was borrowed was not the hope itself. The invincible optimism that lay back of Israel's Messianism could not have been borrowed."(Knudson) "The Hebrews alone among the nations put their Golden Age in the future. This is due to the promise in Genesis of one who should bruise the serpents' head; and likewise to the blessing of Noah on Shem's tribe, for 'Jehovah is Shem's God.'" (Beckwith)

Israel's Golden Age was always in the future. Other nations looked for the reestablishment of an ideal order of some former time, but the Hebrews saw only the ideal kingdom in the future. The seed of the Messianic hope was sown early. In its earliest form, there is much that is crude. Selfish possession of Yahweh's affection marked it. Israel alone was the object of Yahweh's love. Hatred for their enemies was given expression in the belief that they would all be destroyed and Israel would alone remain. The Day of Yahweh could only be a day of joy to Israel, but to their enemies a day of confusion and destruction. "The expected day was thus to be to them a day of light; only to their enemies was it to be a day of darkness."(Knudson)

This idea was changed by the preaching of the eighth century prophets. "From Amos on, the Day of Yahweh is

to be a crisis when Yahweh will manifest his indignation against all iniquity." Amos, thus, inaugurated a new thought that the sins of Israel were as punishable as the sins of other nations. "You only have I known of all families of the earth; therefore will I visit upon you all your iniquities." Amos, 3:2. Isaiah, Hosea and Zephaniah express it similarly, as a day of crisis for all the nations, and a vindication of Yahweh's holiness. (Isa. 2:12ff)

At first the Day of Yahweh was just a local political happening, but it came to be that of a universal happening. God, as king, should hold a great assize at which all men should be judged. No doubt the monarchic rule under which Israel was organized during the progress of her history, and the monarchic conception of God, caused this conception: That the day should be one of great catastrophe was held from the beginning. The prophets contributed the thought that a remnant of good, obedient people will be saved. This remnant came to be that of the seed of the future nation.

Throughout the Old Testament the Day of Yahweh is suggested as the catastrophic end of the existing order, and the establishment of a new order. The change is needed because of the sinfulness of men. It did not occur to the Hebrew mind that a new order might be developed without a sudden end of the old. The catastrophe was inevitable, and the only task of the prophets was to call the nation

to repentance, and thus save as large a remnant as possible.

The prophets shared the common view that "there was to be a glorious future for the chosen people. This future was not to consist simply in the redemption of Israel from captivity, but in a marvelous transformation of the entire world. War was to cease. All the peoples of the world were to be united together under the spiritual leadership of Israel." (Knudson)

Involved in this day of change is the thought of the coming of a Messiah. The Personal Messiah is not implicit in the day of Yahweh, and yet it is expressed in many passages. Beckwith traces the hope for a Messiah back to the patriarchal period. "The Eschatological hope was the anticipation of the theocratic kingdom to be realised with national and territorial limits, but contain^{ed} with it a blessedness which other peoples should recognise and desire." "This theocratic kingdom was realised under Kings Saul, David, and Solomon, when God, the sole king, was represented by human kings. God chose the king and the prophet anointed him, and thus the Human and divine kingship were one." "In this unique relation of the theocratic king to God, and to his people, is contained what later prophets saw in the unfolded vision of a Messiah." "This "unfolded vision of the Messiah" was the forerunner of the New Testament doctrine of God Incarnate."

The prophets thot of him as a man and yet with transcendental powers. In Isaiah, Micah, and Haggai he is the Ideal King. (Isa. 9:6. Micah 11:1-5. Haggai 2:20f) In the exile period the Messiah assumed the form of the Suffering Servant. (Isa. 53:5.) In the post-exilic literature we have the idea of the Son of Man. It is the latter two that "influenced Jesus conception of His own mission and destiny." (Knudson)

Thus the Old Testament doctrine concerning the Messianic Kingdom appears in the Day of Yahweh, the Golden Age and the Personal Messiah.

Further development of these ideas we shall note in the noncanonical literature.

The thot of the writers of this literature is no doubt affected by the experiences thru which the people have passed and are passing. Separated from Jerusalem, the center of their religious life, scattered over the earth, as they had been, they were susceptible to the influences of the people among whom they were forced to live. Babylon more definitely influenced their thot and life than other nations. However after the Greek invasion we note unmistakable evidences of Hellenistic influence.

The belief in the Day of Yahweh is greatly expanded by these writers. The present and the coming age take more

definite shape. The present is a world period about to close. This closing of the period is not due to natural causes or forces, but to unnatural conditions. It is to be marked by a Divine intervention. This is brought out in 2 Esdras 7:31ff and Baruch 30 where all men are to be brought before God's throne and the division of men is to be not on the grounds of Israelitic or non-Israelitic, but of righteousness and unrighteousness. The present world is evil and corrupt, under the sway and power of Satan. This evil order is to be destroyed. Baruch 83:10ff. 2 Esdras 11:40ff. Jub. 10:8.

The nation is not given the prominence as in the Old Testament. This is due no doubt to the fact that what national feeling had obtained had been lost during the long years of separation from Jerusalem and separation from their own race. However this racial feeling did not die. The outlook now is not for a new nation, as in earlier times, but for a new world. The change was to be marked by a day of judgment.

All men are to be judged. The righteous will be rewarded with "eternal life." This is the term of the Apocrypha. Where this eternal life is to be spent is not stated. Paradise is suggested, but while in Enoch 45:5, and Sibylline Oracles 4:186ff, it means the new world, its location is confused for us by the suggestion of Enoch 32:1-3

as at the ends of the earth, and in Sl.En.8:2 as the third heaven and in Bar.51:11 a place indefinitely called "heaven". The point of development is the matter of rewards. This was not seriously considered in the Old Testament. The prophets, the outstanding ethical teachers of the Old Testament, are more concerned with improving the present conditions than with eternal rewards.

But in the Apocryphal days "Rewards and punishments become transcendental" and are of primary interest. Some four punishments are suggested. First, The exclusion from the blessings of the righteous. En.22:13. Second, Death or destruction, which, however does not mean annihilation. "The spirits of the wicked shall be put to death, and they shall cry and wail in boundless void." En.108:3. This that concerning the punishment of the wicked has passed into the New Testament. Third, There shall be spiritual suffering, "They shall pine away in confusion, and be consumed with shame, and shall be withered up with fear." 2 Es.7:87 "They will lament their folly in rejecting the law of God." Baruch 51:4. Fourth, Physical pain is named. "There are all sorts of tortures in that place - - everywhere fire, and everywhere frost and ice, thirst and shivering, while the bonds are very cruel and the angels fearful and merciless, bearing angry weapons with merciless torture." Sl.En.102ff. Such punishments connected with the Day

of Judgment are departures from the Old Testament ideas of that day.

The new and coming age ushered in by the Judgment will be a transformed age. The Messianic Kingdom will be a transformed kingdom. Bar. 5:1ff. Even the heavens will be destroyed. 2Es. 6:20. En. 1:6ff. There will be a new creation. Baruch 49:9ff. 2 Esdras 7:75. This Apocryphal description of the new age surpasses even that of Hosea, Isaiah and Amos. These prophets suggest that all nature will be changed, and the inanimate world changed. Isaiah comes nearer the later conception as he described the new heavens and the new earth. Isa. 65:17. "For behold I create new heavens and a new earth." Enoch pictures the new order like old Jerusalem, as an ideal city, or kingdom. Enoch 90:28. It is to be a kingdom of spiritual perfection. Enoch 10:20f. Jub. 1:17ff.

R.H. Charles says, there are two Eschatologies, the one represented by the Prophets and the other by the Apocalyptists. The prophets were materialistic in their conception of the kingdom. "The Old Testament prophets looked forward to an eternal Messianic kingdom in the present earth." The Apocalyptist thought of the coming kingdom not of material blessedness but of spiritual perfection. "This change took place about 100 B.C."

This does not deny the prophet of his rightful exalted place in the pronouncements of ethical teachings, but it

is true to the fact that the prophets were primarily interested in the practical life of the day, rather than the speculative questions involved in the Messianic hope.

The Apocryphal writers took more the attitude of the Apocalypticist.

The Messiah was no more an organic factor in the kingdom ideas of this period than in the Old Testament. In some books he is not mentioned. (Maccabees. Tobit. Baruch). And yet he is included. Enoch calls him the Son of Man, and that Son of Man. (46:2, 48:2) In other places the expression "the Man" or "that man" is used. (2 Esdras. 133:5) In the Old Testament he is considered the Ideal Prince, the Suffering Servant, and the Son of Man, but here preexistence is assigned to him. Enoch 48:7 "Before the sun and the signs were formed, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits." 48:6. "He was chosen and bidden with him (God) before the world was formed." The Messiah is "endowed with fullness of wisdom and righteousness, glory and might, and he will share the throne of God" "That Son of Man has appeared and has seated himself upon the throne of his glory and all evil will vanish from before his face and cease, but the word of the Son of Man will be mighty before the Lord of Spirits." Enoch. 69:29.

In the Old Testament, God is judge of all. In the

Apocrypha the Messiah is the judge of all. Enoch 47:3.

Baruch 40:1f. "The leader of the hostile hosts will be taken into Mt. Zion where the Messiah will convict him of all his impieties." 2 Esdras 12:32f "He shall come and speak unto them and reprove them for their wickedness and their unrighteousness;-- and he shall set them alive in his judgment, and when he hath reproved them he shall destroy them!" Enoch says the kings, mighty in the earth, sinners and just and also the angels and all the spirits of evil will appear before the Messiah's throne.

In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Messiah is to descend from the tribe of Levi, rather than Judah. In other words, he is to be first of all a priest, and then a ~~king~~ prophet and then a king. However there is the reappearance of the hope for a Messiah from Judah. The powers ascribed to the Messiah from Levi are lofty. He is to be sinless, to walk in meekness and righteousness, to establish a new priesthood, to mediate for the Gentiles, to be king over all the nations, to deliver the captives, and open the gates of Paradise. (T. Jud.; T. Levi; T. Reuben; T. Daniel.) In passing we must suggest the importance of this group of writings. Charles says "The overwhelming value of the book lies in its ethical teachings, which has achieved a real immortality by influencing the thought and diction of the writers of the New Testament. and even the thought of Jesus."

This ethical teaching, much higher and purer than the Old Testament, is yet its true spiritual child and helps to bridge the chasm that divides the ethics of the Old and New Testaments."

While the Messiah is given greater place in the Apocrypha than in the Old Testament, yet the conception is not more exalted. Especially is this true if we accept the Suffering Servant of Isaiah as the Messiah. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed." This is unsurpassed. Nor do we have a suggestion that approaches this. Rather as the Ideal Prince or the Priest or the Son of Man, is he considered in the non-canonical writings.

In discussing the Christian Eschatology as expressed in the New Testament, we are particularly interested in the attitude of Jesus and Paul. Briefly we may suggest the consummation of the development traced thru the Old Testament and the Intertestamental books.

That Jesus was influenced by Old Testament teachings and the Apocryphal works can go without long discussion. It would be strange if he should do otherwise than take the expressions with which they were familiar in his day, and use them, that he might be understood. To these terms he

gave new meaning. "There was much important truth wrapped up in them, and apart from the form in which popular thought had invested them the truth could hardly be made intelligible to the Jews of that day. And 'so far as He took over the transcendent supernatural side of the expectation, He transformed and spiritualised while he adopted it.' In adopting, He "transmuted the apocalyptic tradition." (Plummer and quotation from Sanday.)

Much that was crude and materialistic even in the Apocryphal writings does not appear in the Gospels, and yet there are hints of the old beliefs concerning an earthly kingdom. Jesus does not condemn nor discard the teaching of a catastrophic end of the existing order. In fact he taught that. Just preceding the end will be times of extreme suffering. False Christs will come, wars and tumults famines and earthquakes are foretold in Matt 24:4-14. Jerusalem and the Temple will be overthrown and destroyed. Altho this has the semblance of a local end, yet the temple and Jerusalem meant such as to suggest to the Jew the end of the world. The disciples are continually asking for signs, and Jesus answers that when the end comes they will know it. It will not come until the Gospel has been preached to all nations, and the end will be preceded by a variety of religious, political and physical disturbances. The end will need no heralding sign, but will manifest

itself to all in a way that will leave no doubt as to its character. (Plummer) Jesus' description of the judgment scene is recorded in Matthew 25:31-46. He, the Son of Man is seated on the throne. All the angels are present, all the nations are gathered, the good are separated from the evil. Jesus calling himself the Son of Man, and describing himself as the Judge seemingly points to the influence of the Book of Enoch or some Apocryphal writing.

His teaching concerning future punishment of the wicked seems in keeping with that of the Apocrypha. The story of Dives has all the suggested torture and kinds of suffering that are heretofore pointed out in the Book of Enoch and other writings of this period.

Jesus has somewhat to say concerning the Kingdom. He puts it in his prayer taught his disciples. To them kingdom may have meant earthly rule. But to him it meant a future spiritual kingdom. We do not see that he taught it would be established on this earth. The records do not reveal that he described it in terms of Jerusalem, as John does in his Revelation. His kingdom is one of the highest spiritual perfection. The disciples could not get his full meaning as he described that kingdom, because they were thinking in earthly terms and he was speaking in spiritual terms.

Jesus seems to have accepted the common thought that

the existing order is evil and the world is under the sway of Satan, for this enters into his temptation experience. Consequently he seems to expect a Divine intervention that will mean a "new heaven and a new earth". The old shall be destroyed and the righteous shall inhabit the kingdom of God eternally.

While Jesus seems influenced by the Apocryphal writings we feel that he accommodated himself to his day and sought to get his truth into their lives. For we cannot but see and feel the extent to which His conception of his own mission as the Messiah, and of the Kingdom of God and of the final day of Judgment surpasses any former contributions made to these ideas.

Paul, trained in the writings of the Father, but thoroly converted to the Christian faith, attempts to get the Christ's viewpoint of the doctrines. It is difficult for the Pharisee to change suddenly and not at times have arising in his thots those beliefs of former days. In fact he does not completely rid himself eg the influence of his former teachings. He writes to Timothy, "Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." In general we should say that he accepts and attempts to pass on to his day the teachings of Christ concerning His Messiahship, and His Kingdom and His Judgment. Paul was interested in the Crucifixion and resurrection more than in the former ideas.

B. INDIVIDUAL IMMORTALITY.

The neither the earliest form nor the precise cause is known, belief in some form of existence after death seems to be of universal character. Egypt had it four thousand years before Christ. The Babylonians knew of a "land of no return." Zoroastrianism pictures it. Plato argued for it. The Epicureans repudiated it. The Stoics partly received it. The belief seems to adjust itself to the conditions of the people in whose religion it appears.

"The belief is shaped and colored by climate, geographical position, and circumstances of different races, but in most cases it has taken the form of a belief in an underworld, and a shadowy existence there.-- The purity of the belief has been in proportion to the purity of the Idea of God, and the standards of moral feeling." (Salmond)

This "National Pilgrims Progress" toward an exalted belief was made by the Jews, even as other nations had done, between the years 800 B.C. - 100 A.D. Israel did not come to her final belief without help from outside sources. Consciously or unconsciously foreign beliefs influenced Israelitic belief in the Future Life.

There are three main sources of influence, Babylon, Persia and Greece. Of the three the most helpful influence came from Persia. Babylon's that of death and life was crudely materialistic. They were a race whose

gods were gods of the living, and whose religion was to satisfy life. Their thought of the future was vague and indefinite. Their influence is not traceable nor hardly distinguishable, altho Salmond claims that due to being of the same race, "The popular ideas of the Hebrew on this subject of soul, death and life of the future, are traceable in point of fact to those of the Babylonians."

Persia had the more definite doctrine of the future life. They did not worship the dead, nor think of an underworld, but they were concerned with a system of rewards and punishments. They taught the resurrection of the wicked as well as the righteous. They connected the resurrection with the final judgment. The doctrine of the resurrection arose early in Persia and some claim that the Jew borrowed it from them.

Concerning the extent to which the Greek thought influenced the Jew, there is difference of opinion. Oesterly claims "For the Doctrines of Immortality we are indebted to Hellenism." He quotes Friedlander, "As early as the end of the 4th Century B.C. the Jews of Palestine became acquainted with the Platonic doctrine of Immortality, tho it was some time before the teaching was accepted." Charles claims that the influence was slight. "An immeasurable gulf divides it from Jewish, no less than from the Christian doctrine." At least we will say the Persian was the stronger.

Individualism.

Old Testament eschatology is primarily concerned with the nation. The Messianic Kingdom with its hopes of an ideal nation furnished the outstanding hopes of Israel. The individual was not given definite attention. However this national hope furnished the foundation on which the belief in individualism could arise. In seeking the explanation of the Old Testaments silence on individual immortality, Prof. Knudson suggests two:- first, "The individual was completely subordinated to the family, tribe and nation, that he had no independent rights or worth.--- If the nation was believed to be immortal, nothing more was needed. Second, The Semitic people had no constructive imagination, lacking drama and metaphysics, They concerned themselves with empirical and practical problems". In these he finds elements of truth, but a more conclusive explanation is offered. "The that of the destiny of the individual arose upon that of the nation. The hope of Israel carried with it the hope of the Israelite." (Salmond)

As to just when individualism arose there is much difference of opinion. For some Jeremiah is the originator and Ezekiel is the developer. But for others individualism arose early in Hebrew thought and life, arising with the Messianic hope and developing with it. "The Messianic hope, imperfect as it was in its earliest forms, expressed two important truths, the value of the present life and the

social character of life in the new age." R.L.Stevenson says,"To believe in immortality is one thing, but first of all it is needful that we believe in life." "And so it turned out that the Hebrew religion, which seemed far cruder and more negative in its view of the future life than the heathen faiths, but which did emphasize the value of life as such and its social character, 'proved nevertheless to be the only religion that moved on to a vital and enduring faith in immortality.'"

"To have disentangled the life of the individual from that of the nation was not the achievement of Ezekiel alone. It was the outcome of a long development. ---- It was he who first formulated the doctrine of individualism. He made it a necessary correlate of the divine justice. He also put back of it the gracious will of God and so transformed it into a gospel." (Knudson)

It was in the exile that the individual became the religious unit. With the temple destroyed, and Jerusalem gone and the people scattered, the thought of the people began to turn ~~from~~ toward the idea of the Kingdom of God being within man to some degree. This thought did not substitute for the thought of the Messianic Kingdom, but opened the way for the development of new ideas which were to be connected with the individual.

"Religion centers in the thought of God, but the thought of God becomes a source of inspiration only in so far as it elevates the conception of man. The conception of man is second in importance only to that of God. - - Anthropology lagged far behind theology, and not until the very close of the Old Testament period did a conception of man begin to arise that satisfied the developed religious consciousness. Much of what we find in the Old Testament concerning the nature of man is consequently of an imperfect and sub-Christian character." (Knudson)

The Hebrew, lacking the psychological distinctions, and physiological science, used four terms in attempting to express his conception of man. These terms, basar (flesh), nephesh, (Soul), ruach (spirit), leb (heart), make no minute distinctions, in fact they are used at times interchangeably and synonymously. And yet we are not to consider them synonymous. The Hebrew was neither a Dichotomist nor a Trichotomist. He did not consider soul and body in antithesis. Life was a unity.

The nephesh or soul has not the same meaning as the modern term soul has. "As the body was the union of the dust with the life-giving spirit, and hence might be called "ensouled matter" so the nephesh might be spoken of as due to the union of the life-giving spirit with the flesh and hence might be called "incarnate spirit". Flesh and soul

were thus intimately connected with each other, mutually dependent upon each other, yet they root in different principles, one in dust or matter, the other in breath or spirit." (Knudson)

The soul was thought of in various ways. Because when the breath is gone the body is dead, soul was connected with breath. An example of the converse is found in 1 Kings 17:21f when Elijah breaths into the nostrils of the dead boy and he becomes alive. But in Lev. 17 we find "the life of the flesh is in the blood." Life is lost with the loss of blood, hence the soul is the blood. "A still further reason for the identification of the soul with the blood may perhaps be found in the visible reek of shed blood, This would suggest to the primitive mind that there was in the blood breath-like or soul-like substance." (Knudson)

The Hebrew did not speculate nor philosophise concerning the soul. All theories of Dichotomy and Trichotomy are later attempts to analyse life. Of this the Jew was certain; life had two aspects- flesh or body, and soul or spirit. Of these the flesh died but the spirit was immortal.

Where the spirit goes after the death of the body is the next question. If the spirit lives after death a place of existence must be provided. This place arises in Hebrew thought as Sheol. This thought was no doubt

derived or at least influenced by their ancestor worship. The dead were regarded as not dead, but living and sharing experiences with the living and having superhuman powers to help or injure. Sacrifices were offered to preserve the vitality and honor of the dead in the other world. Sheol developed for a final abode of the clan and nation and finally came to include all mankind.

"The representations of Sheol in the Old Testament are not altogether uniform, but in general it was that of a great subterranean pit or cave to which all the dead went." As to its origin, Charles offers the most plausible that "Sheol was originally conceived of as a combination of graves of the clan or nation, and is thus its final abode. In due course the conception was naturally extended till it embraced the departed of all nations and thus became the final abode of all mankind, good and bad alike." Here the dead continued to live, conscious and active. Such a thought would naturally perpetuate ancestor worship. The prophets opposed this form of worship and consequently their religion seems opposed to the idea of Sheol. They preached the God of the living, not of the dead. This opposition helped lead Israel to a higher conception.

Sheol was not a place of great joy and blessedness. "The Israelites looked forward to it with unconcealed dread". "Only one condition was worse, and that was the state of those

who were unburied, so not admitted to Sheol." Social conditions obtain there, but ethical considerations do not pass over into that life. It was a land of disorder and dust, in the lowest parts of the earth, without light. It is a shadowy existence, most miserable, and no chance to return from it: (Job 10:21f) Here they are cut off from communion with God and his care! (Isa. 38:18f. Psa. 6:5.) It is independent of Yahweh and outside his power. The remembrance of the things of life are gone, pleasures are no more, only pain and sadness take its place. (Job 7:7-10. Ecc. 9:10) Princes and captives, servants and masters, small and great, all are there. (Job 3:13ff)

"The thought which cheered Socrates in view of his end was that in Hades he would be in blessed communion with the great and good of all time, but this is not found among the Hebrews! Rather the view of death was morbid, miserable, bitter, like Achilles - "Speak not comfortably to me of death; I would rather on earth do villains service to another, one without inheritance, whose substance is but little, than be king of all the dead."

Dr. Cheyne puts it:-

Like sheep they sink into Sheol.
Death rules them, terrors affright them;
They go down straight into the grave;
Sheol is their mansion forever.

In relieving itself of this gloomy and despairing outlook upon the future life, Hebrews that had access to three

lines of that. "The first is the resurrection of the body. This means the resurrection of the earthly life. The second is the idea of a judgment in the underworld. This ~~defines~~ deprives the after life of its moral neutrality and gives to it the same interests and values that the present life possesses. The third is the immortality of the soul.-- These three lines of that were first worked out by the Persians, Egyptians and Greeks respectively." (Knudson)

The Jews adopted the that of the resurrection of the body. The groundwork for this belief was prepared by their Messianic Hope. This was but the idea of a national death and resurrection. When the individual came to the place of real worth, personal resurrection became a necessary part of Hebrew teaching. This did not arise in definite form until after the exile.

As in the idea of the Messianic Kingdom so in the resurrection of the body, first we have a limited and then later the universal that of the resurrection. The development is noted in two Old Testament passages. Isa. 26:19 reads: "Thy dead men shall arise, and the inhabitants of the dust shall awaken and shout for joy; for a dew of light is thy dew, and the earth shall produce the shades." This is a truly spiritual doctrine of the future life, but it is confined to the righteous. It is a life "that stands in organic and living relation to the present life in God,

which the faithful enjoy in the earth, and since the

faithful alone stand in this relation, only the

resurrection of the righteous was conceivably possible."

(Charles)

Later we find that it is believed that the

good, bad, righteous and evil, all will be resurrected. Dan. 12:2

"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." "The resurrection was severed from

the root from which it sprang and transformed into an

eschatological property or device, by means of which all

the members of the nation are presented in the body before

God for judgment." (Charles) No doubt the thought of the

resurrection had not at this time included any other but

Israelites, however a great stride has been taken, "when

the atrocities of Antiochus Epiphanes brought religious

despair to the hearts of all true Israelites, and roused

the fervid patriotism of Judas Maccabaeus and his followers."

"The development of this doctrine in the apocryphal

literature of the Jews presents a varied and inharmonious

blend of colors. Inconsistencies abound, and can be explained

only on the ground that each writing was influenced by the

individual experience as well as by the theological

idiosyncracies of its author." (H.D.B.)

The Apocryphal writers virtually accept the doctrine

~~of the resurrection as expressed in the Old Testament.~~

The prophets, while mentioning the life after death, had not used it to urge better living. Rather they held punishments over the heads of the people. But the Apocryphal writers make immortality the incentive for good living. While this does not contribute to the doctrine, yet it gives it the important place which it deserves, as the goal of life.

Sheol becomes an intermediate place from whence the righteous go to their rewards in heaven. Enoch 22 describes it and assigns three classes to it:— two classes of wicked and one of righteous. Two classes are to receive final rewards, but the third class, which is most wicked, have received punishments on the earth and they will remain in Sheol. Of the others, one class which escaped punishment in the upper world, must suffer in Sheol and then be raised at the judgment day to receive punishment. The rest must go ~~the~~ to Gehenna for worse torture. "Here Sheol at its best is only a place of petrified moralities and suspended graces." (Charles) Ecclesiasticus suggests rest after death, an "Eternal rest" (22:11; 30:17; 38:23; 46:19.)

"This idea of rest for the soul hereafter is very different from that of death being corruption and the end of all things, which is the more usual one in Ecclesiasticus, and one is perhaps justified in seeing the beginnings of development here, based, it is true, on some Old Testament passages; the conception of the dead resting must involve

some sort of a belief beyond the bare existence of the shades hereafter." (Oesterly) Here the idea of Sheol becomes the Hades of the New Testament that. "The way of the sinner is made smooth without stones, and at the end thereof is the pit of Hades." (21:10) In the Book of Judith the body as well as the spirit suffers after death. (16:17) In the prayer of Manasses judgment is passed while the spirit is living in Sheol. (Verse 12) In 2 Maccabees we have the greatest development. Here Hades is a place of punishment of the wicked. (6:26) For the righteous Hades is only a temporary abode since the resurrection is reserved for them. (8:9) "That book has a very advanced doctrine of future life" (Charles) In Wisdom, Enoch, Baruch and Jubilees we have suggested that there is a partial retribution immediately after death. 2 Esdras 7:8f suggests that seven days after death the rewards of the righteous and wicked are meted out. Also there is a shadow of a suggestion that there is a possible chance of repentance here in Sheol. But the latter does not appear in either the Old or the New Testament.

Concerning the resurrection, the Apocrypha seems to follow the Old Testament that as expressed in Daniel 12:2. This doctrine is asserted in all the Apocryphal writings of Pharasiac origin, or when arguments are being pressed against the Sadducees. We note two characteristics of these

writings. First, the resurrection is limited to the Israelites. This eventually gives way to the universal. Second, it is a resurrection of the body. It is in the Hellenistic writings that immortality takes the place of the resurrection of the body. (Wisdom 3:1-9)

All Israelites will be resurrected according to 2 Maccabees. This resurrection is not only of the spirit but as well of the body. (7:10,11;14:46) In Baruch (49:2-51) the resurrection of the dead is with bodies exactly as committed to the earth with a view to their recognition by those who knew them, and next their subsequent transformation with a view to a spiritual existence of unending duration. "The most important and best known section of the Book of Enoch (37-70) contains an explicit assertion of a general resurrection (51:1). Whether, however, the writer intended to convey the thought of a resurrection of the Gentiles is doubtful." (H.D.B.) The author definitely denies the Gentile any resurrection, in 2 Maccabees 7:14. However this limited and bodily resurrection is not unanimously accepted by the Apocryphal writers. There are references in 2 Maccabees even that, if taken literally would suggest a universal rising of the dead. Likewise in Baruch (30:2-5) and 2 Esdras (7:28) the universal resurrection is taught. The Book of Jubilees suggests only a resurrection of the spirit. The writer of 2 Esdras,

definitely states his belief that only the spirit will arise.

The corruptible body is discarded. The spiritual and material are mutually antagonistic, and hence are not reunited. The material body is annihilated at death, but the soul assumes a non-material body which does not change. (7:88;4:11;8:53)

As to who will rise he is not definite.

When the resurrection occurs is differently held.

2 Esdras 7:101f suggests that it takes place immediately after death, and seven days of "freedom" and "Rest". Enoch that it occurred at the close of the Messianic era. "Death will befall the Messiah after four hundred years reign, and all mankind and the world will lapse into primeval silence for seven days, after which the renewed earth will give forth its dead and God will judge the world and assign the evil-doers to the fires of Hell, and the righteous to Paradise which is on the opposite side." That it occurs before or at the time of the Judgment seems generally believed.

The beliefs in the resurrection of the dead and an unending communion of the pious soul with God, as expressed in the Old Testament, persisted in the Apocrypha. However the post-canonical writers adjusted the two ideas, and gave them broader scope. "Sheol becomes a place of moral distinctions." "A division is made for the spirits of the righteous, in which is a bright spring of water." Also "the resurrection

and the Messianic age came to be that of in less distinctly earthly or material terms. The resurrection was to be either a resurrection of the spirit or a resurrection 'in garments of light and glory.' And the Messianic kingdom, if established at all, was not to be eternal. The dead were not to be raised to participate in it. It was to be only preparatory to the general resurrection, which was to usher in the heavenly kingdom or an eternal Messianic kingdom in a new heaven and a new earth. A more spiritual conception of the future life came to prevail," (Knudson) To this end the Apocryphal contributed their beliefs. The development did not reach its heights during this period. "Not until the advent of Christianity did this higher hope become a living and burning faith." But Sheol was changed. It lost much of its misery and despair. It loses that sense of "absolute void", or "absolute forgetfulness." God is not cut off from it, but "Thou I make my bed in Sheol, Thou art there," is felt to be true. Sheol becomes an intermediary state from which the righteous go to their rewards and the wicked to their punishments. The resurrection is spiritualised and universalised, until it includes all mankind, and the spirit apart from the body is resurrected.

The consummation of this development we shall find in the New Testament, especially the teaching of Jesus.

u The real basis of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is found in Jesus' teaching and his resurrection. Briefly we would suggest his beliefs, and its relation to the beliefs of the preceding periods.

Jesus was confronted with three attitudes of the Jews to the idea of the resurrection. The Pharisees believed in the immortality of life. The Sadducees, while not denying the immortality of the soul, still lingered in the old conception long outgrown. The Essenes were a monastic order whose belief is somewhat uncertain in this particular. Jesus definitely lines up with the Pharisees teaching concerning immortality. And yet he disagrees with them in several particulars; -1. "Spiritualising and ethicising the aims and means of the resurrection. 2. Thru conscious distinction between form and content. 3. By transcending a material in favor of a universal ideal." Instead of the judgment of the Gentiles by the pious Israelites, the Son of Man judges men out of their own mouths."

That Jesus accepted the doctrine of nSheol, is without doubt. His story of Dives descending into Hades, and there being tortured, illustrates his belief. The redeemed at death enter Paradise, as the thief on the cross, from whence they are gathered into the "kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world". The wicked are "cast into a furnace of fire; where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth."

He accepts a belief in a Gehenna of fire,"where the worm dieth not and fire is not quenched."(Mk. 9:42ff) "He emphatically points to everlasting punishment for the soul or disembodied spirit in a region of everlasting torment." Shailer Matthews write,"The New Testament conception of Sheol is not fundamentally other than that of Judaism. Generally speaking, it does not develop any new doctrine of Sheol, and is as far as possible from favoring the extreme speculation of either Rabbinic Judaism or of Patristic Christianity."

Concerning the resurrection, Jesus teaches the resurrection of the righteous.(Matt. 22:23-32.) But in Matt. 11:24 we may infer the rising of the wicked as well. His thought is more the universal resurrection, for all mankind. This resurrection is not to be bodily, except as a higher bodily form is assumed. In Matt. 22:29ff, the natural bodily functions connected with propagation are denied the future life, but that man will have some higher type of bodily existence seems consistent with his teaching. If we are to base the resurrection doctrine on Jesus' teaching and life, we are confronted with him after the resurrection in some body that demanded food and could be handled. In the Gospel of John do we get a profounder thought of the resurrection as expressed by Jesus than in the Synoptics. Here he "establishes an organic relationship, immediate and

spiritual, between Himself and those committed to Him. This living relationship, in which all believers share, contains the germ of that resurrection life which springs into being at present, and will be perfected in the "Last Day". (John 11:25)

When we turn to the teaching of St. Paul, as it gradually comes into contact with Hellenism and Gentile thought, we find a new prominence given the doctrine. He believed that the new body would be identified with the old material body. He calls it a "spiritual body", and incorruptible, like Christ's risen body. (2 Cor. 5:1; 1 Cor. 15:44; Phil. 3:21) He distinguishes three resurrections; 1. Christ's; 2. Believers in Christ; 3. Other dead. (1 Cor. 15:21-24) He puts no time between these resurrections, while John of the Apocalypse places 1000 years between the latter two. That Paul believed in the resurrection of the wicked as well as the righteous is thus noted. "Paul spoke now of simply passing over into the future life (Phil. 1:23), now of transformation (1 Cor. 15:5), but it is uncertain whether the glorified man is more properly described as his true self, or as a grafting a new plant upon the ruins of the old man; also whether the departure of the soul 'to be at home with the Lord' is a sleeping, a dreaming or a conscious entrance into another sphere of existence." "It was sufficient for him to urge men to the attainment of that resurrection which was the aspiration of his own life."

PART III.

The Apocryphal writings were the text books of the early Christian church. The early Greek Fathers, Origen and Clement, frequently cite these books as "scripture" and "Divine Scripture" inspired etc. Augustine of the Western Church accepted them. Even though some of them, the Pseudepigrapha, were considered heretical, yet the people read them. While Africanus and Jerome only accepted the Hebrew canon, the moral values ~~and~~ of these post-canonical writings were recognised and they were read in the churches.

In our New Testament there are no definite references to the Apocrypha, and yet, the fact that these New Testament writers took their quotations from the Greek Old Testament would indicate that they must have seen and even used the Apocryphal books which were a part of that Bible. Also some of the canonised books are not quoted. The Pentateuch, and the Prophets, and the Psalms are cited, but Ecclesiastes, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah are never cited. Further, there are evidences that the Apocryphal writings were used by the New Testament writers. Hebrews 11:34f refers to the story of the Maccabees found in 2 Macc. 6:18ff. Hebrews 1:3 is like Wisdom of Solomon 7:26. Heb. 4:12, 13 is like Wisdom of Solomon 1:22-24. The writer of the Epistle of James seems acquainted with Ecclesiasticus. Then there is no reason why these men should not have used these writings. They were not barred from usage until after the

Reformation, when the Catholics accepted these books but the Protestants rejected them,

As to Jesus use of them, we are not certain. That he was influenced by them seems evident from the identity of the fundamentals of his teaching with that of the Apocrypha. There is no good reason why he should not have read them and adopted such material for his work as he could well use. His teaching in Matt. 22:23-33 seems identical with 4 Macc. 16:25, which says, "Those who die in behalf of God live unto God as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." Likewise we have no doubt of Paul's use of the books. At least in his studies in Jerusalem he came into contact with them and when he became a Christian he would adapt whatever he had received from whatever source unto his new mission, of presenting the risen Christ to the world. "The church of the first centuries made no essential difference between the writings of the Hebrew Canon and the so-called Apocrypha."

(Schaff-Herzog)

Altho barred from the Hebrew canon, we are not to overlook the importance of these books in contributing to the development of doctrines that arise in the Old Testament and are perfected in the New Testament. With the history and traditions of Israel in mind; with the teachings of the prophets in their thoughts; with the influence of Persia and Greece constantly exerted upon them, these writers could take the doctrines which arose early in Israel—the Messianic hope, with

its Day of Judgment, and its hope for a new and better day, and its hope of a Messiah who should establish better rule on the earth; and the rise of Individual Immortality, with its doctrine of the soul of man, and of Sheol, and of the resurrection; - and could aid in spiritualising them, and thus make them of more exalted worth and eternal hope to the world. This they did in some degree. Jesus found a more exalted thought of man and of the coming kingdom when he came than he would have found three centuries earlier. Various influences worked this change, and prepared the thought of man for His coming, but those influences are in some degree headed up in the Apocryphal writers. "It must be said of the Jewish Apocalyptic that, a product of religious syncretism it testifies to a variety of foreign influences." (Jackson)

There is no ~~divine~~ silence in the period between the Testaments. The Divine voice spoke, and that thru the writers of the Apocrypha. In these two centuries - 200 B.D. - 100 A.D. - there was doctrinal development, and this is shown in the APOCRYPHA and the PSEUDEPIGRAPHA.

 # # # # # # # #