

Scripturalism vs Judaism V

True Christianity has No Foundation in Judaism

Fred R. Coulter—July 7, 1993

In this particular sermon I'm going to be reading, just about the entire time, excerpts from various books that we have researched for this particular project—in particular, I'm going to be reading from *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* by Alfred Edershiem and *Jerusalem in the Times of Jesus* by Joachim Jeremias

Hopefully, if we have some time at the end I will read some of the Sabbath laws of Judaism from the *Code of Jewish Law* by Ganzfried and Goldin. Just to let you know: some of the books that we are studying. I mentioned a couple of them, but I want to mention them again so that you will realize that a lot of the things that we are covering have been published within the last ten years; some of them going back to 1990. Carl Franklin has been in the forefront of finding these books for us.

Let me give you a little background on how we came to the knowledge of these books. When I finished writing the book *The Christian Passover*, it became very obvious that we covered everything up to the time of Jesus Christ. The question remained:

- What happened from the time of Jesus Christ through the destruction of the temple and on into the death of John, and then on into the second century?
- How did we get Judaism, as we have it today on the one hand, and the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church as we have it on the other hand?
- How could two such divergent things take place?

Because of that, we didn't realize what was going on that was taking place within the last 20 years and some books that were published which covers the very area that we need. However, when I was reading and studying *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* by Edershiem there were certain clues that I picked up on that we needed to look into and find out what was the historical background, and were there any books that could cover it, those in particular centered around Judaism and Hellenism and Egypt—in particular Alexandria and Judaism.

Also, we're covering the area that was Palestinian Judaism, which we will see is commonly called 'Eastern Judaism,' while Alexandria Judaism and Hellenistic Judaism is called 'Western Judaism.' However, we need to understand that all during that time, Hebrew was not—nor was Aramaic—the predominate language used in the Holy Land and in the area of the Roman Empire. It was Greek! We

have a book here that documents the Bar Kochva Period in the cave leaflets Greek Papyri. This was published in 1989, which shows absolutely conclusively that Koine Greek was used as the common language, or what is called the lingua-franca or the language of the people.

In addition to that, Carl Franklin has the blessing of living close to the James White Library at Andrew's University and he was able to get many good books that give us the time period of what we are looking for. Twenty years ago we wouldn't have been able to cover it. What we're really doing in this, we are coming to understand how the Church came to be Catholic and the Jews came to be totally Pharisaical and the Eastern Judaism as we know it today.

Books for reference:

- *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, by Aryeh Kasher—a Jewish publication.
- *Christianity and Judaism—Two Covenants* by Yehezkel Kaufmann.
- written by a Jew: *Kabbalah and It's Symbolism* by Gershom G. Scholem—giving us the understanding of Judaism.

There are two branches of Judaism: Hellenistic Judaism and Babylonian Judaism, the Western and the Eastern forms of Judaism.

- *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity (Studies in Antiquity & Christianity)* by Birger A. Pearson. That's going to be a very eye-opening book and we'll get to it in subsequent sermons and reading.
- studies of Antiquity and Christianity entitled *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* by Birger A. Pearson.
- *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* by John G. Gager.
- *The Jewish Historical Atlas*, which then gives us many, many things concerning a summary of the history of Judaism all the way down to the present day.

We're going to be very thorough in what we're doing. We're going to cover everything in the way that it needs to be covered, and we're going to find out that it's absolutely essential for us to realize that true **Christianity never had any foundational beginnings with Judaism**. It is apparent in the Scriptures that the separation began immediately beginning with John the Baptist. All the teachings

that we are learning in the New Testament are in a situation where that those who come into the Church who are in Judaism must come out of Judaism. They must strip away all the traditionalism that they have. As a matter of fact, that's why Jesus, in bringing out very clearly that He wasn't setting aside any of the Law or any of the Prophets, but He was certainly setting aside all of the *traditionalism* of the Jews.

Let me begin reading from: *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Many people have read it. It has been a classic down through the time-period. It was first published in September 1883. Then there are subsequent 2nd and 3rd editions. In here are some very important things, and we're going to see some very interesting statements that he makes. I'll read through some certain, select sections I have highlighted which will be important for our study. I want this to be thorough and on-going. I realize that there are a lot of you who cannot get this book. It's well over 1300 pages; it's really quite a work! But he gives us certain clues here and we're going to see in particularly an admission that he makes, which in some ways is a little disturbing, but in other ways is very revealing.

from: *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* by Alfred Edersheim
(christianbookshelf.org/edersheim/the_life_and_times_of_jesus_the_messiah/)

Preface (from 1st edition):

It is indeed most true that Christ spoke not only to the Jews, to Palestine and to that time, but of which history has given the evidence to all men to all times. We shall perceive that their form is wholly of the times that are caste Jewish, while by the sight of this similarity of the form, there is not only essential differences, but absolute contrariety of substance and spirit.... [between Judaism and Scripturalism] ...Jesus spoke as truly a Jew to the Jews, but He spoke not as they spoke. No, not as their highest and best teachers would have spoken. This contrariety of spirit with manifest similarity of form is in my mind one of the strongest evidences of the claims of Jesus, since it raises the all important question: From whence [where] the teacher of Nazareth?

In describing the traditionalism of the time of Christ, I must have said what I fear most unwittingly on my part would the feelings of some who still cling, if not to have faith of, yet, to what now represents the ancient synagogue.

In other words, he is politely saying, In a round about way, some of these things are going to hurt some of those who believe in *traditionalism*.

Yet, it is not this disclaimer of traditionalism, which not only explains the rejection of Jesus, but it is the sole logical reason of the synagogue; also, its condemnation.

We have a situation here where it shows that Judaism is really between a rock and a hard place with Jesus Christ and the facts of the New Testament and traditionalism.

The New Testament prophecies are not made to point to facts, but facts to point back to prophecies. The New Testament presents a fulfillment of all the prophecies rather than of prophecies, and individual predictions serve as fingerpost to the great outstanding facts which mark where the roads met and parted.

That is where Christianity and Judaism met and parted.

It leads up to this conclusion, that Jesus Christ was a likened to fundamental direction of His teaching and His work and its details antithetic to the synagogue... [going in totally opposite directions] ...in its doctrine, practice and expectancies.

In the 2nd & 3rd editions of this book he says in reference to elements, which weren't well received, regarding anti-Semitism:

Although I'm well convinced that a careful and impartial reader would not arrive at any such conclusion... [of anti-Semitism on his part] ...yet, it was suggested that a perverse ingenuity might have abused certain statements and quotations, for what in modern parlance or term anti-Semitic purposes.

He said that there wasn't any thought on his part of doing that. However, we are going to see a statement here that he's also very protective of the modern Pharisaical Judaism, which he also must protect himself from, and that he deliberately does not give us certain things.

In this next statement, he admits that he's holding back some of the information because it would cause too much difficulty for the people who would then openly see what Judaism really was about, and much of that we now have in these other books, which I mentioned, which is that we're going to see in fact Hellenistic Judaism out of Alexandria was the basis for what we know as the Catholic Church.

In truth, it has been my aim to present not one or another isolated statement or aspect

of rabbinism, but its general teaching and tendency. In doing so, I, however, purposely left aside certain passages which while they most fully brought out the sad and strange extravagances to which rabbinism would go, would have involved the unnecessary quotation of what is not only very painful in itself, but might have furnished an occasion to the enemies of Israel.

What he's saying, he did not translate certain portions of the Talmud to bring out some of the true feelings that the Jews have toward other religions.

...the Old Testament... [which is monotheistic] ...the strictest isolation was necessary... [of the Jews and their worship in the ancient world] ...in order to preserve the religion of the Old Testament from that mixture of foreign elements which would speedily have proved fatal to its existence....

...civilization would necessarily influence them to render the continuance of their separation of a great importance as before. In this respect, even traditionalism had its mission and its use as a hedge around the law to render its infringement or modification impossible.

What actually happened was it destroyed the Truth of the laws and commandments of God by all of the *traditions* that they had.

Then he gives a little of the history of the Maccabees; a little background concerning Hebrew and Greek. He gives background concerning the preeminence of the Babylonians. Let's read just a little bit here concerning the eastern and the western branches of the Jews. Edershiem tells the difference between the eastern Jews of the Diaspora and the western Jews being the Hellenists.

But the difference between the Grecians and the Hebrews was far deeper than merely of language, and extended to the whole direction of thought. There were mental influences at work in the Greek world from which, in the nature of things, it was impossible even for Jews to withdraw themselves, and which, indeed, were as necessary for the fulfillment of their mission as their isolation from heathenism, and their connection with Jerusalem.

At the same time it was only natural that the Hellenists, placed as they were in the midst of such hostile elements, should intensely wish to be Jews, equal to their Eastern brethren. On the other hand,

Pharisaism, in its pride of legal purity and of the possession of traditional lore, with all that it involved, made no secret of its contempt for the Hellenists, and openly declared the Grecian far inferior to the Babylonian dispersion. That such feelings, and the suspicions which they engendered, had struck deep into the popular mind, appears from the fact, that even in the Apostolic Church, and that in her earliest days, disputes could break out between the Hellenists and the Hebrews, arising from suspicion of unkind and unfair dealings grounded on these sectional prejudices.

We need to understand that he is also siding with the eastern Pharisaical Judaism, which survives down to this day as Judaism, and that he upholds Babylonian schools as being better, and he also lays at the feet of the Hellenists certain difficulties and problems that the Jews had.

Let's continue in understanding about Jewish writings and how they affect everything that they do, and then we will understand also what their writings do, how their traditions came about and what affect it had. In addition to the different commentaries and the things that they did after Ezra, concerning the commentaries and Scriptures:

From the outset, Jewish theology divided into two branches: the Halakhah and the Haggadah. The former (from halakhah, to go) was, so to speak, the Rule of the Spiritual Road, and, when fixed, had even greater authority than the Scriptures of the Old Testament...

It is very key to remember and understand in this whole thing concerning Scripturalism and Judaism, is that they held that *their traditions* were of greater importance than the Scriptures. That's why when Jesus came and said 'Don't think I'm going to destroy the Law or the Prophets,' He was showing that he was going to strip away all of this 'Halakhah' and the 'Haggadah' away from the Scriptures of God.

...and, when fixed, had even greater authority than the Scriptures of the Old Testament, since it explained and applied them. On the other hand, the Haggadah (from nagad, to tell) was only the personal saying of the teacher, more or less valuable according to his learning and popularity, or the authorities, which he could quote in his support.

Now, remember when Jesus gave the Sermon on the Mount, that He spoke with authority and not as the scribes, because the scribes always use to quote someone else as their authority.

Unlike the Halakhah, the Haggadah had no absolute authority, either as to doctrine practice, or exegesis. But all the greater would be its popular influence, and all the more dangerous the doctrinal license which it allowed.

What he's saying is that this kind of teaching allowed the *traditions* to take over and supersede the Scriptures.

In fact, strange as it may sound, almost all doctrinal teachings of the Synagogue is to be derived from the Haggadah.

Which means that *the sayings of the teacher* rather than out of Scripture. He's admitting in a very round about way that Judaism does not follow Scripture.

...and this is also characteristic of Jewish traditionalism. But, alike in Halakhah and Haggadah, Palestine was under the deepest obligation to Babylonia....

...even they had to acknowledge that, when the Law had fallen into oblivion, it was restored by Ezra of Babylon; when it was a second time forgotten, Hillel the Babylonian came and recovered it; and when yet a third time it fell into oblivion, Rabbi Chija came from Babylon and gave it back once more.

What he's doing is he's showing how what we know as eastern Pharisaism and what is commonly known as Judaism today came about with the influence from Babylon. So, it is indeed one of the 'daughter's of Babylon.'

For it is one of those strangely significant, almost symbolical, facts in history, that after the destruction of Jerusalem the spiritual supremacy of Palestine passed to Babylonia, and that Rabbinical Judaism, under the stress of political adversity, voluntarily transferred itself to the seats of Israel's ancient dispersion, as if to ratify by its own act what the judgment of God had formerly executed.

Chapter 2: Edershiem explains western Judaism:

When we turn from the Jewish dispersion in the East to that in the West, we seem to breathe quite a different atmosphere. Despite their intense nationalism, all unconsciously to themselves, their mental characteristics and tendencies were in the opposite direction from those of their brethren.... [those in the East] ...With those of the East rested the future of Judaism; with them of the West, in a

sense, that of the world. The one represented old Israel, stretching forth its hands to where the dawn of a new day was about to break. These Jews of the West are known by the term Hellenists—from *hellenizein*, to conform to the language and manners of the Greeks.

Whatever their religious and social isolation, it was, in the nature of thing, impossible that the Jewish communities in the West should remain unaffected by Grecian culture and modes of thought; just as, on the other hand, the Greek world, despite popular hatred and the contempt of the higher classes, could not wholly withdraw itself from Jewish influences. Witness here the many converts to Judaism among the Gentiles; witness also the evident preparedness of the lands of this dispersion for the new doctrine [Christianity] which was to come from Judea.

Many causes contributed to render the Jews of the West accessible to Greek influences. They had not a long local history to look back upon, nor did they form a compact body, like their brethren in the East. They were craftsmen, traders, merchants, settled for a time here or there—units might combine into communities, but could not form one people. Then their position was not favorable to the sway of traditionalism. Their occupations, the very reasons for their being in a strange land, were purely secular. That lofty absorption of thought and life in the study of the Law, written and oral, which characterized the East, was to the, something in the dim distance, sacred, like the soil and the institutions of Palestine, but unattainable.

In Palestine or Babylonia numberless influences from his earliest years, all that he saw and heard, the very force of circumstances, would tend to make an earnest Jew a disciple of the Rabbis; in the West it would lead him to Hellenize. It was, so to speak, in the air; and he could no more shut his mind against Greek thought than he could withdraw his body from atmospheric influences. That restless, searching, subtle Greek intellect would penetrate everywhere, and flash its light into the innermost recesses of his home and Synagogue.

These were the Hellenistic Jews and the Hellenistic Jews then were the basis for the New Testament

church and also the basis from which the Catholic Church was derived.

Such undoubtedly was the case. And yet, when the Jew stepped out of the narrow circle which he had drawn around him... [that is in the confines of the synagogue] ...he was confronted on every side by Grecianism. It was in the forum, in the market, in the counting house, in the street; in all that he saw, and in all to whom he spoke. It was refined; it was elegant; it was profound; it was supremely attractive. He might resist, but he could not push it aside. Even in resisting, he had already yielded to it. For, once open the door to the questions which it brought, if it were only to expel, or repel them, he must give up that principle of simple authority on which traditionalism as a system rested.

Hellenic criticism could not so be silenced, nor its searching light be extinguished by the breath of a Rabbi. If he attempted this, the truth would not only be worsted before its enemies, but suffer detriment in his own eyes. He must meet argument with argument, and that not only for those who were without, but in order to be himself quite sure of what he believed. He must be able to hold it, not only in controversy with others, where pride might bid him stand fast, but in that much more serious contest within, where a man meets the old adversary alone in the secret arena of his own mind, and has to sustain that terrible hand-to-hand fight, in which he is uncheered by outward help.

In other words, he is saying very clearly that Hellenism and the Hellenistic world just penetrated deeply into the whole Jewish community and individual mind. The Hellenists, as a result of all of this, would seek to conciliate the truths of Divine revelation with those others, which he thought he recognized in Hellenism. In other words, those things which he saw in other pagan religions and philosophies he's sought to reconcile with the Old Testament.

On the other hand, there was the intellectual view of the Scriptures—their philosophical understanding, the application to them of the results of Grecian thought and criticism

And this is what was particularly Hellenistic.

What was Jewish, Palestinian, individual, concrete in the Scriptures, was only the outside—true in itself, but not the truth. There were depths beneath.

Then he talks about the stripping away of all of these things to see that there are deeper truths in the Bible.

But this deep symbolism was Pythagorean; this pre-existence of ideas which were the types of all outward actuality, was Platonism!

What he's saying here is that the Jewish Hellenistic philosophy—which they developed themselves in western Judaism—was actually based upon the philosophies of Plato. We can't possibly understand the references to philosophies of Paul unless we understand the philosophical Judaism of Hellenistic Jews. Then he talks about the philosophies of the Greeks and some of the truths that they had. Even Paul agrees to some of the things there and God revealed it to them as he says in Rom. 1: 'these grains of truth'—which the philosophers were able to have—'broken rays of light.'

Broken rays in them, but the focus of truth in the Scriptures. Yet these were rays, and could only have come from the Sun. All truth was of God; hence theirs must have been of that origin. Then were the sages of the heathen also in a sense God-taught - and God-teaching, or inspiration, was rather a question of degree than of kind!

So, what happened in this, the Scriptures of the Old Testament became very Hellenized and very Grecianized from the point of view that the Greek philosophy was now intervening and insomuch so that we have the Greek Old Testament. This was a very powerful thing which was happening.

One step only remained; and that, as we imagine, if not the easiest, yet, as we reflect upon it, that which in practice would be most readily taken. It was simply to advance towards Grecianism; frankly to recognize truth in the results of Greek thought.

Then he explains quite a bit how this affected the Jews.

There was the mighty spell which Greek philosophy exercised on all kindred minds, and the special adaptation of the Jewish intellect to such subtle, if not deep, thinking. And, in general, and more powerful than the rest, because penetrating everywhere, was the charm of Greek literature, with its brilliancy; of Greek civilization and culture, with their polish and attractiveness; and of what, in one word, we may call the time-spirit, that tyrannous...

Tyrannus is the personification of the oppressiveness of the whole Greek thought, Greek civilization, Greek literature, Greek language. It's just like

someone who was a tyrant—that's why it's called 'Tyrannus.'

...who rules all in their thinking, speaking, doing, whether they list or not. Why, his sway extended even to Palestine itself, and was felt in the innermost circle of the most exclusive Rabbinism.

Then he talks about how that even Gamaliel II, a great Jewish patriarch—and that's the one whom Paul had learned as he mentions in the book of Acts—also studied Greek philosophy, spoke Greek. That's why it's an impossibility to say that Paul originally wrote everything in Aramaic, which some people like to say that it is so. But it isn't! It's very obvious from the historical facts that we are covering.

The Edershiem talks about the influence of Greek literature, even on those in Palestine; even working it's way into what is called the 'Mishnah' and referred preeminently if not exclusively to the religious or semi-religious Jewish Hellenistic literature. So, Jews were writing in Hellenistic Greek, outside even the apocrypha. We need to understand that most of what are called the pseudepigraphica writings—that is those apocrypha writings that are contained in the Greek Old Testament or the Septuagint—were written in Greek.

But its occurrence proves, at any rate, that the Hellenists were credited with the study of Greek literature, and that through them, if not more directly, the Palestinians had become acquainted with it.

In fact, the truth is that Palestine was totally Hellenized. Then he continues talking about this Hellenization of Palestine.

Its importance, not only to the Hellenists but to the world at large, can scarcely be over-estimated. First and foremost, we have here the Greek translation of the Old Testament, venerable not only as the oldest, but as that which at the time of Jesus held the place of our Authorized Version, and as such is so often, although freely, quoted, in the New Testament.

In other words, he's saying that the Septuagint was quoted in the New Testament.

Nor need we wonder that it should have been the people's Bible, not merely among the Hellenists, but in Galilee, and even in Judea.... But most, if not all - at least in towns—would understand the Greek version; it might be quoted in intercourse with Hellenist brethren or with the Gentiles; and, what was perhaps equally, if not more important, it was the most readily procurable.

So, he's just saying that the Greek version of the Old Testament—which by the way was probably far more pure in its reliability in its translation than any Septuagint that we have today. I just call your attention, if you don't know anything about the Septuagint, please read the preface in the introduction to it and you will see that the version that we have today has been corrupted substantially so great portions of it are not reliable for dogmatic doctrine.

Then he shows how that the Greek Old Testament was reproduced with hundreds of slaves who were engaged in copying what one dictated.

The result was not only the publication of as large editions as in our days, but their production at only about double the cost of what are now known as cheap or people's editions. Probably it would be safe to compute, that as much matter as would cover sixteen pages of small print might, in such cases, be sold at the rate of about sixpence, and in that ratio. Accordingly, manuscripts in Greek or Latin, although often incorrect, must have been easily attainable, and this would have considerable influence on making the Greek version of the Old Testament the people's Bible.

The Greek version... [the Old Testament] ... like the Targum of the Palestinians, originated, no doubt, in the first place, in a felt national want on the part of the Hellenists, who as a body were ignorant of Hebrew. Hence we find notices of very early Greek versions of at least parts of the Pentateuch. But this, of course, could not suffice. On the other hand, there existed, as we may suppose, a natural curiosity on the part of students, especially in Alexandria, which had so large a Jewish population, to know the sacred books on which the religion and history of Israel were founded.

This is then giving the background as to why the Septuagint originated and the need for it. Basically, it would be like today if everyone in America was speaking English and the only Bible they had available to them was in German, naturally it would be translated into English so we could understand it. In the same way, since Greek was so widely understood and read by everyone, the Old Testament was translated into Greek. Then we have the addition of the apocrypha books that were also written in Greek.

He talks a little bit about Alexandria, and we'll cover considerably more about Alexandria,

because that is the key in understanding all of the difficulties and problems that we have in the foundation of the Catholic Church.

In such manner then the LXX [Septuagint] version became really the people's Bible to that large Jewish world through which Christianity was afterward to address itself to mankind. It was part of the case, that this translation should be regarded by the Hellenists... [Hellenistic Jews] ...as inspired like the original. Otherwise, it would have been impossible to make the final appeal to very words of Greek, still less, to find in them the mystical and allegorical meaning.

Only that we must not regard their use of inspiration—except as applying to Moses, and even there only partially—as identical with ours. To their minds inspiration differed quantitatively, not qualitatively, from what the rapt soul might at anytime experience, so that even heathen philosophers might ultimately be regarded as at times inspired.

What is really being said here is this gives them license to go into the philosophies of the Greeks to understand some of the things that they considered inspired Truth that the pagan philosophers had. This then is the whole background which leads up to much of the apocryphal or pseudepigraphica writings. And also as we will see later, leads much into the Jewish Gnosticism which caused so much problem with the New Testament Church.

At any rate, we know that the Greek Scriptures were authoritatively acknowledged in Palestine, and that the ordinary daily prayers might be said in Greek. The LXX [Septuagint] deserved this distinction from its general faithfulness—at least, in regard to the Pentateuch—and from its preservation of ancient doctrine.

The Septuagint was translated in a about 270_{B.C.} So, we see that this influence was over a long period of time and when we put it in perspective of today's historical setting, we're looking at 300 years. Just take it back to 1693 as far as we are concerned with the beginning of what is called Hellenism.

Chapter 3: The translation of the Old Testament into Greek may be regarded as the starting-point of Hellenism. It rendered possible the hope that what in its original form had been confined to the few, might become accessible to the world at large.

Then Edershiem talks about apocryphal literature that was always, for the most part, written in Greek. All of it was written in Greek with the exception of 1-Maccabees, Judas and part of Baruch. But everything else was written in Greek and it was a product of Hellenizing Jews. One of the things that it did beyond some of these apocryphal writings was to go beyond and show what the next object was.

But the next object was to show that the deeper and purer thinking of heathenism in its highest philosophy supported—nay, in some respects, was identical with—the fundamental teaching of the Old Testament. This, of course, was apologetic of the Old Testament, but it also prepared the way for a reconciliation with Greek philosophy.

Then he shows exactly how many of these things came through the so-called apocryphal writings of the fourth book of Maccabees, the so-called book of wisdom, which was considered the revelation of God—written in Greek—but it was given to a Jew who wrote, supposedly. Then it shows how they blended together plutonic or the philosophy of Plato with the other things of the Stoics.

But the brilliancy of Plato's speculations would charm, while the stern self-abnegation of Stoicism would prove almost equally attractive. The one would show why they believed, the other why they lived, as they did. Thus the theology of the Old Testament would find a rational basis in the ontology of Plato, and its ethics in the moral philosophy of the Stoics.

What we have today is that coming right on down through even the Babylonians into what is called Pharisaism today; this very Stoical kind of beat the flesh type of religion.

Then Edershiem goes into quite a lengthy discussion of the pseudepigraphica literature, showing how all the philosophies of the pagans were the blended into the thinking of the Hellenistic Jews, which then all came to be brought together as a complete system in the work of Philo. Philo is really quite a noted Jewish philosopher who lived on into the time of Jesus Christ. Many of his things are very important for us to understand in realizing all of the problems and difficulties associated with Alexandria in Judaism or Hellenistic Judaism.

Philo was the one who brought all of this together, and he was the one to bring together the heathen philosophy and the faith of the Jews and to make it all one! Then he was the one who went back and allegorized with the interpretation the things concerning the Bible, and according to Hellenized

Grecianism what it meant. He gives quite a long dissertation of everything of the Jewish thought of Philo and how that worked into all of the teaching that actually caused Western Judaism to be wholly and absolutely separate and different from the Babylonian Eastern Judaism.

Philo had no successor. In him Hellenism had completed its cycle. Its message and its mission were ended. Henceforth it needed, like Apollos, its great representative in the Christian Church, two things: the baptism of John to the knowledge of sin and need, and to have the way of God more perfectly expounded. On the other hand, Eastern Judaism had entered with Hillel on a new stage. This direction led farther and farther away from that which the New Testament had taken in following up and unfolding the spiritual elements of the Old. That development was incapable of transformation or renovation. It must go on to its final completion, and be either true, or else be swept away and destroyed.

So, he's showing the great conflict that there was. There was Western Judaism with Hellenism—with the Septuagint version of the Bible, had great influence into Palestine, into Jerusalem, into the inner circles of rabbinism.

(go to the next track)

Chapter 5: Edershiem gives a history and a background of Alexandria and the Jewish communities and the capital of Egypt in Alexandria and the capital of the Roman Empire in Rome, which then were the central things for Jewish Hellenism. It's also important for us to understand the great community that was there in Alexandria. They had a great synagogue/cathedral and it says of this that they had an eldership of a Sanhedrin of Alexandria on the model of the Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem.

It is a strange, almost inexplicable fact, that the Egyptian Jews had actually built a schismatic Temple.

So, there was a temple in Egypt that the Jews had their own priesthood that they officiated at.

During the terrible Syrian persecutions in Palestine Onias, the son of the murdered High-Priest Onias III., had sought safety in Egypt. Ptolemy Philometor not only received him kindly, but gave a disused heathen temple in the town of Leontopolis for a Jewish sanctuary. Here a new Aaronic priesthood ministered, their support being derived from the revenues of the district around. The new Temple,

however, resembled not that of Jerusalem either in outward appearance nor in all its internal fittings. At first the Egyptian Jews were very proud of their new sanctuary, and professed to see in it the fulfillment of the prediction, that five cities in the land of Egypt should speak the language of Canaan, of which one was to be called Ir-ha-Heres, which the LXX [Septuagint]. (in their original form, or by some later emendation) altered into the city of righteousness. This temple continued from about 160 B.C. to shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem.

This has a great bearing on what happened to the New Testament Church, because here was a renegade priesthood. Here was one where they declared that they were fulfilling Scripture. And also of the Scripture in Isaiah which says, 'out of Egypt shall My Son come.' This Onias wanted to fulfill that. When we understand that this occurred just right after the desecration of the temple in Jerusalem; it really is profound! They didn't offer animal sacrifices there, but they offered incense and wine and meal offerings on a daily basis. We will see that this was actually a foundational beginning of what is known in the Catholic Church today as *the Eucharist*—or the substitute for what we call *the Passover*.

This temple continued from about 160 B.C. to shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem. It could scarcely be called a rival to that on Mount Moriah, since the Egyptian Jews also owned that of Jerusalem as their central sanctuary, to which they made pilgrimages and brought their contributions, while the priests at Leontopolis, before marrying, always consulted the official archives in Jerusalem to ascertain the purity of descent of their intended wives.

The Palestinians designated it contemptuously as the house of Chonyi (Onias), and declared the priesthood of Leontopolis incapable of serving in Jerusalem, although on a par with those who were disqualified only by some bodily defect. Offerings brought in Leontopolis were considered null, unless in the case of vows to which the name of this Temple had been expressly attached. This qualified condemnation seems, however, strangely mild, except on the supposition that the statements we have quoted only date from a time when both Temples had long passed away.

Nor were such feelings unreasonable. The Egyptian Jews had spread on all sides—southward to Abyssinia and Ethiopia, and westward to, and beyond, the province of Cyrene.

What he's showing here is the whole tremendous affect of what this temple in Egypt had on Hellenizing Judaism and also on the setup of the synagogues, the way that the high priest at Leontopolis was regarded by the Jews in Egypt.

Also they had some important things happening with the temple at Jerusalem, because much of the money that came to support it came from Egypt. So, they couldn't renounce and denounce the temple at Leontopolis completely, because they were getting money for the temple at Jerusalem from the Jews in Egypt.

The Temple at Jerusalem bore evidence of the wealth and munificence of this Jewish millionaire.... [Antonia] ...The gold and silver with which the nine massive gates were covered, which led into the Temple, were the gift of the great Alexandrian banker.

Here we have set up a Judaism which was based on Greek philosophy combined with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, with the temple at Leontopolis, with its own Jewish priesthood—which did not necessarily follow the things that they did at the temple in Jerusalem. This was really quite an event. This is something that Eastern Judaism does not like to tell us; and of which all of these books of Gnosticism are based upon what happened there, and how was it that we came to have the Catholic Church as we have it today.

We need to cover a couple of other things concerning the Jewish community in another very important city called Antioch. As you know, Antioch was a place where we had the greatest number of Gentile converts. As a matter of fact, that is the first place that it is noted that Christians were called *Christians*.

Just to project a little ahead of some of the things that we're going to cover down the road while we're covering Edershiem. I want to get into what he says here concerning Antioch and concerning the Jews at Antioch and some of the things which may tie in to the problems that the Christian Church had from the circumcision party within the Church and those who supposedly came down from Jerusalem and we find the confrontation between Paul and Peter in Gal. 2. But I want to cover just a little bit here concerning Antioch, which was the capital of Assyria.

Chapter 6: The connection between Jerusalem and Antioch was very close. All that occurred in that city was eagerly watched in the Jewish capital. The spread of Christianity there must have excited deep concern. Careful as the Talmud is not to afford unwelcome information, which might have led to further mischief...

That's a nice way of saying of showing the problems that Christianity was causing Judaism.

...we know that three of the principal Rabbis went thither... [to Antioch] ...on a mission—we can scarcely doubt for the purpose of arresting the progress of Christianity.

We may find a connection here between rabbinism and trying to bring circumcision and ritualism upon the Church through that form of Pharisaism. This probably very deeply affected Peter, because that was no small, little problem that was involved in Gal. 2. I wanted to mention that here because that follows right along in some of the things I'm reading out of Edershiem. I realize that some of this is pretty heavy reading and it's written in a very awkward form, so some of the reading is very difficult even for me.

Again, we find at a later period a record of religious controversy in Antioch between Rabbis and Christians. Yet the Jews of Antioch were strictly Hellenistic, and on one occasion a great Rabbi was unable to find among them a copy of even the Book of Esther in Hebrew...

This shows the things that they had. There was also a large synagogue there. We have some really difficult problems to deal with in understanding what was happening in the early New Testament Church.

- What was happening within Judaism?
- Why was it that Jesus stayed mostly in Galilee and did not come to Jerusalem but to visit it?
- Why do we have all of this influence of the Greeks, the Greek Old Testament, the whole thing concerning the New Testament Church?
- Why was this great controversy?
- Why is that Pharisaism today basically formed out of the remnants of Eastern Judaism do not tell us very much, little if anything, concerning Western Judaism and all the affects that it had?

These are some of the questions that we are going to cover.

As we have seen previously, when Ezra came back out of Babylon and canonized the Scriptures, set up the synagogue system and set up the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogue, and with the various instructions for that, which later became to be known as *tradition*. Those were essentially good rules on how to keep people involved in the Scriptures.

However, because of the apostatizing Jews and because of getting more and more into heathenism—especially getting more and more into Grecianism as it were—and actually beginning to lose track of their Jewishness—even Greek-speaking Jews had to take a firm stand against all of the idolatry, against all of the Grecianism, against all the heathenism that came about. So, now we have the beginning of all of the *traditions* then which separated the Jews from the Gentiles. Here's part of what Edershiem says about this:

Chapter 7: his abhorrence of all connected with idolatry, and the contempt entertained for all that was non-Jewish, will in great measure explain the code of legislation intended to keep the Jew and Gentile apart.

To begin with, every Gentile child, so soon as born, was to be regarded as unclean.

This is the basis for a lot of the clean and unclean laws that have nothing to do with clean and unclean meats, or health and sanitary things as concerned in the Old Testament. This had a great bearing on trying to bring the New Testament Church out of Judaism. Notice this attitude that as soon as it was born it was regarded as *unclean*.

Those who actually worshipped mountains, hills, bushes—in short, gross idolaters—should be cut down with the sword.

We are going to see tremendous and gross discrimination that the Jews had against anyone and anything which was not accepted by them and their most stringent rules and regulations. This is something to say that they should be *cut down with the sword*. However, with the Jews living in the area:

It was impossible to exterminate heathenism, Rabbinic legislation kept certain definite objects in view, which may be thus summarized: To prevent Jews from being inadvertently led into idolatry; to avoid all participation in idolatry; not to do anything which might aid the heathen in their worship; and, beyond all this, not to give pleasure, nor even help, to

heathens. The latter involved a most dangerous principle, capable of almost indefinite application by fanaticism. Even the Mishnah goes so far as to forbid aid to a mother in the hour of her need, or nourishment to her babe, in order not to bring up a child for idolatry! But this is not all.

Heathens were, indeed, not to be precipitated into danger, but yet not to be delivered from it. Indeed, an isolated teacher ventures even upon this statement: The best among the Gentiles, kill; the best among serpents, crush its head. Still more terrible was the fanaticism which directed, that heretics, traitors, and those who had left the Jewish faith should be thrown into actual danger, and, if they were in it, all means for their escape removed. No intercourse of any kind was to be had with such—not even to invoke their medical aid in case of danger to life, since it was deemed, that he who had to do with heretics was imminent peril of becoming one himself, and that, if a heretic returned to the true faith, he should die at once—partly, probably, to expiate his guilt, and partly from fear of relapse.

Terrible as all this sounds, it was probably not worse than the fanaticism displayed in what are called more enlightened times. Impartial history must chronicle it, however painful, to show the circumstances in which teaching so far different was propounded by Christ.

In other words, what Jesus taught was so different it was diametrically opposite of what Judaism was preaching. I just want to bring out something here very clearly: Notice the attitude here that was taken toward all people in the New Testament Church; had to bring the Church out of this kind of thinking. Remember when Peter told Cornelius, 'You know that it is an unlawful thing for a man who is a Jew to come unto one of who is a Gentile, or to have company with him, or to eat with him.'

Yes, *these things did affect the Church!* This is what the Church came out of! So, for people to say that Christianity was built on Judaism is an absolute and total error. It *came out of Judaism*. It came out of this behavior. *It came out of these circumstances.*

Edershiem, in this chapter, talks about many of the different things that the Jews did to avoid, to segregate, to discriminate, to alienate, to completely separate themselves from even the presence, the look, the sound, the smell, the company of Jews with Gentiles.

In truth, the bitter hatred which the Jew bore to the Gentile can only be explained from the estimate entertained of his character.

That is what the Jew thought of the Gentile.

The most vile, and even unnatural, crimes were imputed to them. It was not safe to leave cattle in their charge, to allow their women to nurse infants, or their physicians to attend the sick, nor to walk in their company, without taking precautions against sudden and unprovoked attacks. They should, so far as possible, be altogether avoided, except in cases of necessity or for the sake of business. They and theirs were defiled; their houses unclean, as containing idols or things dedicated to them; their feasts, their joyous occasions, their very contact, was polluted by idolatry; and there was no security, if a heathen were left alone in a room, that he might not, in wantonness or by carelessness, defile the wine or meat on the table, or the oil and wheat in the store.

Under such circumstances, therefore, everything must be regarded as having been rendered unclean. Three days before a heathen festival (according to some, also three days after) every business transaction with them was prohibited, for fear of giving either help or pleasure. Jews were to avoid passing through a city where there was an idolatrous feast—nay, they were not even to sit down within the shadow of a tree dedicated to idol-worship. Its wood was polluted; if used in baking, the bread was unclean; if a shuttle had been made of it, not only was all cloth woven on it forbidden, but if such had been inadvertently mixed with other pieces of cloth, or a garment made from it placed with other garments, the whole became unclean.

Jewish workmen were not to assist in building basilicas, nor stadia, nor places where judicial sentences were pronounced by the heathen. Of course, it was not lawful to let [lease] houses or fields, nor to sell cattle to them. Milk drawn by a heathen, if a Jew had not been present to watch it, bread and oil prepared by them, were unlawful. Their wine was wholly interdicted—the mere touch of a heathen polluted a whole cask; nay, even to put one's nose to heathen wine was strictly prohibited!

Painful as these details are, they might be multiplied. And yet the bigotry of these Rabbis was, perhaps, not worse than that of other sectaries.... [Other sectarian groups] ...It was a painful logical necessity of their system, against which their heart, no doubt, often rebelled; and, it must be truthfully added, it was in measure accounted for by the terrible history of Israel [the Jews].

When we get into some of the *Code of Jewish Law* you're going to see that what he brought out here is really very mild. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of laws and they're mind-boggling.

During the time leading up to the time of Antiochus Epiphanies, which Edershiem calls

...the period of severe domestic troubles, beginning with the persecutions under the Seleucidæ, which marked the mortal struggle between Judaism and Grecianism, the Great Assembly had disappeared from the scene. The Sopherim had ceased to be a party in power. They had become the Zeqenim, Elders, whose task was purely ecclesiastical—the preservation of their religion, such as the dogmatic labors of their predecessors had made it. Yet another period opened with the advent of the Maccabees. These had been raised into power by the enthusiasm of the Chasidim, or pious ones,' who formed the nationalist party in the land, and who had gathered around the liberators of their faith and country.

But the later bearing of the Maccabees had alienated the nationalists. Henceforth they sink out of view, or, rather, the extreme section of them merged in the extreme section of the Pharisees, till fresh national calamities awakened a new nationalist party. Instead of the Chasidim, we see now two religious parties within the Synagogue—the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

We'll have quite a bit more to say about the Pharisees and the Sadducees, because the Pharisees conformed those who wanted to be priest-like but were not priests. The Sadducees were, in fact, of the high priest family. However, many of the high priests were very Hellenized, so you've got this almost incongruous setup. The only thing they would recognize would be just the Scriptures.

The Pharisees, on the other hand, wanted to try and take over and dictate all of the powers and rituals that the Sadducees would do, because they considered Sadducees unfit. This struggle went back and forth, and finally in about 5 or 6_{B.C.} most of the

Pharisees were killed. When we come down to the time of Jesus Christ, the Pharisees had gained some of their power back, but we will see when we read in Jeremias that they didn't have the power which they now ascribe to themselves, and in particular Josephus claimed to have had over the Sadducees was really not true and did not exist. This has a great bearing on how we count Pentecost.

Then Edershiem gives a little history leading up to what is called the Sanhedrin. This is what he says of the Sanhedrin:

The power of the Sanhedrin would, of course, vary with political circumstances, being at times almost absolute, as in the reign of the Pharisaic devotee-Queen, Alexandra, while at others it was shorn of all but ecclesiastical authority.

Then Edershiem shows clearly that the Sanhedrin was in full-force at the time of Jesus.

After this brief outline of the origin and development of an institution which exerted such decisive influence on the future of Israel, it seems necessary similarly to trace the growth of the traditions of the Elders, so as to understand what, alas! so effectually, opposed the new doctrine of the Kingdom. The first place must here be assigned to those legal determinations, which traditionalism declared absolutely binding on all—not only of equal, but even greater obligation than Scripture itself. And this not illogically, since tradition was equally of Divine origin with Holy Scripture, and authoritatively explained its meaning; supplemented it...

There we have how they looked upon their traditions. Then it brings out again concerning the Halakhah and concerning the Halakhoth.

These Halakhoth were either simply the laws laid down in Scripture; or else derived from, or traced to it by some ingenious and artificial method of exegesis; or added to it, by way of amplification and for safety's sake; or, finally, legalized customs. They provided for every possible and impossible case, entered into every detail of private, family, and public life; and with iron logic, unbending rigor, and most minute analysis pursued and dominated man, turn whither he might, laying on him a yoke which was truly unbearable.

In describing the historical growth of the Halakhah, we may dismiss in a few sentences the legends of Jewish tradition about patriarchal times. They assure us,

that there was an Academy and a Rabbinic tribunal of Shem... [one of the sons of Noah] ...and they speak of traditions delivered by that Patriarch to Jacob; of diligent attendance by the latter on the Rabbinic College; of a tractate (in 400 sections) on idolatry by Abraham, and of his observance of the whole traditional law...

You go back to Genesis 26:5 and you will see that it doesn't define any of the commandments, laws or statutes that Abraham obeyed. And yet, the traditionalists go back and claim that it was everything that they had now come up with some many hundreds of years after Abraham. Here is how they talk about some of these things here:

...of the introduction of the three daily times of prayer, successively by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; of the three benedictions in the customary grace at meat, as propounded by Moses, Joshua, and David and Solomon; of the Mosaic introduction of the practice of reading lessons from the law on Sabbaths, New Moons, and Feast Days, and even on the Mondays and Thursdays... [which were the Pharisaic fast days] ...and of that, by the same authority, of preaching on the three great festivals about those feasts.

Further, they ascribe to Moses the arrangement of the priesthood into eight courses (that into sixteen to Samuel, and that into twenty-four to David), as also, the duration of the time for marriage festivities, and for mourning. But evidently these are vague statements, with the object of tracing traditionalism and its observances to primeval times, even as legend had it, that Adam was born circumcised, and later writers that he had kept all the ordinances.

But other principles apply to the traditions, from Moses downwards. According to the Jewish view, God had given Moses on Mount Sinai alike the oral and the written Law...

Most of what the traditionalism of Judaism is about is the so-called *oral law*, which then was supposed to have been passed down so that what they have today is authentically what God gave Moses on Mt. Sinai with the written law.

...that is, the Law with all its interpretations and applications. From Exodus 20:1, it was inferred, that God had communicated to Moses the Bible, the Mishnah, and Talmud, and the Haggadah,

even to that which scholars would in latest times propound.

In answer to the somewhat natural objection, why the Bible alone had been written, it was said that Moses had proposed to write down all the teaching entrusted to him, but the Almighty had refused, on account of the future subjection of Israel to the nations, who would take from them the written Law. Then the unwritten traditions would remain to separate between Israel and the Gentiles. Popular exegesis found this indicated even in the language of prophecy.

Well, there's no such thing in the Bible that shows any of that.

But traditionalism went further, and placed the oral actually above the written Law. The expression, After the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel, was explained as meaning, that God's covenant was founded on the spoken, in opposition to the written words. If the written was thus placed below the oral Law, we can scarcely wonder that the reading of the Hagiographa was actually prohibited to the people on the Sabbath...

The Holy writings are those called the Psalms.

...from fear that it might divert attention from the learned discourses of the Rabbis. The study of them on that day was only allowed for the purpose of learned investigation and discussions.

Then it talks about how the Law divided into three sections as it were:

The first of these comprises both such ordinances as are found in the Bible itself, and the so-called Halakhoth of Moses from Sinai—that is, such laws and usages as prevailed from time immemorial, and which, according to the Jewish view, had been orally delivered to, but not written down by Moses.... [you've got those extra things] ...For these, therefore, no proof was to be sought in Scripture...

In other words, if they proclaimed it an oral law; if it was a Halakhoth then you didn't need any proof. All you needed to say was that it was the oral law.

—at most support, or confirmatory allusion (*Asmakhtu*). Nor were these open to discussion. The second class formed the oral law [the Scriptures], or the traditional teaching in the stricter sense. To this class belonged all that was supposed to be implied in, or that could be deduced from, the Law of Moses. The latter contained,

indeed, in substance or germ, everything; but it had not been brought out, till circumstances successfully evolved what from the first had been provided in principle.

For this class of ordinances reference to, and proof from, Scripture was required. Not so for the third class of ordinances, which were the hedge drawn by the Rabbis around the Law, to prevent any breach of the Law or customs, to ensure their exact observance, or to meet peculiar circumstances and dangers. These ordinances constituted the sayings of the Scribes or of the Rabbis.

This body of traditional ordinances forms the subject of the Mishnah, or second, repeated law. We have here to place on one side the Law of Moses as recorded in the Pentateuch, as standing by itself. All else—even the teaching of the Prophets... [or the Holy Writings, Psalms] ...and of the Hagiographa, as well as the oral traditions—bore the general name of Qabbalah—that which has been received.

After explaining somewhat about the Talmud, the Babylonian Talmud and the Mishnah, then Edershiem makes this summary statement:

It is sadly characteristic, that, practically, the main body of Jewish dogmatic and moral theology is really only Haggadah, and hence of no absolute authority.

What he's really saying is that all of the traditions—which are the interpretations of various rabbis—have absolutely no authority whatsoever. Then he talks a little bit about the Halakhah, which are those things supposedly based on Scripture.

The Halakhah indicated with the most minute and painful punctiliousness every legal ordinance as to outward observances, and it explained every bearing of the Law of Moses.

What he is showing here is that even the laws and commandments of God were taken and just literally torn apart by all of this traditionalism, so that by time we come down to the time of Jesus, you've got very little left concerning Scriptures and the Laws of God, and therefore, we see and understand why Jesus chose those people who were from Galilee who were not infected with this hideous *Pharisaism* and *traditionalism* which was just based upon the opinions of people, rabbis, and so-called legal scholars who just laid these heavy burdens to be born upon the people as they gave their pronouncements.

Let's just finish a little bit more with Edershiem and then we'll be done with the summary of the things that he brought out. Also, this will help us in understanding some of the things that Joachim Jeremias writes. Edershiem says this of the New Testament compared to the rabbinical traditions, which he calls contrariety:

Rabbinism started with demand of outward obedience and righteousness, and pointed to sonship as its goal; the Gospel started with the free gift of forgiveness through faith and of sonship, and pointed to obedience and righteousness as its goal.

In truth, Rabbinism, as such, had no system of theology; only what ideas, conjectures, or fancies the Haggadah yielded concerning God, Angels, demons, man, his future destiny and present position, and Israel, with its past history and coming glory. Accordingly, by the side of what is noble and pure, what a terrible mass of utter incongruities, of conflicting statements and too often debasing superstitions, the outcome of ignorance and narrow nationalism; of legendary coloring of Biblical narratives and scenes, profane, coarse, and degrading to them; the Almighty Himself and His Angels taking part in the conversations of Rabbis, and the discussions of Academies; nay, forming a kind of heavenly Sanhedrin, which occasionally requires the aid of an earthly Rabbi.

The miraculous merges into the ridiculous, and even the revolting. Miraculous cures, miraculous supplies, miraculous help, all for the glory of great Rabbis, who by a look or word can kill, and restore to life. At their bidding the eyes of a rival fall out, and are again inserted. Nay, such was the veneration due to Rabbis, that R. Joshua used to kiss the stone on which R. Eliezer had sat and lectured, saying: This stone is like Mount Sinai, and he who sat on it like the Ark.

Modern ingenuity has, indeed, striven to suggest deeper symbolical meaning for such stories. It should own the terrible contrast existing side by side: Hebrewism and Judaism, the Old Testament and traditionalism; and it should recognize its deeper cause in the absence of that element of spiritual and inner life which Christ has brought. Thus as between the two—the old and the new—it may be fearlessly asserted that as regards their substance and spirit, there is not a difference, but a total

divergence, of fundamental principle between Rabbinism and the New Testament, so that comparison between them is not possible. Here there is absolute contrariety.

That's why I've said emphatically and dogmatically that *true Christianity*—Christian Christianity—never had anything to do with rabbinism; never had anything to do with Judaism. Therefore, when people come along and try and take Christianity back and put it back into the 'old wineskin' of traditionalism, it is not going to result in salvation.

The painful fact just referred to is only too clearly illustrated by the relation in which traditionalism places itself to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, even though it acknowledges their inspiration and authority. The Talmud has it, that he who busies himself with Scripture only (i.e. without either the Mishnah or Gemara) has merit, and yet no merit.

Even the comparative paucity of references to the Bible in the Mishnah is significant. Israel had made void the Law by its traditions. Under a load of outward ordinances and observances its spirit had been crushed. The religion as well as the grand hope of the Old Testament had become externalized. And so alike Heathenism and Judaism—for it was no longer the pure religion of the Old Testament—each following its own direction, had reached its goal. All was prepared and waiting.

Waiting for Christ to come and bring the Gospel of the New Testament. So, Edershiem does a pretty good job in what he brings out here, but I tell you it's really tough reading, and that's why very few people have read it. If you want to take the time, you have the time, get the book, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. There are many, many good things in it. There are some things which are most difficult, there are other things which are really not quite as factual as they ought to be. But it's well worthwhile to get, to read and to understand.

This will help you understand the great severity of how Judaism looked upon Jesus and the apostles and attempting to kill them and destroy everything they do. Sending out false apostles, false epistles, letters and all of these sorts of things, which we will cover later. Now you know why there existed such hostility between the Jewish religious leaders and Jesus Christ, and also the apostles and why later they did everything they could to destroy Christianity, to destroy the apostles. That's why God had to totally reject them and destroy Jerusalem and cast them out completely.

You know that *the big problem is that the same attitudes of the Jews are there to this very day!*

References: Books:

- *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* by Alfred Edersheim

Note: entire book can be found at:

(christianbookshelf.org/edersheim/the_life_and_times_of_jesus_the_messiah/)

- *Jerusalem in the Times of Jesus* by Joachim Jeremias
- *Code of Jewish Law* by Ganzfried and Goldin
- *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* by Aryeh Kasher
- *Christianity and Judaism—Two Covenants* by Yehezkel Kaufmann
- *Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* by Gershom G. Scholem
- *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity (Studies in Antiquity & Christianity)* by Birger A. Pearson
- *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* by Birger A. Pearson
- *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* by John G. Gager
- *The Jewish Historical Atlas*

FRC:bo:

Transcribed: 1-23-12