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ABSTRACT

It is the aim of this study to define the meaning and delineate the significance of the concept of righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew. In order to achieve this aim, it was necessary to incorporate an analysis of the concept of righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature. It is only against this background that the full significance of the Matthaean concept of righteousness is revealed.

Contrary to the opinion of numerous scholars, this study concludes that in the Gospel of Matthew, righteousness does not refer to the gift of God for man but rather to the demand of God upon man. Righteousness refers to right conduct, namely conduct based on an extremely meticulous interpretation of the law; an interpretation based on a hermeneutical principle reminiscent of the Rabbinic practice of making a fence around Torah.

This conclusion does not imply that Matthew advocates that salvation is attainable by man's own effort. In the Gospel of Matthew the concept of righteousness does not have a soteriological function as it does in the Pauline writings. To compare the Matthaean and Pauline concepts of righteousness is not equivalent to comparing their respective teachings on the nature of salvation. Matthew and Paul agree that salvation is the gift of God. But in contrast to Paul, who expresses this idea in terms of the concept of righteousness, Matthew expresses it without reference to this concept. Consequently, the theological reason underlying the numerous attempts to bring the meaning of the Matthaean righteousness-terminology into agreement with
that of Paul has been obviated by this study.

With respect to the problem of significance, this study clearly shows that the concept of righteousness does not play a role in Matthew's self-understanding as a follower of Jesus. According to Matthew, those who are properly religious in a Christian sense are known as disciples, not as the righteous. The essence of discipleship is not expressed as doing righteousness (a term referring to the demand of God upon man) but as doing the will of God (a term stressing both the gift and the demand).

Why in fact does Matthew employ the concept of righteousness in his gospel? This study concludes that the concept of righteousness has a provisional function in the Gospel of Matthew. It provides a point of contact between the religious understanding of first-century Palestinian Jews and the teaching of Jesus as Matthew understood it.

It is the nature of such a provisional concept merely to facilitate in bridging a gap of understanding. Consequently, once the way to the new understanding has been shown, the provisional concept is discarded. In the final analysis, Matthew's emphasis is placed on the disciples who are to do the will of God rather than on the righteous who do righteousness.

That the concept of righteousness was in fact able to function as a significant provisional concept, is supported by its use in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature. The present study demonstrates that the component parts of the Matthaean concept of righteousness can be readily understood against the background of the thought expressed in these writings.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF THE MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE
MATT HAEAN CONCEPT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

1. The State of the Question

The controversy regarding the meaning of the Matthaean concept of righteousness has revolved primarily around the following question: Does the term righteousness (dikaiosyne) refer to God's gift to man or God's demand upon man? This question has basically been answered in four different ways; that is, two diametrically opposed positions and two mediating views have been presented.

The positions of Fiedler and Strecker are representative of the diametrically opposed views. Fiedler has attempted to show that in all seven dikaiosyne-passage$s in the Gospel of Matthew, righteousness is both the eschatological gift and the demand of God. The gift, however, precedes the demand. Accordingly, Fiedler views righteousness essentially as the gift of God.

Strecker, on the other hand, asserts that in all seven...

---


dikaiosyne-passages, righteousness refers to Rechtschaffenheit. It is always seen as a demand upon man; never as the gift of God.

The two other views are essentially attempts at finding a mediating position between the two extreme views just expressed. These two mediating views are similar insofar as they both acknowledge that the term dikaiosyne does not have the same meaning in each occurrence. In some cases it refers to the gift of God while in others it refers to the demand made upon man. The point of contention between these two views stems from the relative importance assigned to these two aspects of righteousness.

In one mediating view greater significance is assigned to those passages in which dikaiosyne is interpreted as referring to the gift of God. For example, Ziesler comes to the conclusion that in Mt 5:20 righteousness refers to the demand made upon man while in 5:6 it refers to God's gift. With respect to the significance of these passages he concludes:

It is probably no accident that 5:6 precedes 5:20: human righteousness is inadequate, and what is needed is not only a more thoroughgoing kind, but one which comes as God's gift to those who long for it.

See especially Weg, pp. 157f., 179f., 187.

J. A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul (Society for NTS Monograph Series 20; Cambridge, 1972), p. 144. Cf. K. Kertelge, 'Rechtfertigung' bei Paulus (NTAB NF 3; 2nd ed.; Münster, 1971), pp. 46ff., who states that Mt 5:20 and 6:1 must be seen in the light of 5:6; B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew (New York, 1930), p. 134: "As has been acutely observed the term δικαιοσύνη in Mt can in most cases be best rendered 'Salvation'.


This view differs only minimally from the extreme position taken by Fiedler. While the interpretation of individual passages does differ, the end result is the same. The real significance of the Matthaean concept of righteousness is seen in the fact that it refers to the gift of God.

The second mediating view does not gravitate toward either of the extreme positions. Commentators such as Schniewind and Lohmeyer, for example, treat each dikaiosyne-passage on its own merit. Some passages are seen as reflecting the meaning of righteousness as the gift of God while others as the demand made upon man. No attempt is made to subordinate one meaning to the other. The tacit assumption appears to be that Matthew simply does not use the term dikaiosyne consistently.

Despite the fact that there is wide disagreement as to the meaning of the Matthaean concept of righteousness, there is a scholarly consensus that this concept plays an extremely important role in the Gospel of Matthew. It is especially argued that the concept of righteousness plays a crucial role in determining the Matthaean view

---

6 J. Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (NTD 2; Göttingen, 1950).
7 E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Matthäus (Göttingen, 1956).
8 E.g. statements such as the following are made without any recourse to proof: K. Tagawa, "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew", NTS 16 (1970), pp. 149ff.; "It is well known, for example, that ὑπηκοούμενοι is one of the fundamental concepts in Matthew." Cf. R. Banks, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law: Authenticity and Interpretation in Matthew 5:17-20", JBL 93 (1974), p. 242; H. Frankenmüller, "Die Makarismen (Mt 5, 1-12; Lk 6, 20-23). Motive und Umfang der redaktionellen Komposition", BZ 15 (1971), p. 71.
of the nature of salvation. As a matter of fact, irrespective of their views as to the meaning of the Matthaean concept of righteousness, scholars claim that the relative degree of agreement and disagreement between the Matthaean and Pauline concepts of righteousness is directly reflected in their respective views of the nature of salvation. The conceptual language employed in the scholarly discussion of the relationship between the Matthaean and Pauline views of salvation is that of righteousness by faith as the gift of God and/or righteousness by works as man's ability to meet the demand of God.

According to Fiedler's interpretation, the Matthaean and Pauline concepts of righteousness are essentially in agreement; both Matthew and Paul view righteousness as Heilsgabe. It should be noted that in his introduction, Fiedler shows obvious satisfaction in being able to claim that Matthew holds a Pauline understanding of righteousness.

Exegetes who hold the view that not all dikaiosyne-passages in the Gospel of Matthew refer to righteousness as the gift of God but who at the same time claim that the Matthaean and Pauline views of salvation are compatible, are confronted by a problem. This difficulty is generally solved by subordinating the demand to the gift. Kertelge, for example, argues that although the Jewish understanding of righteousness in terms of works still seems to be visible in the Gospel of Matthew, it is in fact fundamentally, i.e. christologically, broken.

Scholars who do not subordinate one aspect of the Matthaean

---

9 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 4.
10 Ibid.
11 Kertelge, 'Rechtfertigung' bei Paulus, p. 47.
teaching regarding righteousness to the other or who claim that righteousness refers solely to the demand of God upon man, acknowledge that the Matthaean view of salvation differs from the Pauline one. For example, Stuhlmacher points out that due to the imbalance between the aspects of righteousness as gift and demand, it is impossible for Matthew to lend expression to a view of salvation which is sola gratia. 12

2. The Method of the Present Study

On the basis of a preliminary study it became evident that a knowledge of the meaning and significance of the concept of righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature is invaluable for an understanding of the Matthaean concept of righteousness. It should be noted, that in this study the background literature is not used for the purpose of finding literary sources for or influences upon Matthaean usage. Every attempt has been made to derive Matthew's understanding of the concept of righteousness from the Gospel of Matthew itself. Naturally at times passages from the background literature have been introduced in order to show that a certain meaning attached to an expression in the Gospel of Matthew is plausible. Care has been taken, however, to ensure that supporting background literature has been quoted only after a meaning has first been derived from the text of the gospel.

The primary purpose of the discussion of the background literature is to gain perspective. This study aims to determine how Matthew relates to the teaching of His own time. Since the concept of righteousness is employed in the debate with the scribes and Pharisees, it is crucial that this type of perspective be gained.

It was noted that the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature were found to be especially helpful in providing the setting against which the Matthaean concept of righteousness becomes intelligible. It was therefore decided to limit the study of the background materials to these two bodies of literature.

It is not assumed that the background materials other than the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature are irrelevant to this investigation. In other words, the whole question as to the Jewish-Christian or Gentile-Christian character of the Gospel of Matthew is not prejudged in this study. On the other hand, the fact that these Jewish-Palestinian writings are adequate in providing the background

---

13 For the dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature see the introductions of chapters II and III respectively.

14 Cf. Mt 5:20.

15 Until the late 1940's the view of the Gospel of Matthew as exhibiting a Jewish-Christian character and being intended for Jewish Christians was generally accepted. With the appearance of an article by K. W. Clark, "The Gentile Kiss in Saint Matthew", JBL 66 (1947), pp. 165-172, this view was seriously questioned. The Gentile-Christian character of the Gospel of Matthew was also advocated by P. Nepper-Christensen, Das Matthaeusevangelium, ein judenchristliches Evangelium? (Aarhus, 1958). However, it was not until the publication of studies by W. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, and G. Strack, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, in 1959 and 1962, respectively, that the hypothesis stressing a final Gentile-Christian redaction of the Gospel of Matthew was systematically proposed.
against which the Matthaean concept of righteousness can be viewed is significant.

One major weakness in Strecker's study is that he has not systematically considered the meaning of the concept of righteousness in the Jewish-Palestinian writings. Other scholars, notably Ziesler and Fiedler, have attempted to deal with all possible materials which might elucidate the meaning of the concept of righteousness in the New Testament. Their treatment of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Rabbinic literature, however, is the weak point in their investigations.

With respect to the Dead Sea Scrolls they have failed to grasp that there are significant variations in the use of the righteousness terminology among the various writings. In this study special attention will be given to this fact. 16

With respect to the Rabbinic literature the investigations of Ziesler and Fiedler have two major flaws. Like many other New Testament scholars, Ziesler and Fiedler have failed to apply the same critical methods of evaluation to Rabbinic texts as they have applied to early Christian texts. For example, sayings from the fifth- and sixth-century Talmuds have been applied indiscriminately to New Testament times. In order to remedy this situation, the present study will deal only with the Tannaitic literature rather than with the Rabbinic literature as a whole. 17

The second flaw in Ziesler's and Fiedler's treatment of the

16 See ch. II, sec. 1.
17 See ch. III, sec. 1, for the extent of the Tannaitic literature.
Rabbinic literature is that they simply have not treated the vast majority of the most significant passages dealing with the concept of righteousness in the Tannaitic literature. Ziesler acknowledges that because of the "sheer vastness of the material"\(^{18}\) he has simply attempted "to indicate the range of meanings without pretending to thoroughness".\(^{19}\) As a matter of fact, Ziesler has only made a more exhaustive analysis of two samples: Genesis Rabbah and the Targum Onkelos.

The choice of these two particular writings is unfortunate. Genesis Rabbah was compiled very late, probably no earlier than the Palestinian Talmud.\(^{20}\) Although Targum Onkelos may possibly date from the second or third century A.D., its usefulness to the investigation at hand is limited. Since it is an Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch it is very limited in its ability to express Rabbinic thought.

Ziesler's acknowledged lack of thoroughness is especially evident with respect to the Tannaitic midrashim. For example, in Sifre on Deuteronomy there are a total of 17 relevant passages containing a total of 41 occurrences of the nouns \textit{tsedeq} and \textit{tsedaqah}. Ziesler refers to only one of these passages and even this one reference is not discussed in the section dealing with the Rabbinic writings\(^{21}\) but is

---

\(^{18}\) Ziesler, \textit{Righteousness}, p. 112.

\(^{19}\) Ibid.


\(^{21}\) Ziesler, \textit{Righteousness}, pp. 112-127.
only referred to incidentally as one of the passages which Bultmann cites. Ziesler does not at all refer to Sifre on Numbers and Sifra. Consequently, Ziesler's study is of little value as a word study of the righteousness-terminology with respect to the Tannaitic literature.

Fiedler's analysis of the meaning of righteousness in the oldest Rabbinic literature is beset with even greater problems than that of Ziesler. Fiedler, like Ziesler, treats only relatively few passages; but even the passages he does treat are not gleaned directly from the Rabbinic literature but indirectly from Strack-Billerbeck.

In contrast to these studies, the present study intends to be exhaustive. All references to the nouns ṭsedeq and ṭsedaqah in the Tannaitic literature will be discussed.

In addition to the nouns ṭsedeq and ṭsedaqah, this study will also deal with the adjective ṭsaddiq in the background literature. Fiedler dealt only with the nouns and not the adjective. This omission has had negative consequences: Having looked only at righteousness and not at the righteous, Fiedler has failed to grasp the total significance of the use of the Matthaean concept of righteousness.

Ziesler has treated not only the noun and adjective but also

---

22 Ibid., p. 10, no. 2.

23 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, pp. 80-87.


25 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", II, p. 97, n. 2, explaining that he has dealt only with the noun because of limitations of space.
the verb. Since Ziesler's aim is to deal with the meaning of righteousness in Paul where the verb plays an important role, this is indeed necessary. On the other hand, in the Gospel of Matthew, the verb does not play an important role.²⁶ It does not form an integral part of the Matthaean concept of righteousness. Since the study of the background materials is not an end in itself but is undertaken for the purpose of comparison, the verb related to the root ḫ-r-d-q has not been included in this investigation.

In this study of the Gospel of Matthew, stress will not only be placed on determining the meaning of the righteousness-terminology but also on determining the overall significance of the use of the concept of righteousness in the gospel as a whole. In order to provide a valid basis of comparison, the twofold approach of determining specific meanings of various terms and their overall significance will also be applied to the study of the background literature. This approach has largely been neglected in previous studies.

3. Thesis

On the basis of the methodology outlined above, this writer has reached the conclusion that none of the interpretations suggested thus far have adequately shown the meaning and significance of the Matthaean concept of righteousness.

In the Gospel of Matthew righteousness is never seen as the gift of God for man but always as the demand of God upon man.

²⁶ It occurs twice: Mt 11:19 = Lk 7:35; Mt 12:37.
Righteousness refers to right conduct, namely, conduct that corresponds to the will of God as expressed in the law.

This does not mean that Matthew advocates that salvation can be attained by man's own effort. As a matter of fact, the Pauline categories of righteousness by faith versus righteousness by works are not applicable to the Gospel of Matthew. Scholars who have used these Pauline categories as the basis for their interpretation of the Matthaean concept of righteousness have tended to confuse the issue.

Matthew agrees with Paul that salvation is the gift of God. However, to express this idea Matthew does not make use of the righteousness-terminology, as is the case with Paul, but uses sayings such as, "he (Jesus) will save his people from their sins." Consequently, when one compares Paul's and Matthew's teaching concerning righteousness one is not in actual fact comparing their respective views of the nature of salvation.

Matthew's self-understanding of who is a true follower of Jesus, a Christian, is not in terms of being a righteous person who does righteousness. This does not mean that Matthew does not stress the importance of conduct which corresponds to the will of God as expressed in the law. As a matter of fact, in comparison to the other Synoptics, Matthew places great emphasis on ethical conduct and performing good works. This understanding of righteousness, however, does not comprise Matthew's entire understanding of what it means to be a follower of

27 Mt 1:21.
Jesus. Rather than seeing himself as a **righteous person** doing righteousness Matthew views himself as a **disciple** doing the will of God, and the will of God includes the idea that salvation is the gift of God. The one who is truly religious in a Christian sense is a **disciple** rather than a **righteous** one.

If the concept of righteousness does not play a definitive role in Matthew's understanding as to who is properly religious in the Christian sense, then what is the **significance of this concept?** In the Gospel of Matthew the concept of righteousness is used in a provisional way. The concept of righteousness is used to provide a point of contact between the religious understanding of contemporary Jews and the teaching of Jesus as Matthew understood it. Matthew explains that in order to be a follower of Jesus, to be truly religious, one must have a righteousness which exceeds that of contemporary religious standards. However, once people have realized that there is such a difference, once they have become members of the church (ἐκκλησία), this provisional concept can be discarded. After all, provisional concepts can only facilitate bridging gaps of understanding; they can never fully express the view to which they point. Within the fellowship of the Christian community (the perspective from which the Gospel of Matthew is written), the terminology changes from **righteous** and **righteousness** to **disciple** and the will of God.

That the concept of righteousness indeed served as a meaningful point of contact between the religious understanding of first-century Palestinian Jews and the teaching of Jesus as Matthew understood it, is apparent from the usage of this concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls and
the Tannaitic literature. Even the idea of using the concept of righteousness as a provisional concept is not unique; for in one of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Manual of Discipline, the concept of righteousness plays a similar role.
CHAPTER II

TSEDEQ, TSEDAQAH AND TSADDIQ IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1. Introduction

This study of the words connected with the root ts-d-q in the Dead Sea Scrolls is not an end in itself but is undertaken for the purpose of providing a basis of comparison to the use of the concept of righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew. In the study of the Gospel of Matthew, stress will not only be placed on determining the meaning of terms such as dikaiosyne and dikaios but also on determining the overall significance of the use of the concept of righteousness in this gospel. In order to provide a valid basis of comparison, the twofold approach of determining specific meanings of various terms and their overall significance, must also be applied to the study of the words connected with the root ts-d-q in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

In order to make a valid comparison, however, it is not enough consistently to apply methodological principles to various bodies of literature. It is of utmost importance that the methodological principles be applied to bodies of literature which represent compatible literary categories. Specifically, the question which must be asked is whether the Gospel of Matthew can be compared to the Dead Sea Scrolls as a whole or whether distinctions must be made amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls. In other words, the question of the homogeneity of the Dead Sea Scrolls must be faced.
The New Testament discipline of Redaktionsgeschichte has shown beyond doubt that the Gospel of Matthew is composed of various traditional materials which were brought together by a redactional process, the final stage being carried out by a specific individual or a group of persons. While discrete anterior traditions must therefore be taken into account, it is nevertheless evident that certain redactional motifs are inherent in the Gospel of Matthew, enabling us to treat it as a literary unity.

Soon after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it was pointed out by scholars such as Reicke¹, Burrows² and Teicher³ that similarly to the New Testament, this literature is not homogeneous but reflects various stages of a historical development. Since that time many facts have emerged which support this conclusion.

It is now generally accepted that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written over a period of time and reflect a historical development. Although this general principle is accepted, there is wide divergence of opinion as to what constitutes the correct chronological sequence.

¹Bo Reicke, "Die Ta'ämire-Schriften und die Damaskus-Fragmente", StTh 2 (1949), p. 63, suggests that like all writings from the ancient Near East, these writings too did not come into being all at once but "recht langsam, auf Grund einer anfänglich mühslichen Entwicklung".

²M. Burrows, "The Discipline Manual of the Judean Covenanters", OSI 8 (1950), p. 162, notes with respect to IQS, "it was composed in what may be called 'scrapbook fashion'. Separate and independent bodies of material seem to have been copied on the same scroll in the order in which they came into the copyist's hands, much as we may suppose the books of the Old Testament prophets were put together."

of the scrolls. 4

Neither is there unanimity of opinion as to the time span between the appearance of the first and last of the scrolls. Most scholars agree that the scrolls found in the caves of Qumran were stored there no later than A.D. 70, the date of the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. 5 The terminus ad quem for the final redaction of the Dead Sea Scrolls is thus firmly established.

There is a great deal of controversy, however, as to the terminus a quo. As Dupont-Sommer 6 points out, even when archaeological data are taken into account, the historical background reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls could conceivably refer to the pre-Maccabean period prior to 168 B.C., the Maccabean or Hasmonean epoch between 168 and 63 B.C. or the Roman period from 63 B.C. onwards. Consequently, we are dealing with a period of at least 100 years during which the scrolls could have been composed. Vermes has suggested that the original composition of the Manual of Discipline (1QS) may date from the latter part of the second century B.C. 7 and that the War Scroll

---


6 Essene Writings, p. 340.

(1QM) was composed during the beginning of the first century A.D. ⁸

Although the exact chronological sequence of the writings comprising the Dead Sea Scrolls may never be established with any degree of certainty, the fact that a historical development is reflected in these writings is evident. For example, P. von der Osten-Sacken⁹ has traced a development in the dualistic thought as portrayed by the scrolls. Rabinowitz ¹⁰ has demonstrated that the theme of persecution points to a development in time.

The problem of the dating of the scrolls is compounded by the fact that the individual writings themselves are not homogeneous but are composed of various strata. This is especially obvious in the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH). G. Jeremias has given a number of convincing arguments to support his conclusion that 1QH does not represent a literary unity. ¹¹


---

⁸Ibid., p. 123.

⁹Peter von der Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial (StUNT 6; Göttingen, 1969).

¹⁰"Sequence and Dates", p. 178.


Although this view is not substantiated by clear evidence, the general conclusion that IQS has been compiled from various sources cannot be denied.\footnote{13}

It has also been suggested that the War Scroll\footnote{14} and the Damascus Document (CD)\footnote{15} have been compiled from various sources. Nevertheless, with the exception of the Thanksgiving Hymns, it appears that through a process of redaction, the various sources have been integrated so that though differences are still visible, each writing does in fact show some degree of uniformity. There are, however, marked differences between the various writings. This is especially evident when the Damascus Document is compared to the rest \footnote{16} of the


\footnote{14} Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamōn aus Höhle 4 von Qumran", ZAW 69 (1957), pp. 131-151, has compared 1QM with 4QM\(a\) (70 fragments discovered in 1952 in cave 4) and concludes, "Wir hätten dann in 4QM\(a\) eine Kopie des alten, nicht-qumranischen Textes des Buches Milhamān vor uns, während 1QM eine sozusagen 'qumranisierte' Fassung darstelle." See also Becker, Heil Gottes, pp. 43-50; J. van der Ploeg, "Zur literarischen Komposition der Kriegerrolle", in H. Bardtke, ed., Qumran-Probleme (Berlin, 1963), p. 293.


\footnote{16} While the Damascus Document is generally included among the Dead Sea Scrolls, it should be noted that only fragments of this writing were found in the caves of Qumran. The Damascus Document is also known as the Zadokite Document.
Dead Sea Scrolls.

The Damascus Document has been known for a much longer period of time than the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls. It was discovered in 1896 in the Genizah of a synagogue in old Cairo and published in 1910. Sukenik was the first to suggest that the Damascus Document should be considered as one of the writings belonging to the Dead Sea Sect. This suggestion seemed to be confirmed when fragments of this writing were indeed discovered in the caves of Qumran and today this view is generally accepted.

The fact that the Damascus Document was transmitted independently of the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls may be significant, for, as Burrows has noted, "The relation between the Damascus Document in particular and the rest of the Qumran literature is not yet entirely clear. The combination of close resemblances at some points with marked differences at others indicates that either two distinct though related groups or two different stages in the history of the same movement are represented."

Attention has especially been drawn to the differences between

---


the Damascus Document and the Manual of Discipline. Butler has argued that the distinctive names such as volunteers, sons of light, sons of righteousness, sons of truth and men of God's lot used in 1QS indicate a longer period of separation from the main stream of Judaism than is evident in CD and that CD is thus earlier than 1QS. Most scholars, however, disagree with this conclusion and hold that CD is later than 1QS.

It has also been suggested that 1QS and CD are two rule books which may not simply reflect different stages in the evolution of the Dead Sea Sect but which reflect the thought of different groups who had practices and beliefs of their own but remained within the larger community.

Although it is granted that much more work needs to be done on the question of the homogeneity of the Dead Sea Scrolls before

---


21 Butler, "The Chronological Sequence of the Scrolls of Qumran Cave One", p. 535. Other scholars who claim that CD is earlier than 1QS are, Rowley, op. cit., p. 539; B. Otzen, "Die neugefundenen hebräischen Sektenschriften und die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen", StTh 7 (1953), p. 141.


definitive conclusions can be reached, it is clear that any study of a specific aspect of the thought of the Dead Sea Sect must come to terms with this problem. The literary unity of the Dead Sea Scrolls should not be taken for granted.

Unfortunately the whole problem of the homogeneity of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been ignored or at least deemed unimportant by a large number of scholars. Not only have obviously complex writings such as 1QH been treated as works by a single author24 but even the Dead Sea Scrolls as a whole are regarded by many scholars as portraying a single, uniform point of view.

Ringgren, for example, chooses various topics within general subject areas such as God, Man and Eschatology, and taking proof texts from all available non-biblical texts found in Qumran, gives a "systematic account of the doctrines and practices of the Qumran community".25 The result is essentially an eclectic account of beliefs which in all probability were never held by any particular group of persons at a specific time and place.

24 Maier, Die Texte vom Toten Meer, II, p. 63, notes that the majority of scholars support the idea that the hymns in 1QH stem from a single author, the Teacher of Righteousness. Maier argues, however, that it has not been proven that there is a single author. J. Licht, "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll", IEJ 6 (1956), p. 2, argues for a single author of 1QH not on the basis of the authorship of the Teacher of Righteousness but for the following reason, "This very monotony, however, proves on closer inspection to be its true unity, for insofar as we can judge now, DST is the work of one man developing what is almost a single theme in a long series of variations."

Some of the major studies of the words connected with the root te-d-q in the Dead Sea Scrolls which have been undertaken for the purpose of providing comparative material for New Testament studies have also taken the homogeneity of the Dead Sea Scrolls for granted. Under the heading "The Hebrew writings of the Intertestamental period", Ziesler\(^{26}\) not only treats the Dead Sea Scrolls but also Sirach. His statistics and conclusions thus refer to this whole body of literature.

Consequently, when Ziesler compares the meaning of righteousness in Paul to that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Sirach, he is comparing two very dissimilar bodies of literature. He is comparing the writings of one man, Paul, as best as they can be determined\(^{27}\) to a very composite literature. He is comparing the view of a single man to that of one or more communities whose thought developed over a number of generations.

In contrast to Ziesler, who combines the Dead Sea Scrolls and Sirach, Kertelge\(^{28}\) treats the Dead Sea Scrolls separately as background material for the study of God's righteousness in Paul. Like Ziesler, however, he fails to come to terms with possible variations of this concept amongst the various writings which comprise the Dead Sea Scrolls.


\(^{27}\) *Ibid.*, Ziesler points out that Ephesians (p. 153) and the Pastoral Epistles (p. 154) should not be used as material for Pauline theology. He also notes possible problems with respect to the authorship of Philippians (p. 148, n. 1), Colossians and Thessalonians (p. 152, n. 4).

Although Kertelge agrees with Becker that some variations in the meaning of the concept of God's righteousness exist in the Dead Sea Scrolls, he nevertheless goes ahead to stress the common rather than the divergent elements of this concept. Consequently, the comparison is between Paul's thought and that of a group of writings reflecting the thought of various individuals and/or groups of people through a period of time.

It is not the contention of this study that no common motifs exist in the writings comprising the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is, however, regarded as a proven fact that the Dead Sea Scrolls as a whole are not as homogeneous from a literary point of view as is the Gospel of Matthew. The Dead Sea Scrolls do not bear the imprint of a redaction by a single redactor as is the case with the Gospel of Matthew. Consequently, the procedure of taking proof texts from the various scrolls may lead to a composite picture which in actual fact may never have been held by a specific member of the community.

It must be emphasized again, that it is not argued that the method of taking proof texts from various scrolls necessarily leads to a composite picture. It is only maintained that the possibility exists and that it is therefore imperative that no general conclusions as to the teaching of the Dead Sea Scrolls with respect to the concept of righteousness are made until it has definitely been established that no-substantial-differences-exist-between-the-various-writings or

---

29Ibid., p. 28, n. 62, Kertelge refers to Becker, Heil Gottes, pp. 120, 126, 149f.
strata within the writings.

The methodology of this study will therefore be to investigate the role of the concept of righteousness in each of the Dead Sea Scrolls. This does not mean that each writing is thought of as the product of a single author. It is, however, suggested that all the individual writings except 1QH, are comparable to the Gospel of Matthew, inasmuch as they consist of various traditional materials which were brought together by a redactor and bear the imprint of his thought. 30

Fiedler, in his study of the concept of righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew, does in fact treat the writings of the Dead Sea Scrolls individually. But as will be shown below, he stresses the Old Testament background of the passages in which the nouns tsedeq and tsedaqah are found to such an extent that he fails to grasp their contextual meaning in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Because of this emphasis he comes to the conclusion that the meaning of tsedeq/tsedaqah in the Dead Sea Scrolls concurs with the Old Testament meaning of Heil.

Although the defects of the various studies dealing with the concept of righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls as a background to the use of this concept in the New Testament are real, this does not mean that all the conclusions reached in these studies are invalid. Many of the observations are perceptive and some of the conclusions

30 It is not implied that the analogy between the Gospel of Matthew and the various Dead Sea Scrolls conforms in all details.

31 M. J. Fiedler, "Der Begriff Ἰσχαοσύνη im Matthäus-Evangelium, auf seine Gründlagen untersucht" (Ph.D. dissertation; Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg, 1957).
valid. The great drawback is that they are generally only valid within a very limited frame of reference. Consequently, a new, comprehensive study is needed which takes account not only of the meaning of the various words connected with the root ts-d-q but also of their overall significance within the thought expressed by the individual writings.

2. The Damascus Document

The noun tsedeq occurs 12 times in CD. In CD 1:11 and 20:32 it is found in the title moreh tsedeq and the use of tsedeq in this title is pivotal in the determination of the overall significance of the concept of righteousness in CD.

From a grammatical viewpoint tsedeq could be used substantively or adjectivally in this title, that is, it could be an objective genitive or a subjective genitive. The decision as to which is the correct use in this case carries far-reaching consequences. If moreh tsedeq is translated as righteous or right teacher, then tsedeq is simply a term used to define the status of a certain office or person. If on the other hand, it is translated as Teacher of Righteousness, that is, the one who teaches righteousness, then tsedeq could be an important term pointing to a central concept within the thought of the author/redactor or even within the community to which CD was directed.

There is no consensus of opinion as to the meaning of the title moreh tsedeq. Weingreen, for example, claims that tsedeq is used adjectivally.

It would seem, therefore, proper to conclude that, in the title we have under scrutiny, namely פִּי הַיְדָו, the noun פִּי has,
first, the effect of an adjective and is to be understood as meaning "true" in the sense of genuine. It expresses the idea of one publicly recognized in his title to office and in the exercise of his accredited functions. In this association the noun פֶּתַח has no moral content at all; it is part of a conventional title and conveys the idea of legitimacy. 32

As proof, Weingreen lists examples from the Old Testament 33, the Rabbinic literature 34, and contemporary usage 35 which he claims show that תְּשֵׁדֶק is always used adjectivally when it occurs in the genitive position in construct-genitive expressions. Since there is evidence for continuity in such a usage, he concludes that this principle must also hold true for the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Weingreen's arguments and also those of other scholars holding similar views 36 are not convincing, for when one looks at the Damascus Document itself, it is evident that in the title מְשֶׁרֶת תְּשֵׁדֶק, תְּשֵׁדֶק.

33. Ibid., pp. 168f., Weingreen notes that in II Chron 15:3, for example, תְּשֵׁדֶק is equivalent to אֱמֶת. It is interesting to note that G. Jeremias, Lehrer, pp. 312f. uses the OT, i.e. especially Hos 10:12, as proof that תְּשֵׁדֶק is to be understood substantively in the title מְשֶׁרֶת תְּשֵׁדֶק.
34. Weingreen, op. cit., p. 169, refers to expressions such as: קֹדֶשׁ בְּרוּךָ, תְּשֵׁדֶק יְשֵׁרָה יְשֵׁרָה
35. Ibid., p. 166, "It is, in fact, not unusual to find the title מְשֶׁרֶת תְּשֵׁדֶק printed on the official notepaper of a contemporary rabbi, as the formal attestation of his full rabbinic qualification to act as judge."
36. M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (London, 1961), p. 20, talks about the so-called Teacher of Righteousness and argues that "The title itself appears to mean the 'true (legitimate) teacher', 
is used substantively. The passage which most clearly provides such proof is 6:11. Here the expression נַעֲרַּהּ מַעֲרַּה occurs. The term מַעֲרַּה could be the masculine, third person singular hiph'il imperfect of מַעֲרַּה. If this were the case then 6:11 would have to be translated as "he will teach righteousness".

On the other hand, מַעֲרַּה could also be the masculine, singular, qal participle of מַעֲרַּה. Since the expression נַעֲרַּה מַעֲרַּה appears to be the subject of יִדְוֹ, this explanation is more plausible than the former. Consequently 6:11 should be translated as "he who teaches righteousness".

The noun נַעֲרַּה is unmistakably the object of the participle מַעֲרַּה.

---

in contradistinction to a 'false teacher'. W. H. Brownlee, "The Habakkuk Commentary", in Burrows, ed., The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery (New Haven, 1950), I, p. XIX, writes, "His chief interest was in the Righteous Teacher (or Teacher of Righteousness)", but in the remainder of his exposition he uses the title "Righteous Teacher" exclusively. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, p. 83, n. 3, prefers the translation "Righteous Teacher", for he says that tsedeq is not an objective genitive. He does, however, admit that the "Righteous Teacher" teaches righteousness.


There are no textual difficulties as far as the reading in CD 6:11 is concerned. It should also be noted that similar expressions occur in the Tannaitic literature and the OT. In Sifre on Deuteronomy 144 on Deut 16:12 the following statement is found: "רָעַשׁ שֵׁיְרֵהוּ יָדִים." Since the relative pronoun "א" is used here it is certain that יד is treated as the direct object of רָעַשׁ. In Hos 10:12 we find the statement, "עַל יִבְרָא וּרְוִי וְרַבִּים לָכֶם (until he comes and rains righteousness upon you)." Jeremias has noted that in this instance יד must be objective.

What is the relationship between the expressions יד יִבְרָא (CD 6:11) and יד וְרַבִּים (CD 1:11, 20:32)? Lohse translates both expressions as "Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit" and on the basis of the respective contexts it indeed appears certain that both expressions refer to

40. The following three editions of the text all agree as to the reading: A. M. Habermann, The Scrolls from the Judean Desert (Israel, 1959), p. 80; Lohse, Texte, p. 76; Rabin, The Zadokite Documente, p. 23.


42. G. Jeremias, Lehrer, pp. 313f. Jeremias also notes that it is generally acknowledged that the title יד יִבְרָא is probably based on Hos 10:12 and Joel 2:23, (עַל יִבְרָא וְרַבִּים לָכֶם) and that not only in Hos 10:12 but also in Joel 2:23 יד יִבְרָא can only be understood as being objective.

43. Lohse, Texte, pp. 67, 77, 107. Cf. Mai, Die Texte vom Toten Meer, I, pp. 47, 54, 70; Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, pp. 122, 131, 141, translates both expressions as "Teacher of Righteousness".
the same person. The moreh tsedeq is the one who teaches tsedeq. Since tsedeq is objective in the expression, it is indeed probable that it is also objective in the expression. The Teacher of Righteousness is the one who teaches righteousness.

Although CD 6:11 provides the best argument for the claim that tsedeq in the title moreh tsedeq is an objective genitive, this passage by no means exhausts the evidence. The phrase in CD 1:1 also lends support to such a conclusion. As in the title moreh tsedeq we have here a construct-genitive relationship. is a construct participle and is in the genitive position. The translation "all right/ righteous knowers" makes little sense. The context demands the translation "all you who know righteousness". Tsedeq thus is an objective genitive. The emphasis is placed on righteousness, not on the knowers. Since tsedeq is used substantively in CD 1:1 it would be strange indeed if it were not used in the same way in CD 1:11. After all, from the context it appears natural that those "who know righteousness" (CD 1:1) in essence know that which has been communicated to them by the Teacher of Righteousness (CD 1:11).

In addition to CD 1:11; 6:11 and 20:32, the noun tsedeq

44 Thus C. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, pp. 3, 23; Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 131, n. 6. For the view that these expressions refer to different persons see: L. Ginzberg, Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte (New York, 1922), p. 314f., "und dieser Unterschied zwischen Elija und den anderen Gesetzlehrern wird durch in Gegensatz zum sonstigen in unserer Schrift angedeutet." Cf. A. S. van der Woude, Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran (Studia Semitica Neerlandica; Assen, 1957), pp. 72ff., who states that CD 1:11 refers to the historical Teacher of Righteousness and CD 6:11 to Elijah.
occurs in eight further passages. In three of these, that is, CD 4:17, 20:17 and 29, tsedeq is definitely used substantively. In 20:17 and 29 it is a noun in the absolute state. In 4:17 tsedeq occurs in the genitive position in the following construct-genitive expression: לשה צדיק. On the basis of the three categories listed it is obvious that CD 4:17 refers to "three kinds of righteousness" rather than "three right kinds".

In the five remaining passages tsedeq occurs in the genitive position in various construct-genitive expressions. Although the immediate context in each of the passages does not provide compelling reasons for treating tsedeq substantively, neither are there compelling reasons for treating it adjectively.

On the basis of the evidence presented, we must therefore conclude that the title moreh tsedeq should be translated as Teacher of Righteousness, tsedeq being the object of the teaching of the Teacher. Although the evidence points to this conclusion, one should not overlook the possibility that the whole question of the subjective and objective use of tsedeq may have eluded the author/redactor of CD. The problem with which we have been dealing, may in actual fact be a

45 For a more detailed discussion of this passage see below in this section. The use of the definite article also suggests the translation "three kinds of righteousness".

46 It must be noted that although the best English translation of the verb הדר is to teach, this translation in actual fact does not bring out the full meaning of this verb. Weinigreen, "The Title Moreh Sadek", p. 173, has pointed out that in Rabbinic Hebrew the use of the hiph'il form of הדר did not imply the involvement of a teacher or guide but that "the significance of this word is not instructive but legal." Weinigreen admits, however, that it is hard to find an English equivalent and in fact he does not offer an English translation of this title.
pseudo-problem arising solely out of difficulties inherent in the process of translating from Hebrew to English. The expression moreh tsedeq may have been used purposely because it was vague and could thus include both the idea of Teacher of Righteousness and of Righteous Teacher. It should not be taken for granted that these two ideas are mutually exclusive.

On the basis of CD 6:11, however, it is clear that the moreh tsedeq, be he the Teacher of Righteousness or the Righteous Teacher, teaches righteousness. Consequently, while keeping in mind the reservations just outlined, the best English translation of the title moreh tsedeq as used in CD still appears to be Teacher of Righteousness.

Let us now turn to the question of the meaning and overall significance of the noun tsedeq in the Damascus Document. This writing begins with the following exhortation:

Hear now, all you who know righteousness, and consider the works of God.

The Damascus Document is addressed to those who know tsedeq.

---

47 The primary argument in favour of the translation "Righteous Teacher" is the analogy to the expression רְשׁוֹן הָיוֹם (CD 20:1) which can be translated as "Unique Teacher". Cf. Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 139. Although such a meaning is probable, it is by no means certain. Lohse, Texte, p. 105, has suggested the translation "der Lehrer der Gemeinschaft".

48 Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 121, translates בְּשׁוֹתֵי as "words of God". There seems to be no justification for this translation, for in CD 1:10 he translates נְחַשְׁיוֹנָם as "their works".

49 Translation by Vermes, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 97.
Righteousness is a term used to identify the community. The simple fact that this term is stressed at the beginning of the writing may be indicative of the importance attached to the concept of righteousness.

The nature of the righteousness which identifies the community is specified in the ensuing discussion. With respect to the Teacher of Righteousness, it is stated in CD 1:11ff. that he is to lead the people in the way of God's heart and to make known God's plans to the future generations. From the contrast between the "waters of falsehood" (דוע חבל) in CD 1:15 and the "paths of righteousness" (דוע תורוה) in 1:16, it is clear that tsedeq stands for all that is true as opposed to that which is false.

It can therefore be concluded that tsedeq refers to the content of the teaching of the Teacher of Righteousness. The teaching is to be true as opposed to the false teaching of others. Insofar as it reveals God's heretofore unknown plans for future generations, the teaching is to be esoteric. In fact the teaching is to be in accordance with God's will. Those who know righteousness are those who are aware of the teaching which makes known the will of God.

The content of God's will is disclosed even more fully in CD 20:32ff., the second passage in which the title moreh tsedeq occurs. Here it is stated that the Teacher of Righteousness teaches the precepts of righteousness (תורה תבנית). From CD 20:11 it is clear that the תבנית refer to the laws of the covenant made in the Land of

50 With respect to the esoteric factor in the teaching see G. Jeremias, Lehrer, pp. 314f.
Damascus, which is thought of as the New Covenant. God's ordinances of righteousness (זָכָאר) mentioned in CD 20:31 most likely also refer to the laws of the New Covenant. Consequently, Ginzberg's suggestion that צדָאָק in the title מִשְׁכָּר צדָאָק refers to the proper understanding of Torah is correct as long as Torah is defined not in terms of the covenant made at Sinai but in terms of the New Covenant made in the Land of Damascus. Accordingly, צדָאָק refers not only to God's laws in general but also specifically to the totality of the rules and regulations of the community to which the Damascus Document is directed.

The reference to צדָאָק in CD 3:15, "His testimony of righteousness", also comes under the general category of the law. That God's commandments are meant here is clear from the context which deals with the hidden things in which all Israel had strayed.

---

51 See also CD 20:29, תְּרוּעָה רָשִׁים, precepts of the covenant.
52 The New Covenant, מִשְׁכָּר תַּרְוָא, is mentioned in CD 6:19, 8:21, 19:33f. 20:12.
53 L. Ginzberg, "Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte", Mgwj 58 (1914), p. 159, n. 2, "In Verbindung mit נָבִי bedeutet פִּיא das Wahre, Richtige; in unserer Schrift die wahre Auffassung der Torah." This view is supported by Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, p. 19, who gives "true Doctor of the Law" as a possible translation of מִשְׁכָּר צדָאָק and by T. H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (Garden City, 1956), p. 61, who translates the title מִשְׁכָּר צדָאָק in CD 1:11 as "one who could teach the Law correctly".
54 Weingreen, "The Title Moreh Sedek", p. 173, points out that the term נָבִי "was used to designate the rabbinic function, which was not merely to expound the תּרָא, but to apply and enforce Halakhic decisions." Consequently, it is not only the term צדָאָק which implies that the Teacher of Righteousness was associated with the law.
The reference to the teaching of righteousness in CD 6:11 is also to be understood primarily in terms of the law since it occurs in the context of the discussion of the law. 55

There is yet another passage in which tsedeq is used with reference to the law insofar as it refers to man's juridical behaviour. In CD 20:17 it is noted that at a certain point in the future there will not be anyone who can reprove with righteousness (פֶּתֵּא). To reprove with righteousness means to reprove justly, that is, according to the commandments of the covenant.

The ten references to tsedeq discussed so far give rise to the conclusion that tsedeq is that which is taught by the Teacher of Righteousness, namely, that man's behaviour is to be in harmony with God's will. The latter is defined concretely by the commandments of the New Covenant made in the Land of Damascus. In other words, tsedeq is a technical term designating proper conduct according to a specific norm.

The two remaining references to tsedeq deviate from this general meaning to some extent. In the statement, "Righteousness and truth are your judgments towards us", 56 in CD 20:29, tsedeq refers solely to God. Ziesler 57 observes that in this passage tsedeq refers

55 Cf. Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 131, notes 5 and 6; Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, p. 23, n. 112; Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 92.

56 Unless indicated otherwise, all translations of non-English texts are my own.

57 Righteousness, p. 88.
to God's legal activity in judgment. Ziesler, however, also categorizes the references to ṭṣēḏeq in CD 3:15, 20:11 and 31:33 as referring to God's as opposed to man's righteousness.\(^{58}\) At first sight the reference to God's ordinances of righteousness in CD 20:31, for example, appears to refer solely to God's righteousness. However, since these ordinances are normative for man's conduct, they are related also to man's righteousness. With respect to passages such as these, Ziesler's classification is misleading. In CD 20:29, on the other hand, ṭṣēḏeq does seem to refer primarily to God's righteousness,

That ṭṣēḏeq has a use and meaning in CD 20:29 different from those in the rest of the Damascus Document is not surprising, for CD 20:28–30 is based on a traditional formula of confession. This formula is also found in IQS 1:24–26.\(^{59}\)

The last passage under discussion in which the noun ṭṣēḏeq occurs is CD 4:17. Here the three nets by which Belial ensnared Israel are described as "three kinds of righteousness" (יִשְׁרָאֵל נַחֲצָתָן וּפִנּוּיָם) consisting of lust, riches and defilement of the Sanctuary. Ziesler\(^{60}\)

\(^{58}\)Ibid.


\(^{60}\)Righteousness, p. 89.
notes that this passage is to be classified among those in which *tsedeq* refers to man's ethical behaviour in general rather than specifically juridical behaviour. Although this explanation is correct, it fails to touch upon the real significance of the use of *tsedeq* in this passage.

As was noted previously, there are 10 passages in CD where *tsedeq* is a technical term for man's proper conduct in the sight of God. CD 4:17 attributes an even broader meaning to *tsedeq*. Not only can it refer to behaviour which is proper in God's sight, but also to any type of normative conduct. According to Belial, lust, riches and defilement of the Sanctuary are representative of proper behaviour. Hence they can be designated as *tsedeq*.

In contrast to CD 20:29, where the meaning of *tsedeq* deviated from the general use, in CD 4:17 the case is not so much a deviation in meaning as an expansion of meaning. It can thus be concluded that in the Damascus Document the term *tsedeq* embraces the whole concept of the behaviour of man.

Just as the noun *tsedeq* is a technical term for the proper conduct of man, so the adjective *tsaddiq* is used in the Damascus Document to designate those whose conduct is in accordance with *tsedeq*. The adjective *tsaddiq* occurs five times in CD. In four cases *tsaddiq* is placed in opposition to *rasha*. From CD 20:20 it is clear that the contrast is between two diametrically opposed categories of people. The righteous one (*tsaddiq*) is the one who serves God while the wicked one (*rasha*) is the one who does not. In CD 4:7 the *tsaddiq* is also

---

contrasted with the rasha and the criterion here appears to be that the righteous one follows Torah while the wicked one does not. In CD 1:19 both the tsaddiq and rasha are mentioned and then in 1:20 it is implied that the righteous one walks in perfection.

In CD 11:21 the terms ד'לפ'ר and ל'ל'ומ occur in a quotation of Prov 15:8: It is of course impossible to be absolutely certain which text of Prov 15:8 the author of CD 11:21 was following, yet it is feasible that the text of Prov 15:8 read ל'ל'ומ instead of ד'לפ'ר. Schechter suggests that the text of CD 11:21 is corrupt and points to a confusion with Prov 15:29. However, another explanation is possible. It could be that the adjective ל'ל'ומ was substituted for ל'ומ because the contrast between ל'ומ and ל'ל'ומ was firmly entrenched in the thought of the author/redactor of this passage.

It can be stated with certainty that in the Damascus Document tsaddiq is the primary designation for those who are properly religious. Other terms such as seers of truth, the just and men of perfect

---

62 I follow the suggestion of K. G. Kuhn, Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten (Göttingen, 1960), p. 185, n. 1, that ד'לפ'ר stands for ד'לפ'ר. Cf. Lohse, Texte, p. 90, ד'לפ'ר; Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, p. 58, gives the translation "prayer of the righteous" thus treating ד'לפ'ר adjectivally; but Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 85, reads ד'לפ'ר.

63 Thus R. Kittel, ed., Biblia Hebraica (7th rev. ed.; Stuttgart, 1968). Schechter, Fragments of a Zadokite Work, p. 82, n. 3, notes that there is a discrepancy between the reading ל'ומ of Prov 15:8 and ל'ל'ומ in our text.

64 Ibid.

65 CD 2:13.

66 CD 20:2. The adjective ל'ומ also occurs in 3:6, 8:7 and 19:20 but in this case it does not refer to persons.
holiness also occur. Yet in passages which deal with the fundamental distinction between those who are and those who are not properly religious the terms used are tsaddiq and rasha.

Having established that tsedeq and tsaddiq are important terms in the Damascus Document, let us now inquire as to the use and meaning of the noun tsedaqah. This noun occurs only twice in CD. In CD 8:14/19:27 Deut 9:5 is quoted. The expression נֶפֶל, however, is not part of the quotation which in fact is relevant to the context.

The occurrence of the expression נֶפֶל in CD 20:20, on the other hand, is significant. As Ziesler points out, tsedaqah here refers to God's saving, gracious activity. As is clear from the foregoing discussion, this meaning does not overlap with the meaning of tsedeq. It is therefore hard to understand how Fiedler could reach the conclusion that in the Damascus Document tsedeq/tsedaqah has the Old Testament meaning of Heil. With respect to the Damascus Document it is clear that the nouns tsedeq and tsedaqah do not refer to a single concept. The two nouns are used with their own distinct meanings.

67 CD 20:2,5,7.
68 CD 7:5-8:21 of MS A is parallel to 19:1-34 of MS B. Consequently, the reference to tsedaqah in 8:14 and 19:27 must be counted as a single occurrence.
69 Ziesler, Righteousness, pp. 89f.
70 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 73f. Fiedler's analysis consists primarily of the assertion that CD 1:11, 5:11 and 20:32 are based on Hos 10:12; CD 1:1 on Is 51:7; CD 8:14 (19:27) on Deut 9:5; CD 20:11,33 on Deut 4:8; CD 1:16, 20:17 on OT thought in general. He fails, however, to see how the term tsedeq is actually used in the context of CD.
The noun tsedeqah refers to God's saving, gracious activity and in
comparison to tsedeq plays a relatively minor role in the Damascus
Document. Tsedeq, on the other hand, is the primary designation for
man's proper conduct.

3. The Manual of Discipline

In contrast to the Damascus Document where the adjective
tsedeq and the title mereh tsedeq play a significant role, these
expressions do not occur in the Manual of Discipline. The noun tsedeq,
however, does occur 17 times in 1QS in expressions other than the

71The statistics in this study are generally based on Kuhn's
Kokkordanz. With respect to 1QS 1:26, however, I have not followed
Kuhn's reading of ת"ם in, but that of Lohse, Texte, p. 6, ת"ם, and
Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 61, ת"ם. Since 1QS 1:24-26 and
CD 20:28-30 are parallel and the reading in CD 20:29 is definitely
ת"ם, Kuhn's reading ת"ם in 1QS 1:26 is not only doubtful on
textual but also on contextual grounds.

72A number of scholars suggest that the Teacher of Righteous-
ness is to be regarded as the author of various parts of 1QS. E.g.
Leanev, Rule of Qumran, p. 115, suggests that the Teacher of Righteous-
ness is the author of 1QS 10:1-11:22. Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings,
pp. 71f., suggests that even though the Teacher of Righteousness is
not explicitly mentioned in 1QS, this writing may basically derive from
him. R. Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen
Testament und den Qumran-Texten", TU 73 (1959), p. 635, on the other
hand, explains, "In 1QS, wo der 'Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit' noch nicht
gehalten wird, wartet man auf den Propheten und die beiden Messias,
ähnlich nach den Testimonia". Rowley, "Some Traces of the History of
the Qumran Sect", p. 539, argues that 1QS could not have been written
by the Teacher of Righteousness.

73This number includes 1QS 1:26 (see n. 71 above) and 1QS 9:14.
For 1QS 9:14 Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 69, reads פ"ב; Leanev,
Rule of Qumran, p. 231, gives the translation "the sons of Zadok" and
explains that in this case this is a title for the whole community.
However, the expression sons of Zadok most naturally refers to the
priesthood. Consequently, it has been suggested that פ"ב really stands for פ"ב; thus Lohse, Texte, p. 34, n. d; Kuhn,
Kokkordanz, p. 185, n. 2; W. H. Brownlee, The Dead Sea Manual of
title moreh ṣedeq.

In five instances 74 teṣe dq occurs as a noun in the absolute state. In 11 instances 75 it occurs in the genitive position of various construct-genitive expressions and in one case 76 it is preceded by a lacuna so that its grammatical usage remains undetermined.

In some of the construct-genitive expressions it is evident that teṣe dq is used substantively. For example, in QOS 4:9 the translation of לְיַדוֹת הָרְשָׁעָה as "in the service of righteousness" 77 or "in serving righteousness" 78 fits the context much better than the grammatically possible translation "in the right service". Also in QOS 9:5 the meaning expressed by the translation "an agreeable odour of righteousness" 79 best fits the context.

Another factor supporting the conclusion that teṣe dq can be used substantively while in the genitive position, is the analogy to the use

footnotes:

74 QOS 1:26; 4:24; 10:11; 11:15,16.
75 QOS 1:13; 2:24; 3:1,20,22; 4:2,4,9; 9:5,14,17.
76 QOS 10:26.
77 Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 80.
78 Leane, Rule of Qumran, p. 144.
79 Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 93.
of the terms truth and perversity. In 1QS 3:19 the expressions תורוהת והוולות and תורוהת והוולות must be translated as "the origin of truth" and "the origin of perversity" respectively, for a translation such as "the true origin" would not fit the context. Accordingly רוחות which occurs in the same context must mean "the spirits of truth and perversity". הנין and הלע are thus treated as nouns when they occur in the genitive position. Therefore the translations "sons of truth" (1QS 4:5, 6) and "sons of perversity" (1QS 3:21) must also be correct and by analogy the expression פֲּרָא in 1QS 3:20, 22 should mean "sons of righteousness".

These arguments in conjunction with the fact that in five instances תְּסֵדֶק does occur as a noun in the absolute state, do not necessarily prove that תְּסֵדֶק is always used substantively. These factors, however, do indicate that in general תְּסֵדֶק has the meaning righteousness rather than right. Consequently, all references to תְּסֵדֶק should be used in determining the meaning of the concept of righteousness in the Manual of Discipline.

Ziesler divides the 15 references to תְּסֵדֶק according to the following categories: man's general ethical behaviour, the behaviour

80 Ibid. p. 78.
81 C. Jeremias, Lehrer, pp. 309f., argues that in 1QS 1:13, 4:9 and 9:5 תְּסֵדֶק is used adjectively.
82 Ziesler, Righteousness, pp. 88-90, has 15 instead of 17 references because he does not include 1QS 1:26 and 9:14.
83 1QS 2:24; 4:9, 24; 9:5; 11:16.
of the covenant people, man's juridical behaviour, God's judgment, God's ordinances and God's righteousness as seen primarily as his saving, gracious activity.

There are a number of problems with this classification. The distinction between the general ethical and juridical meaning of tsedeq with respect to man's behaviour seems to be based primarily on the fact that the majority of passages listed as belonging to the former category are very vague in indicating the meaning of tsedeq. It must also be pointed out that Ziesler's distinction between man in general and the covenant people in particular is misleading. Although the covenant people are not specifically mentioned in some passages, it is by no means the case that such passages do not apply to them. Consequently, the only valid conclusion which can be drawn on the basis of the 10 passages where tsedeq refers to man (plus 1QS 1:26 and 9:14, the passages which Ziesler does not treat but which should be included) is that in these passages tsedeq refers to man's general conduct, both ethical and juridical.

Ziesler's presentation of God's righteousness is also somewhat misleading. In actual fact only 1QS 10:11 and 11:15 seem to refer

---

84 1QS 3:20, 22; 4:2.
86 1QS 3:1; 4:4.
87 1QS 1:13.
88 1QS 10:11; 11:15 (both legal and gracious).
specifically to God's righteousness.\(^8^9\) The three other passages, namely 1QS 1:13, 3:1 and 4:4, refer to God's righteousness in the form of his ordinances and judgment primarily with the intent of showing that this is to be a norm for man's conduct. In these passages, \textit{tsedeq}\(^9^0\) refers to man's behaviour as revealed by God. This meaning applies to all references to \textit{tsedeq} in 1QS except 10:11 and possibly also 10:26 and 11:15.

In 1QS 10:11, \textit{tsedeq} definitely refers to God's saving, gracious activity.\(^9^0\) In 1QS 10:26, \textit{tsedeq} could also have this meaning. The decision as to whether it does depends largely on how the lacuna before it is filled.

With respect to 1QS 11:15, Ziesler notes that the meaning of \textit{tsedeq} could be both legal and gracious.\(^9^1\) However, since \(_caption\) is parallel to \(_caption\) it is very probable that the meaning tends more to the legal than the gracious side.

Before discussing the overall significance of the use of \textit{tsedeq} in 1QS, it is necessary to inquire into the meaning of the noun \textit{tsedaqah}. This noun occurs 12 times in 1QS. Three times it refers to man's righteousness and nine times to God's righteousness.\(^9^2\)

The passages in which \textit{tsedaqah} is used with respect to man are

\(^8^9\) Fiedler, "Der Begriff", II, p. 77, n. 116, claims that \textit{tsedeq} refers specifically to God's righteousness only in 1QS 1:13 and 11:15.


\(^9^2\) Cf. \textit{ibid.}, pp. 88-90.
1QS 1:5, 5:4 and 8:2. It must be noted that in these passages tsedeqah occurs as part of a series of terms which refer to man's conduct.

1QS 5:4 and 8:2 seem to be loose quotations of Micah 6:8, that is, the list of virtues given in Micah 6:8 is expanded to include tsedeqah. It is unlikely that tsedeqah refers to man's gracious activity analogous to God's gracious activity (e.g. 1QS 11:12) or to man's strict justice analogous to God's strict justice (e.g. 1QS 10:25) since terms with such meanings already occur in the lists, namely דמשק and דבש, respectively.

As will be shown in the discussion of the Tannaitic literature, the most common meaning of tsedeqah during the Tannaitic period was almsgiving. For want of a better explanation, let us suggest that in 1QS 5:4 and 8:2 tsedeqah refers to almsgiving. This meaning may also apply to 1QS 1:5, although in this list only דמשק and דבש occur in addition to tsedeqah.

The nine occurrences of tsedeqah referring to God are classified as follows by Ziesler. 1QS 1:21; 10:23, 25; 11:3, 12, 14(twice) refer

---

93 Ibid., pp. 89f., Ziesler suggests that in 1QS 5:4 and 8:2 tsedeqah refers to the behaviour of the covenant people. With the possible exception of 4Q51 (39) 1:18 where tsedeqah is used to refer to the graciousness of angels, Ziesler claims that there is no passage in the Dead Sea Scrolls where tsedeqah has the connotation of benevolence in the sense of almsgiving. He agrees with C. F. D. Moule who suggested to him privately "that as a monastic group, eschewing private property, having a common life which would render 'charity' unnecessary within the sect, and having small concern with the material welfare of outsiders, the covenanters would have little scope for almsgiving." Ibid., p. 90, n. 5. However, even though the social conditions reflected in 1QS and CD are admittedly different, it should nevertheless be noted that CD 14:13ff. specifically deals with funds allotted to charity.

94 Righteousness, pp. 88f.
to God's righteousness in the sense of his saving, gracious activity with 10:25 and 11:14 also having legal overtones. IQS 11:5, 6 are listed with examples from IQH under the general category of God's righteousness in the sense of his acting reliably, faithfully, within his own covenant. Ziesler notes, however, that in the case of the IQS passages there is a strong note of graciousness. It thus appears that the latter two passages should be included in the saving, gracious activity category. IQS 10:25, on the other hand, should not be included in this category since the legal aspect seems to dominate. It thus appears that in all passages except IQS 10:25, *tsedagah* refers primarily to God's saving, gracious activity.

In IQS 10:25 *tsedagah* refers to God's strict justice; for this passage states, "... with prudent knowledge I will fence [it] in with a firm boundary", to keep the faith and the law strictly according to the righteousness of God." The meaning of *tsedagah* in this passage is identical with the meaning of *tsedeq* in IQS 1:13, 3:1 and 4:4. In these passages both terms refer to the strict justice of God which serves as a norm for man's conduct.

It is thus clear that there is some overlap in the meanings of *tsedeq* and *tsedagah*. Both terms are used to refer to God's saving, gracious activity and to God's strict justice which is to be a norm for man's conduct. It should be noted that IQS 10:11, where *tsedeq* definitely refers to God's saving, gracious activity, and IQS 10:26

---

95 Up to this point the translation is that of Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, p. 235. The rest of the translation is that of Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, p. 100.
and 11:15, where tsedeq may also have such a meaning, all occur in that part of IQS which is generally known as the Hymn (IQS 10:9-11:22). 96 Although there is no consensus of opinion as to the number of literary sources from which IQS has been compiled, it is generally acknowledged that the Hymn represents one such source. 97 The overlap in meaning between tsedeq and tsadaqah in IQS is therefore primarily due to the fact that IQS incorporates various sources.

The overlap in meaning is by no means so great that it is possible to treat tsedeq and tsadaqah as referring to a single concept. Fiedler's conclusion that in IQS the basic meaning of tsedeq/tsadaqah is Heil 98 is therefore misleading. Although there is some overlap, it is nevertheless evident that tsedeq primarily refers to God's and man's righteousness insofar as God's law is a norm for man's conduct and tsadaqah is primarily used to refer to God's saving, gracious activity.

While Fiedler's conclusion is unwarranted, the fact that there is an overlap in meaning between tsedeq and tsadaqah does indicate that the final redactor of IQS was not perturbed by the lack of preciseness in the use of these terms. Consequently, the question must be posed whether tsedeq plays as significant a role in IQS as in CD where it was used as an important technical term.

96 Leaney, Rule of Qumran, p. 236, designates IQS 10:8b-11:15a as the Hymn and 11:15b-22 as the Benediction. Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 70, refers to IQS 10:1-11:22 as the Hymn.

97 Cf. Becker, Heil Gottesa, pp. 39-42. Leaney, Rule of Qumran, p. 115, suggests that the author of IQS 10:1-11:22 is the same as the author of IQH.

98 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 75.
As will be shown in the following discussion, tsedeq in fact does not play as decisive a role in 1QS as in CD. This conclusion, however, is not based so much on the fact of the overlapping meanings of tsedeq and tsegagah as on the fact that tsedeq plays a relatively minor role in 1QS when compared to the term 'emet (truth).

It has been noted by a number of scholars that the terms tsedeq and 'emet are often used synonymously in the Dead Sea Scrolls.\(^9\) While this is undoubtedly true, it should not be concluded that these two terms are treated with equal importance in the various writings. In both 1QS\(^1\) and CD\(^2\) a number of passages show that tsedeq is synonymous with 'emet. Nonetheless it is clear that in CD tsedeq is the primary term used to define man's proper conduct while in 1QS this role is played by 'emet.

A simple word count points to this conclusion. In 1QS tsedeq occurs 17 times while 'emet occurs 43 times. In CD, on the other hand, tsedeq occurs 17 times while 'emet occurs only four times.

The conclusion that tsedeq and 'emet are the primary terms used to define man's conduct in CD and 1QS respectively is corroborated by the fact that in the passages in which both 'emet and tsedeq occur, in CD tsedeq plays the more important role while in 1QS 'emet does.

---

\(^9\) Cf. Ibid., II, p. 81, n. 126; G. Jeremias, Lehrer, p. 311, points out that an original 'emet was replaced by a tsedeq in 1QH 2:4.


In CD *emet* occurs only once independently of *tsedeq*, that is, in CD 2:13 the "seers of truth"\(^{102}\) (דוקי כארוב) are mentioned. In the other passages *emet* and *tsedeq* are always mentioned together; *tsedeq* always being mentioned first. \(^{103}\) The order is especially significant in CD 20:29f., for in the parallel passage in 1QS 1:26, *emet* is mentioned first.

In 1QS 1:13 the noun *tsedeq* occurs only after it has been stated in 1QS 1:11f. that the volunteers are to cling to God's truth and purify their understanding in the truth of the precepts of God. In 1QS 2:24 *tsedeq* occurs in a list of expressions which begins with "the Community of truth". It appears that *emet* is the basic term in this passage.

In 1QS 9:5 "odour of righteousness" is parallel to "perfection of way" with both expressions being subordinate to the idea that everything is to be "in accordance with eternal truth" (1QS 9:3). Even the reference to God's righteousness in 1QS 11:15 is not without parallel, for in 11:4 there is a reference to God's truth.

In the section dealing with the two spirits (1QS 3:13-4:26) there are a total of six references to *tsedeq*. \(^{104}\) Here, too, however, it is *emet* rather than *tsedeq* which is of prime significance. The

\(^{102}\) Translated as "Seher der Wahrheit" by Lohse, Texte, p. 69; cf. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, p. 8. The translations of Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 124, "He showed the truth" and Vermes, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 98, "He proclaimed the truth", are not as accurate.

\(^{103}\) CD 3:15; 20:29f., 31.

\(^{104}\) 1QS 3:20, 22; 4:2, 4, 9, 24.
main theme of this section is the interaction of the spirits of truth and perversity. The term ḫemet occurs 15 times in this section. Tsedeq is simply one of the synonyms for ḫemet. This is particularly evident in IQS 4:23ff.: 

Till now the Spirits of truth and perversity battle in the hearts of every man; (24) (they) walk in Wisdom and Folly. And according to each man's share of Truth and Righteousness, so does he hate Perversity. And according to his portion in the lot of Perversity, and (according to) the wickedness (which is) in him, so does (25) he abominate Truth. 105

In the above passage it is clear that in v. 23 truth (נדי) and perversity (רֵעַ) are placed in opposition. Then in the first part of v. 24 truth (נדי) and righteousness (כְּנֵי) are contrasted with perversity (נרָע). Finally at the end of v. 24 we return to the original contrast as stated in v. 23. In this passage tsedeq is a synonym for ḫemet or simply a part of the concept of truth.

Leamey's analysis of IQS 3:13–4:26 lends support to the conclusion that ḫemet rather than tsedeq is of primary significance in this section. He suggests that in this section of IQS "the thought certainly oscillates between two sets of terms, truth/perversity, light/darkness". 106 The fact that ḫemet rather than tsedeq is of prime importance in this section attains added significance, for as Leamey has pointed out "This passage is given a heading (3.13ff.)

105 Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 82.
106 Leamey, Rule of Qumran, p. 37.
which shows its fundamental importance to the men of the sect. 107

With respect to the concept of truth, Leaney goes on to explain that in 1QS "'To know the truth' is a state of mind parallel with the action, 'to keep the Law'; and 'to practise the truth' . . . means 'to keep the Law'." 108 As was shown above, in CD such a meaning is attached to tsedeq.

The expressions used in 1QS to designate those who are properly religious also indicate that 'emet rather than tsedeq is the term designating the proper conduct of man. In the Damascus Document there was no doubt that the term tsaddiq was the principal designation for the one who was properly religious. In 1QS this term does not occur. The expression "sons of righteousness" (יִתְבָּרֵן), on the other hand, does occur three times in 1QS. 109 It is, however, by no means the principal designation for those who are properly religious. Other terms such as sons of truth 110 and sons of light 111 seem to be much more important. It is these expressions which, with their respective counterparts, sons of perversity 112 and sons of darkness, 113 relate

108 Leaney, Rule of Qumran, p. 46.
109 1QS 3:20, 22; 9:14. With respect to 9:14 see n. 73 above.
110 תְּבַרֵן, 1QS 4:5, 6.
111 כַּפְּרֵי אָדָם, 1QS 1:9; 2:16; 3:13, 24, 25.
112 כַּפְּרֵי אָדָם, 1QS 3:21; כַּפְּרֵי פִּסְח, 1QS 5:2, 10; 8:13; 9:17.
113 כַּפְּרֵי תְּשׁוּפָה, 1QS 1:10.
most closely to the terms truth/perversity (נ(setting) and light/darkness (ורה/שינה) around which the thought of 1QS revolves.

Let us now see how the use of the words connected with the root ֶטֶדֶב in the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls compares to that of CD and 1QS. In other words, do the remaining writings reflect the usage of CD where ֶטֶדֶב is the principal designation defining proper conduct and ֶטֶדֶב is the primary term used to designate those who are properly religious insofar as they practise ֶטֶדֶב, or do they reflect the usage of 1QS where the term ֶכֶת rather than ֶטֶדֶב designates proper conduct?

As was noted previously, the purpose of this study is not only to investigate the meaning of the words connected with the root ֶטֶדֶב but also their overall significance in the thought expressed by the various writings. Since many of the writings are either very short and/or preserved in a very fragmentary condition, they do not provide suitable research material for such a study. However, in order to gain a better understanding of how extensive the use of the words connected with the root ֶטֶדֶב is in the Dead Sea Scrolls, we will nevertheless briefly deal with this material before turning to those writings which are more significant with respect to the purpose of this study.

4. Miscellaneous Writings

In the Micah Commentary (IQpMic) there is a reference to the
Teacher of Righteousness. The great number of lacunae, however, make it impossible to reconstruct the context in which this title is found.

In Florilegium (4QFl) 2:4 the expression מְגַיִּרְנָה occurs. Since the expression is surrounded by lacunae, it is not possible to determine how this term is used.

In Patriarchal Blessings (4QPatr) line 3 the title פִּיטֵנָה מִשְׁמָה is found. It is clear from line 5 that the פִּיטֵנָה מִשְׁמָה "has kept [....] the Law with the members of the Community". Consequently, tsedeq is related to the concept of the law in this passage. Since this writing consists of only six lines, it is impossible to arrive at a conclusion as to the overall significance of the concept of righteousness in the thought of the author of this writing.

In Testimonia (4QTest), the Commentary on Nahum (4QpNah) and the Rule Anexe (1QS) neither the nouns tsedeq nor 'emet are found. In the Book of Blessings (1QSb), on the other hand, the nouns

114 פִּיטֵנָה מִשְׁמָה, F 8-10, line 6, Did., I, p. 78. J. T. Milik, "Fragments d'un Midrash de Michée dans les Manuscrits de Qumran", RB 59 (1952), p. 415, argues that the reading מְגַיִּרְנָה instead of מְגַיִּרְנָה is an intentional "intensification du nom du Maître, par le pluriel." But G. Jeremias, Lehrer, p. 147, is probably right in asserting that מְגַיִּרְנָה is simply an orthographic variant for מְגַיִּרְנָה. He points to the similar usage in 1QM 19:3 (משה for משה) and 1QH 7:17 (משה for משה).

115 Cf. Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 278; G. Jeremias, Lehrer, p. 147.

116 Lohse, Texte, p. 258.

117 Ibid., p. 246.

118 Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 315.
tsedeq119 and 'emet120 each occur three times. In 1QSb 3:24 tsedeq and 'emet are used synonymously. It is difficult to determine which term has the greater significance in this writing. It should be noted that although only parts of five columns remain, this writing probably consisted of more than five columns.121 Caution should thus be exercised in arriving at any definite conclusions about this writing until a greater part of the text has come to light.122

5. The Thanksgiving Hymns

In 1QH there are 14 occurrences of the noun tsedeq. In five instances tsedeq is specifically used with reference to man; referring to man's ethical behaviour in 1QH 2:13, 5:22, 6:19 and 16:5 and to man's legal activity in 1QH 6:4. In eight passages tsedeq refers to God. In 1QH 1:23, 26, 30; 9:33 and possibly in 10:36 it refers to God's judgment and punishment of man. In 1QH 4:40 and 13:19 it refers to

120 1QSb 1:2; 2:28; 3:24.
121 Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 110, n. 1, shows that there must have been at least a sixth column.
122 There are further references to words connected with the root tsedeq in the following passages: The noun tsedeq occurs in:
God's deeds in general while in 1QH 11:18 it specifically refers to God's saving, gracious activity. 123

It was noted with respect to 1QS that the attempt to draw a clear cut distinction between God's as opposed to man's righteousness was impossible since the two concepts were closely related. In the case of 1QH, on the other hand, such a distinction is possible. This does not mean that there is no relationship at all between the two concepts. For example, in 1QH 1:26f. ṭsedeq is used in a passage which contrasts God's and man's behavior and there certainly is a point of contact between the way man (1QH 6:4) and God (1QH 1:23,30) reprove with righteousness. But the view that God's righteousness is the norm for man's righteousness is not as intrinsic to the thought of 1QH as it is in CD and 1QS.

The reason for the lack of uniformity in the use of ṭsedeq in 1QH may very well stem from the fact that 1QH is a collection of hymns which do not reflect a uniform background. Because of the problem of the lack of homogeneity it is difficult if not impossible to draw a general conclusion as to the relative importance of the terms ṭsedeq and ḫemet in 1QH. The fact that there are 53 occurrences of ḫemet as opposed to 14 occurrences of ṭsedeq and that these two nouns are treated as synonyms in a number of cases 124 seems to indicate that

123 The meaning of the remaining reference to ṭsedeq in 1QH 2:4 is uncertain because of lacunae in the text.

124 In 1QH 1:30; 2:13f.; 4:40 and 16:4f., ṭsedeq and ḫemet have parallel meanings and 1QH 2:4 shows that they could be used interchangeably since an original ḫemet is replaced by a ṭsedeq in this passage.
\textit{j'emet} is a more important term in QH than tsedeq. This conclusion
is in actual fact misleading for there are significant variations in
the use of these terms among the hymns.

QH 7:26-33 represents a hymn which except for some minor
lacunae has been preserved in its entirety.\footnote{\textit{Cf. G. Morawe, Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von
Qumrân (ThA 16; Berlin, 1960), p. 136; Holm-Nielsen, \textit{Hodayot}, p. 138;
Dupont-Sommer, \textit{Essene Writings}, p. 224.}} In this hymn the terms
tsedeq, tsedaqaah and tsaddiq do not occur. There are, however, two
references to God's truth (7:26,28) and one reference to the sons of
God's truth (7:29f.). Consequently, in this hymn \textit{j'emet} is the term
which above all stands for that which is right.

QH 1:3-39 represents the major part of a hymn whose beginning
and end is missing.\footnote{\textit{Thus Morawe, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 139. \textit{Cf. Holm-Nielsen, \textit{Hodayot},
pp. 17ff.}}} In the preserved portion of this hymn the noun
\textit{j'emet} occurs twice (1:27,30) while the noun tsedeq is found three times
(1:23,26,30). The adjective tsaddiq is found in 1:35, designating
those who are properly religious. It appears that in this hymn tsedeq
rather than \textit{j'emet} is the primary term designating that which is right.

Holm-Nielsen has noted that the two hymns mentioned above make
very little use of Scripture.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 28, 140.} Consequently, the variation in the
use of the terms tsedeq and \textit{j'emet} has a basis other than the imitation
of scriptural modes of expression.

Like tsedeq, the noun tsedaqaah also has a number of meanings.
in 1QH. In 1QH 4:37; 7:19; 11:31; 16:9; 17:17,20(twice) and perhaps also in 11:7 and 14:16 tsedeqah refers to God's saving, gracious activity. In five instances, however, the meaning of tsedeqah diverges greatly from that of mercy. In 1QH 1:26f. "works of righteousness" are contrasted with "service of iniquity". In both 1QH 4:30 and 31 tsedeqah refers to man's conduct, in the sense that it should be perfect. The expression "the paths of righteousness" in 1QH 7:14 also refers to man's ethical conduct.

In 1QH 7:17 tsedeqah means the very opposite of mercy.

Although there are some lacunae in 7:17f., the general meaning of the passage is clear. It is stated that one is not delivered by righteous deeds (ηπεταίρια) but by God's grace (τὸν θῶν). Righteous deeds are thus clearly distinguished from grace. 128

The adjective tsaddiq occurs eight times in 1QH. The occurrence in 1QH 16:1 is insignificant since it is surrounded by lacunae. In 1QH 1:36, 4:38, 7:12, 15:15 and 16:10 tsaddiq is used to refer to man. In 4:38 and 7:12 the righteous one (tsaddiq) is contrasted to the wicked one (rasha'). In 1QH 1:36 the tsaddiqim are defined as the perfect of way and in 15:15 the one who walks according to the covenant is said to be righteous.

On the basis of the passages just discussed, it appears that the use of the adjective tsaddiq in 1QH is parallel to that of CD. There is, however, one additional use of tsaddiq in 1QH which is not found in CD, namely in 1QH 12:19 and 14:15 God is described as being righteous.

128 The occurrences of the noun tsedeqah in 1QH 8:2 and 18:17 have not been discussed since these passages are filled with lacunae.
(tsaddiq). It should also be noted that, while in CD the term tsaddiq is the principal designation for those who are properly religious, this does not seem to be the case in IQH. For example, the expression "seers of truth" occurs only once in CD (2:13), in IQH, on the other hand, the expression "sons of truth" occurs five times and "men of truth" twice. Because of the problem of the lack of homogeneity of IQH, no general conclusions can be drawn as to the primary designation for those who are properly religious.

In conclusion it can only be stated that with respect to the use of tsaedaq, tsaedagh, 'emet and tsaddiq in IQH, there are some factors which suggest an affinity with IQS, while other factors point to an affinity with CD. The lack of uniformity in usage is indicative of the fact that rather than representing a literary unity, the hymns in IQH represent the thought of various authors during various stages of the development of the Dead Sea Sect. Although a much more thorough study of this problem could be made, this has not been attempted in this study, for the final result of such an investigation would of necessity be inconclusive since the majority of the hymns have not been preserved in their entirety.


130 IQH 14:2 and according to Lohse, Texte, p. 116, also in 2:14, מַעֲשֶׂה [םַעֲשֶׂה].

131 Morawe, Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumrân, p. 161, shows that only six out of a total of 33 hymns are preserved in their entirety.
6. The War Scroll

In IQM there are seven occurrences of the noun tsedeq. In five cases the meaning appears to correspond to the primary meaning of tsedeq in IQS, that is, tsedeq refers to man's conduct insofar as this conduct is in agreement with God's righteousness. God's righteousness in this case refers to his will as made known specifically through his ordinances.

In the two remaining passages tsedeq refers solely to God's activity. In IQM 18:8 פְּרָ֣עֲכָהּ refers to God's saving, gracious activity. In IQM 4:6 the expression פְּרָ֣עֲכָהּ occurs as one of the titles which are written on the banners of the four levite families. Since פְּרָ֣עֲכָהּ is one of the other titles, Ziesler is probably right in assuming that tsedeq here too refers to God's saving, gracious activity.

The two meanings of tsedeq found in IQS thus also occur in IQM.

---

132 IQM 1:8; 3:6; 13:3,10; 17:8; but the reading in 1:8 is not certain. The lacuna is completed as follows by various scholars: פְּרָ֣עֲכָהּ by Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 95; פְּרָ֣עֲכָהּ by Lohse, Texte, p. 180; פְּרָ֣עֲכָהּ by Yadin, The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, E.t. by Batya and Chaim Rabin (Oxford, 1962), p. 259; "Then [the sons of righteousness]" by Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 170. The reading in 13:10 is also uncertain. While Yadin, Scroll of the War, p. 323; Lohse, Texte, p. 210 and Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 104, all fill the lacuna as פְּרָ֣עֲכָהּ; Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 189, has "all the angels of justice" and Gaster, Dead Sea Scriptures, p. 298, has "all works of righteousness".

133 Cf. Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 88.

134 So Yadin, Scroll of the War, p. 274, n. 6.

135 Righteousness, p. 88.
Similarly to 1QS it is also the case in 1QM that tsedeq is not the primary designation for that which is right. There are 12 occurrences\(^{136}\) of 'emet and it appears that this term is more significant than tsedeq.

The noun tsedagah does not occur in 1QM. Also the adjective tsaddiq is not found. Although there may be a reference to the sons of righteousness in 1QM 13:10\(^{137}\), it is obvious that the primary expression for those who are properly religious is sons of light\(^{138}\) and those who are not, sons of darkness.\(^{139}\) The expression sons of truth is also found in 1QM.\(^{140}\)

On the basis of the foregoing data it is possible to conclude that the use of the words connected with the root ts-d-q in 1QM shows a greater affinity to 1QS than to CD.

7. The Habakkuk Commentary

In 1QpHab the nouns tsedeq and tsedagah occur six times\(^{141}\)

---

\(^{136}\) 1QM 1:16; 4:6; 11:14; 13:1, 2, 9, 10 (twice), 12, 15; 14:12; 17:8.

\(^{137}\) See n. 132 above.

\(^{138}\) The expression יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs in 1QM 1:1, 3, 9, 11, 13 and perhaps also in the lacunae in 13:16 (cf. Lohse, Texte, p. 210) and 1:16 (cf. Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 96).

\(^{139}\) The expression יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs in 1QM 1:1, 7, 10, 16; 3:6, 9; 13:16; 14:17; 16:11 and possibly in the lacuna in 1:15 (cf. Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 95).

\(^{140}\) 1QM 17:8 and possibly in 1:16 where Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 96, fills the lacuna as הָדָּקָן יִשְׂרָאֵל.

\(^{141}\) 1QpHab 1:13; 5:10; 7:6; 8:3; 9:10; 11:5.
and once respectively with their use being restricted to the title Teacher of Righteousness. The use of the adjective tsaddiq is restricted to quotations from the text of Habakkuk. 143

It appears that the variation in the use of tsedeq and tsedaqah in the title Teacher of Righteousness does not reflect an intentional attempt to distinguish between two distinct titles. According to 1QpHab 2:2 the מורה מצדיק is the one who teaches things which he has directly received from the mouth of God and as such is contrasted to the Man of Lies (אציו חיגה). Similarly in 5:10f. the מורה מצדיק is contrasted to the Man of Lies and in 7:4f. it is stated that God has made known all the mysteries to the מורה מצדיק. Consequently, the functions of the מורה מצדיק and the מורה משובח seem to be identical. 144 The reading מורה משובח in 1QpHab 2:2 may therefore either rest on a simple copying error 145 or it may be indicative of the fact that the

142 1QpHab 2:2; Habermann, The Scrolls, p. 43, has the reading מורה מצדיק. M. Burrows, ed., The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark’s Monastery (New Haven, 1950), I, plate LV, shows the necessity for a letter following the p. מורה מצדיק, and the following scholars have suggested the reading מורה מצדיק: Lohse, Texte, p. 228, מורה [מ] צדיק; Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 186, מורה מצדיק; K. Elliger, Beilage zu "Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer" (Tübingen, 1953), p. 4, מורה מצדיק.

143 Hab 1:4 is quoted in 1QpHab 1:12, and Hab 1:13 in 1QpHab 5:9. Possibly there is another occurrence of the adjective tsaddiq in 1QpHab 7:17, for the lacuna should be filled with Hab 2:4.

144 It should be noted that in 1QpHab the title מורה מצדיק is written with the definite article while in CD it is not. It is generally agreed that the references in 1QpHab and CD refer to the same title. Cf. G. Jeremias, Lehrer, pp. 308ff.

145 Thus K. Elliger, Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen, 1953), p. 168, n. d., suggests that in 1QpHab 2:2, just
title Teacher of Righteousness was not such a well established technical term in the thought of the author/redactor of 1QpHab as might be expected.

The latter possibility is supported by the fact that the noun tšedeq does not play a prominent role in 1QpHab. As mentioned above, it does not occur outside of the title Teacher of Righteousness. Consequently, it is by no means a proven fact that tšedeq is the primary term designating what is right. Such a role could very well be attributed to šemet. In 1QpHab 8:9 it is noted that when the Wicked Priest first came, he was called by the name of truth. In this context šemet is a term designating everything that is right. The term šemet also occurs in 1QpHab 7:10-12 where it is stated that the men of truth and doers of Torah do not slacken in the service of truth.

In the above passage those who are properly religious are called men of truth and doers of Torah. In 1QpHab 8:1 the doers of Torah are mentioned again and it is made clear that they are the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness. It should be noted that the expression doers of Torah in 8:1 is substituted for the term tšaddiq of Hab 2:4 which in all probability filled the lacuna in 1QpHab 7:17. 146 It thus appears that the primary term for those who are properly

---

as in 1:13, 5:10 and 7:4, there originally was the reading פָּתֹם נַרְדְּשָׁ. The reading in 2:2 resulted because of a confusion with the definite article, "Vermutlich erklärt sie sich aus dem Versehen eines Abschreibens, der das vor das Wort gehörende n (des Artikels) hinten setzte, so dass die Nachtragung des Artikels über der Zeile notig wurde." 146

146 Cf. Lohne, Texte, p. 236.
religious is not tsaddiq.

It can therefore be concluded that although 1QpHab like CD makes use of the title Teacher of Righteousness, the overall importance attached to the terms tesedeq and tsaddiq in 1QpHab is more in line with that of 1QS than CD.

8. The Commentary on Ps 37

In 4QpPa37 the nouns tesedeq and tesadqah do not occur but the adjective tsaddiq occurs twice in the actual commentary and five times in biblical quotations.

Since it is surrounded by lacunae, the expression גַּם יִשְׂרָאֵל in 4QpPa37 2:26 does not elucidate the usage of the adjective tsaddiq. In 4QpPa37 4:8 the expression מְדוּנֶה occurs in the course of the interpretation of Ps 37:32 where it is stated that "the wicked watches the righteous" (יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל). In the interpretation יִשְׂרָאֵל is said to refer to the Wicked Priest and מְדוּנֶה to the righteous one (מְדוּנֶה) whom the Wicked Priest is attempting to kill.

Let us now see how some other occurrences of the term tsaddiq which are quoted from Ps 37 are interpreted. Twice tsaddiq is said to

---

147 4QpPa37 2:26; 4:8.

148 Ps 37:12 is quoted in 4QpPa37 2:12; Ps 37:16 in 2:21; Ps 37:21 in 3:9; Ps 37:29 in 4:2; Ps 37:32 in 4:7. It is also probable that Ps 37:17 is quoted in the lacuna in 4QpPa37 2:23; Ps 37:22 in 3:17; Ps 37:30 in 4:3; Ps 37:39 in 4:19.


150 Lohse, Texte, p. 276.
refer to the doers of Torah\textsuperscript{151} and once to the congregation of the poor.\textsuperscript{152}

There are also some lacunae which can be filled with the proper quotations from Ps 37 with a high degree of certainty. On the basis of these passages тaздaдdь is interpreted to refer to the men of Cod's good pleasure\textsuperscript{153}, to the teacher\textsuperscript{154}, indirectly to the righteous themselves\textsuperscript{155} and to someone who spoke the truth.\textsuperscript{156}

On the basis of these passages it can be concluded that the term тaздaдdь is by no means the most prominent term designating those who are properly religious. Instead of making use of this term, 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} on many occasions replaces the term тaздaдdь of the biblical quotations by other terms in the commentary.

Let us now turn to the question of the significance of the

\textsuperscript{151}Ps 37:12 and 16 are quoted in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 2:12 and 21 respectively and the doers of Torah are mentioned in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 2:14 and 22.

\textsuperscript{152}Ps 37:21 is quoted in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 3:9 and the רוח הבכורה are mentioned in 3:10. The term ד'pרъ of Ps 37:29 is quoted in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 4:2, however, in this instance the lacuna in the text prevents a determination of how this term is interpreted.

\textsuperscript{153}Ps 37:17 is quoted in the lacuna in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 2:23 and the רָזִיעַ are mentioned in 2:24f.

\textsuperscript{154}Ps 37:22 is quoted in the lacuna in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 3:17 and the הָרָזִיעַ is mentioned in 3:19.

\textsuperscript{155}Ps 37:39 is quoted in the lacuna in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 4:19 and the 3rd person plural suffix of the verbs ד'pרъ and ד'pמ[ם] in 4:21 refers back to ד'pרъ of 4:19.

\textsuperscript{156}Ps 37:30 is quoted in the lacuna in 4QPs\textsuperscript{37} 4:3 and in 4:4 it is stated that the interpretation concerns the רָזִיעַ זָאוֹמָהךְ.
noun tsedeq in 4QPs37. As was pointed out above the nouns tsedaqah and tsedeq are not found in this writing. However, the term דודו followed by a lacuna occurs three times and it has been suggested that in each of the three cases the lacuna should be filled with the noun tsedeq. For example, Lohse \(^{157}\) gives the following readings:

4QPs37 3:15, מזרע [תורה; \(^{158}\) 3:19, מזרע [תורה; \(^{159}\) 4:27, מזרע [תורה]. \(^{160}\)

Allegro has added 4QPs37 4:8 as another passage referring to the Teacher of Righteousness. He restores the text as follows: \(^{161}\)

A number of scholars have followed Allegro's suggestion. \(^{162}\) Carmignac \(^{163}\) specifically lists this passage among those which provide the best evidence for the proper description of the Teacher of Righteousness. It now appears that Allegro's restoration of the text may have been faulty, for another restoration in which the term מזרע cannot occur seems more probable. According to Lohse the text

\(^{157}\) Texte, pp. 272-279.

\(^{158}\) Cf. DJD, V, p. 44.

\(^{159}\) Ibid.

\(^{160}\) Ibid., V, p. 45.

\(^{161}\) J. M. Allegro, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect", JBL 75 (1956), p. 94. It should be noted that the method of citing passages in 4QPs37 is that followed by Lohse, Texte, pp. 272-279. Allegro refers to 4QPs37 4:8 as pPs 37:32-33 line 2 or Fragment II,2.

\(^{162}\) E.g. Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 272; Vermes, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 245.

should read. This passage could thus refer to the righteous one rather than to the Teacher of Righteousness. Since it appears that scholars were probably wrong in the case of 4Qps37 4:8, care should be taken in the restoration of the text in 4Qps37 3:15,19 and 4:27 where the term occurs. For example, with respect to 3:15 it should be made clear that is a restoration of the text. It cannot be assumed as G. Jeremias has done that is the only possible reading, especially since in CD 20:1 the expression occurs. It should also be noted that rather than could be the primary designation for that which is right. The noun is only postulated as occurring in 4QPs37, while the noun in fact is found in this writing. In 4Qps37 3:15ff. it is stated that God leads the teacher in his truth and in 4:3f. the interpretation of Ps 37:30, a passage in which the adjective occurs, makes reference to someone who spoke the truth.

Since the text of 4Qps37 has not come down to us in a good

---

164 Lohse, Texte, p. 276; cf. DJD, V, p. 45. I have not been able to ascertain on what basis Lohse and DJD were able to offer a more complete text than the one given by Allegro.

165 G. Jeremias, Lehrer, p. 147, does not indicate in his translation of 4Qps37 3:15 that the term is not found in the text.

166 Lohse, Texte, p. 276; cf. DJD, V, p. 44.

167 Lohse, Texte, p. 276; cf. DJD, V, p. 45.
state of preservation, all the facts concerning the use of the words connected with the root *ts-d-q* may never be known. This much is certain, however, it is not a foregone conclusion that righteousness is viewed as an important concept in this writing. As a matter of fact, it appears that in the Damascus Document the concept of righteousness plays a far more significant role than in 4QpPs37.

9. Conclusion: The Concept of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls

On the basis of the foregoing study it is evident that the Dead Sea Scrolls do not display uniformity in the use of the terms *tsedeq*, *tsedagah* and *tsaddiq*. The divergence in usage is particularly evident when comparing the Damascus Document and the Manual of Discipline. Although the content and purpose are markedly similar in these two writings, insofar as they are both rule books, it is only in the Damascus Document that the term *tsedeq* plays a vital role in the formulation of the message expressed by this writing. In the Manual of Discipline *tsedeq* is subordinated to *jemet*. Consequently, while it is possible, or even necessary, to talk in terms of a concept of righteousness with respect to the Damascus Document, one is forced to talk about a concept of truth when dealing with the Manual of Discipline. As a matter of fact, it appears that of all the writings comprising the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is only in the Damascus Document that *tsedeq* is used as a major conceptual term.

What is the concept of righteousness in the Damascus Document? In CD the term righteousness, *tsedeq*, is raised to the position of a
technical term, or possibly in the eyes of the ordinary members of the community to the level of a popular slogan, symbolizing everything that is right in the sight of God.

The members of the community know righteousness only through the teaching of the Teacher of Righteousness, for the content of his teaching is righteousness. The Teacher of Righteousness makes known and interprets God's righteousness (tsedeq) which is primarily understood in terms of God's ordinances which were revealed to the community in the Land of Damascus and are referred to as the New Covenant. God's righteousness understood in this way is to be the norm for man's righteousness. Man's righteousness is understood in terms of the ideal of perfect adherence to God's ordinances. From man's point of view, righteousness thus refers to perfect conduct in the sight of God, especially when viewed with reference to the sectarian use of the expression "precepts of righteousness" (מִצְוֹת ḳָדְם).

The man who strives to live according to this ideal is righteous (tsaddiq) and as such is sharply contrasted to the person who is wicked (rasha') and does not live according to tsedeq.

Although the ideal expressed in the Damascus Document is perfection of way, it is clear that this goal is not actualized in everyday life. This is evident from the fact that the possibility of deviating from the path of perfection has been taken into account and specific punishments for specific transgressions are outlined.168

168 See especially CD 14:19ff. Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 160, refers to this passage as "the penal code".
It should be noted that although God's saving, gracious activity (tsedeq) is mentioned in the Damascus Document\textsuperscript{169} this concept is not employed with reference to the gap between the norm and man's actual performance. Transgressions are punished. The concept of righteousness (tsedeq) stresses the ideal of perfection of way.\textsuperscript{170} Man's tsedeq is not dependent on God's tsedeq.

Consequently, it is evident that the principle stated by Fiedler\textsuperscript{171} that man can do tsedeq only after God has shown his tsedeq to him is in actual fact not found in the Dead Sea Scrolls as a whole. Undoubtedly, this view finds expression in the hymn\textsuperscript{172} at the end of 1QS and in the Thanksgiving Hymns.\textsuperscript{173} It is incorrect, however, to apply this principle to the Dead Sea Scrolls as a whole, for it is simply not clearly stated in the non-hymnic material.

What is the reason behind this variation? The answer to this question involves the concept of genre, for the hymnic and non-hymnic writings are representative of distinct genres. In the hymnic writings the attitude of prayer predominates and as man comes humbly before his creator his thoughts naturally turn to God's grace. In the halakic discussions of the non-hymnic writings, on the other hand, man is concerned with his religious duties. He thinks in terms of what he can

\textsuperscript{169}CD 20:20.
\textsuperscript{170}See especially CD 2:14-16.
\textsuperscript{171}"Der Begriff", I, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{172}1QS 11:2,13. With respect to the hymn see n. 96 above.
\textsuperscript{173}E.g. 1QH 4:37; 7:19; 11:31; 17:20.
and must do.

Which mode of thought takes precedence over the other? Since Fiedler argues that man can do tsedeq only after God has shown his tseduah to him, he implies that the thought expressed in the hymnic writings should take precedence over that in the halakic discussions in the non-hymnic writings. Such a conclusion is unwarranted. It is generally acknowledged that the hymnic writings are influenced by the Old Testament to a much greater extent than the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Because of the use of Old Testament modes of thought some of the terminology incorporated into the hymnic writings is not fully representative of sectarian usage. In this way ideas which were not necessarily in complete harmony with sectarian teaching could find their way into the hymnic writings. This does not mean that all ideas expressed in these writings are suspect. It does indicate, however, that one should not attach such great importance to these ideas so that they are seen as governing the thought expressed in the non-hymnic writings. At best it can only be said that the ideas expressed in the hymnic and non-hymnic writings are valid within their own respective frames of reference. No absolute conclusions can be

---

174 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 75.
175 Cf. Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, p. 301.
176 E.g. out of a total of five occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls the plural noun נְכָרָה occurs four times in hymnic material (1Q5 10:23, 11:3; 1QH 7:17, 17:17) and only once in non-hymnic material (1Q5 1:21). As G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, E.t. by D. M. G. Stalker (Edinburg, 1962), I, p. 372, has pointed out, this plural noun is used in the OT to refer to Jehovah's righteous acts, meaning His saving acts in history.
drawn as to which mode of thought should govern the other.

Within a specific writing, on the other hand, it is possible to draw conclusions as to the relative stress given to God’s ṭsedaqah and man’s ṭsedeoq. In the Damascus Document there is room for God’s ṭsedaqah. 177 Although the exact relationship between these two ideas is not made explicit it is nevertheless obvious that within the thought of CD much greater stress is placed on man’s responsibility to strive for the ideal of perfection, than on God’s saving, gracious activity. If man commits a transgression he is not forgiven but he is punished. If he actually despises the commandments of God he is excommunicated from the community. 178 In the concept of righteousness expressed in the Damascus Document, not ṭsedaqah but ṭsedeoq is stressed, for ṭsedeoq represents all that is right in the sight of God and as such is to be the goal of man’s personal effort.

The term ṭsedeoq does not play such a decisive role in the remainder of the Dead Sea Scrolls. G. Jeremias’s generalization that the term ṭsedeoq is used as a religious password (religiöses Kennwort) or a slogan (Schlagwort) in the Dead Sea Scrolls in general, is therefore not entirely correct. 179 Especially the implication that such a use leads to a deterioration (Verflachung) 180 of the meaning of ṭsedeoq does not hold true for the Damascus Document. In CD the use of

177 CD 20:20.
179 G. Jeremias, Lehrer, p. 311.
180 Ibid.
tsedeq as a slogan is to be viewed in a positive rather than a negative sense. For the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls, on the other hand, Jeremias's observations do apply. Especially in 1QS and 1QH where the term truth ('emet) is stressed as the term designating that which is right in the sight of God, and t'sedeq is simply used as a synonym for 'emet, there is a deterioration of the meaning of t'sedeq.

That the term t'sedeq is used in several instances\(^{181}\) with the meaning which is generally ascribed to t'sedaqah, namely God's saving, gracious activity, supports the contention that there is a deterioration of the meaning of t'sedeq in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls. It should be noted that this also holds true for the term t'sedaqah since in a few instances\(^{182}\) t'sedaqah takes on the usual meaning of t'sedeq, insofar as t'sedeq refers to man's conduct.

It should be noted, however, that even in the writings which do not reflect that the author/redactor thought in terms of a concept of righteousness, the terms t'sedeq and t'sedaqah are not used interchangeably as for instance in the Old Testament.\(^{183}\) Despite the fact

\(^{181}\) 1QS 10:11; 1QH 11:18; 1QH 18:8 and possibly 1QS 10:26, 11:15; 1QM 4:6.

\(^{182}\) 1QS 10:25; 1QH 1:26; 4:30, 31; 7:14, 17; 1QpHab 2:2. It should also be noted that in 1QS 1:5, 5:4 and 8:2, t'sedaqah may refer to almsgiving; i.e. definitely not to God's saving, gracious activity.

\(^{183}\) G. Quell, "The Concept of Law in the OT", TNT, II, p. 175, n. 2; in the discussion of the concept of law notes with respect to t'sedeq/t'sedaqah "there is no discernible shift of meaning as between the masc. and fem." Zieseler's analysis of the terms t'sedeq and t'sedaqah in the OT also shows that there is a high degree of overlap in the use of these terms; Righteousness, pp. 17-35.
that there are some instances in the Dead Sea Scrolls in which the meanings of tsedeq and tsedaqah overlap, it is nonetheless clear that tsedaqah primarily refers to God's saving, gracious activity and that tsedeq primarily refers to God's ordinances, the norm for man's conduct. With respect to the latter a difference exists between the Damascus Document and the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls, for in the former the norm is specified as being the laws of the New Covenant which was made in the Land of Damascus while in the latter the exact nature of the norm is not specified.

Although amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls there is some variation in the overall significance attached to the term tsedeq, it is clear that tsedeq is thought of as a norm for man's conduct. This seems to be in direct contrast to the usage of the Old Testament, for as G. v. Rad rightly points out "... Jahweh's righteousness was not a norm, but acts, and it was these acts which bestow salvation." Consequently, while the concept of righteousness is emphasized only in the Damascus Document, the idea that tsedeq was a norm for man's conduct seems to pervade the thought of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a whole.

CHAPTER III

TSEDEQ, TSEDAQAH AND TSADDIQ IN THE
TANNAITIC LITERATURE

1. Introduction

In the discussion concerning the method of the present study it was stated that the Tannaitic literature was found to be invaluable for an understanding of the Matthaean concept of righteousness. Before turning to the use of the terms tsedeq, tsedaqah and tsaddiq it is necessary to deal with the nature of this literature.

The Tannaitic period is generally defined as spanning 10 B.C. to 220 A.D., that is, beginning with the disciples of Shammai and Hillel and ending with the contemporaries of R. Judah ha-Nasi. The rabbis who lived during this period are known as the Tannaim and their sayings and discussions form the Tannaitic literature.

---

1 See ch. I, sec. 2.


3 It should be noted that the title Rabbi is in actual fact applied only to the Tannaim after the fall of Jerusalem (70 A.D.).
The Tannaitic literature has been preserved in two distinct forms. In the mishnaic form the materials are arranged according to topical criteria while in the midrashic form the materials follow the sequence of the biblical book which is commented upon. Both types of writings are primarily halakic rather than haggadic in content.

The Tannaitic literature of the mishnaic form consists of the Mishnah, Tosefta and various traditions in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds which are attributed to Tannaim. The latter sayings are generally referred to as baraitot. The Tannaitic literature of the midrashic form consists of the halakic midrashim such as the Mekilta on Exodus, Sifra on Leviticus, Sifre on Numbers and Deuteronomy, Sifre Zuta on Numbers, Mekilta of R. Simeon b. Yohai on Exodus, Midrash Tannaim on Deuteronomy and baraitot in later midrashim such as Midrash Rabbah.

Although all the materials just mentioned can technically be termed Tannaitic, not all are on the same level of reliability. In this study we will concentrate only on those writings which appear to be most authentic. Consequently, the following materials will be excluded. We will not deal with traditions found only as baraitot in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds and the later midrashim such as Midrash Rabbah. Since these writings were compiled two or more centuries after the close of the Tannaitic period, it is indeed likely that some baraitot underwent redactional changes.

4 Technically this term refers to any Tannaitic tradition outside of the Mishnah.
Neither will we deal with the Tannaitic midrashim known as the Mekilta of R. Simeon b. Yohai on Exodus, Sifre Zuta on Numbers and Midrash Tannaim on Deuteronomy. Although these midrashim may at one time have existed as distinct entities, today they are known to us only through later sources and have been reconstructed from them. The reliability of such reconstructed writings is suspect.

It is not implied that the Tannaitic traditions found in the writings which are excluded from this study are totally unreliable and thus worthless. On the contrary, some of these sayings may indeed cast additional light on the concept of righteousness as understood by the Tanna'im. It is, however, beyond the scope of the present study to implement a critical analysis of these writings in order to determine which of the sayings are in fact Tannaitic and which show later redactional influences. As a first step it has been deemed advisable to deal only with the most authentic literary sources of the Tannaitic period.

We will therefore deal exclusively with the Mishnah, Tosefta, and the halakic midrashim known as the Mekilta on Exodus, Sifra on Leviticus and Sifra on Numbers and Deuteronomy. These writings correspond to the first two of five categories of Tannaitic traditions considered most reliable by Neusner. It should be noted that Neusner places the Mishnah-Tosefta ahead of the Tannaitic midrashim in his scale of reliability. Both types of materials in turn are deemed more reliable than the Baraitot in the Talmuds and the later midrashim.5

5. Neusner, Eliezer Ben Hyrcanus (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 4; Leiden, 1973), II, pp. 1-3; cf. II, pp. 225f. It should
The compilation of the Mishnah by R. Judah ha-Nasi took place ca. 200 A.D. ⁶ Undoubtedly this work was enlarged by later additions ⁷ but basically the Mishnah deals with traditions up to ca. 200 A.D.

As Bowker has noted, the relationship between the Mishnah and Tosefta "remains one of the most vexing problems of rabbinic scholarship." ⁸ For the purpose of this study we will follow the traditional view that the Tosefta was compiled at roughly the same time as the Mishnah ⁹ and follow Neusner's ¹⁰ conclusions as to its reliability.

With respect to the dating of the Tannaitic midrashim it must be noted that Wacholder has argued that the Makilta on Exodus was composed by a writer in the eighth century, that is, after the

be noted, however, that Neusner's scale of reliability is derived on the basis of the traditions pertaining to Eliezer ben Hyrcanus.


⁷ E.g. Sotah 9:15 reports the death of R. Judah ha-Nasi. Rather than dealing in detail with the problem of later additions at this point, we will postpone such discussions until they arise in passages dealing with the concept of righteousness.


⁹ Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, p. 75, agrees with the opinion of Gaon Sharira that Nyya bar Aba, a disciple and friend of R. Judah ha-Nasi, was the author of the Tosefta. Strack also notes the opinion of Johanan that the Tosefta is based on the lectures of Nehemiah, a contemporary of R. Meir.

¹⁰ See discussion above on Eliezer Ben Hyrcanus, II, pp. 1-3.
completion of the Babylonian Talmud. It appears that Wacholder holds a similar view as to the date of Sifra on Leviticus and Sifra on Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Smith has strongly attacked Wacholder's dating of the halakic midrashim as "peculiar opinions". Indeed Wacholder's view runs counter to the overwhelming scholarly consensus that the Mekilta on Exodus, Sifra on Leviticus and Sifra on Numbers and Deuteronomy are Tannaitic. The compilation of these midrashim, however, seems to have taken place after that of the Mishnah. Malamed has noted that the final redaction of the halakic midrashim took place two generations after that of the Mishnah.

It was noted that the Tannaitic period stretches from 10 A.D. to 220 A.D. The bulk of the Tannaitic literature, however, deals with the Rabbinic discussion from the fall of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) to

---


14For the consensus view see Wacholder, "The Date of the Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael", p. 117, n. 1.

220 A.D. Since the final redaction of the Gospel of Matthew took place after the fall of Jerusalem, perhaps as late as 80 – 100 A.D., there is definitely an overlap in time between the thought expressed in the writings under discussion and the redactional activity of Matthew. While it is easy to discern that the Talmudic literature is relevant as a background to the time of the final redaction of the Gospel of Matthew, it is not absolutely clear to what extent this literature is relevant to the time of the activity of Jesus. For example, of what value is the Talmudic literature as a background to the debates between Jesus and the Pharisees as depicted in the Gospel of Matthew?

It cannot be taken for granted that the Rabbi continued the Pharisaic traditions. On the other hand, it would indeed be surprising if there were no continuity of thought. Indeed Zeitlin has argued

16 J. Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 (Leiden, 1971), III, p. 303, states that "The rabbinic traditions about the Pharisees before 70 A.D. consist of approximately 371 separate items—stories or sayings or allusions—which occur in approximately 655 different pericopes." It should be noted, however, that Neusner deals only with named sayings.


18 Since the Talmudic literature is generally used as a background for the Pauline epistles which were composed before the fall of Jerusalem, the use of the Talmudic literature with regard to the time of the Matthewan redactional activity is based on a relatively sound premise.

that Pharisaic views can be established from Rabbinic materials. Consequently, while the Tannaitic literature is most relevant to the time of the final redaction of the Gospel of Matthew, it is not totally unrelated to the time of Jesus.

An exhaustive study of the terms tsedeq and tsedaqah is thus in order as a background against which the Matthaean concept of righteousness can be viewed. It should be noted that in the case of the Mishnah, Mekilta on Exodus and Sifra on Leviticus the word counts are based on the respective concordances. In the case of the Tosefta the concordance lists the references in the actual Rabbinic discussion but not in scriptural quotations. The count of the latter type of references is based on the research of the author. The concordance to Sifra on Numbers and Deuteronomy has not been published up to the latter and consequently the count is based on the research of the author.

The present study will deal in detail only with the terms tsedeq, tsedaqah and tsaddiq. Other related terms will not be investigated. For example, the meaning of the term merit (zekut) is in certain cases related to the meaning of tsedeq. While an investigation of this term could be of benefit, a preliminary study has shown...

---


21 C. J. Kasowski, Thesaurus Thosephthae (Jerusalem, 1932).

22 E.g., in Sifra Qedoshim parah 4,4 on Lev 19:15 tsedeq and zekut are related as far as the meaning of mercy is concerned.
that an understanding of the concept of merit (sekut) is not crucial for an understanding of the concept of righteousness (tesdeq). Since every study is bound by certain limitations of time and space\(^{23}\), and the value of the study of related terms was not found to be critical, it was decided to concentrate on the three terms mentioned above. Consequently, this study is not only restricted to the most authentic writings comprising the Tannaitic literature but also to the primary terms dealing with the concept of righteousness.

In the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls each writing was discussed separately. This was done in order to discover any possible variations among these writings in the use of the terms tesdeq, tesdaqah and tesaddiq. In the study of the Tannaitic literature the same method will be followed.

As was noted above, the Tannaitic midrashim were compiled after the Mishnah and Tosefta. Consequently, it might be expected that the Mishnah and Tosefta would be discussed first. Since the occurrences of the term tesdeq are more numerous in the Tannaitic midrashim than in the Mishnah and Tosefta, it was deemed advisable to commence the study with the Tannaitic midrashim.

---

\(^{23}\) A complete investigation of the concept of merit would be very time consuming; especially since E. P. Sanders, "Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison", HTR 66 (1973), p. 463, has attacked the view on which the so-called Rabbinic doctrine of merits is based, namely "that the Rabbis believed in a system which required that one fulfill one more commandment than the number of his transgressions, so that when transgressions and fulfillments are weighed, fulfillments would weigh more heavily."
2. Sifre on Deuteronomy

The Noun Tsedeq

The noun tsedeq occurs 29 times in Sifre on Deuteronomy. Of these occurrences 19 are dependent, that is, they occur in direct biblical quotations, and 10 are independent. In three instances the term tsedeq in the biblical quotation is not relevant to the context in which the quotation is found. Consequently, these passages will not be discussed. The 26 remaining references to tsedeq are found in nine distinct contexts and will be discussed in the order in which they occur in Sifre on Deuteronomy.

In Sifre Deut 16 on 1:16 (pp. 25ff.), the term tsedeq occurs three times in direct quotations of Deut 1:16 and twice in the course of the discussion of this verse. The passage begins by quoting Deut 1:16, "And I charged your judges at that time, 'Hear the cases between your brethren, and judge righteousness.'" In the ensuing discussion the emphasis is placed on the need to examine the differences between the various cases brought before the judges ensuring that not all cases are treated alike. Deut 1:16 is illustrated

24 Since the concordance to Sifre on Deuteronomy and Numbers does not go as far as ¥, this count and the one in the next section dealing with Sifre on Numbers is based on the research of the author.


26 The English translations of biblical texts will generally be those of the Revised Standard Version (1952) except in cases where the
and in a sense even summed up by a saying attributed to the men of the Great Synagogue, "Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence around the Law." 27

The discussion then turns to "and judge righteousness" (פִּינְדֶה מִנְדֶה). 28

"And judge righteousness." The righteous in his righteousness (правд п'їд) claims and offers evidence. 29 For example: one is wrapped in his cloak and the other says: "It is mine." One ploughs with his cow and the other says: "It is mine." One takes possession of his field and the other says: "It is mine." One dwells in his house and the other says: "It is mine." Therefore it was said: "And judge righteousness." The righteous in his righteousness (правд п'їд) claims and offers evidence. 30

In the above passage tsedeq refers to the proper type of judgment. The tsedeq of the tsaddiq manifests itself by the fact that all his decisions are based strictly on evidence. Everything he owns

Rabbinic discussion points to the need for a different translation or where a more literal translation of terms involving the root ts-d-q is necessary. It should be noted that deviations from the R.S.V. will not be indicated.

27 Abot 1:1; E.t. by Danby, The Mishnah, p. 446.

28 Finkelstein, Sifre on Deuteronomy, p. 27.

29 This sentence follows the E.t. of M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Jerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (1903; rpt. Israel, 1972), II, p. 1645.

30 Unless stated otherwise, all English translations of Sifre on Deuteronomy are those of the author.
is definitely his on the basis of clear evidence.

In Sifre Deut 144 on 16:18 (p. 198) the phrase פִּי חַיָּה which is found in Deut 16:18 is quoted twice in the following context.

"And they shall judge the people" (Deut 16:18). Without their will. "With judgment of righteousness" (Deut 16:18). But has it not already been said: "You shall not pervert justice" (Deut 16:19)? (Therefore) why does scripture say: "With judgment of righteousness" (Deut 16:18)? This (is said with respect to) the appointment of the judges.

This passage raises the question of why the phrase "with judgment of righteousness" is added; the implication is that this phrase was not really needed since the topic of the perversion of justice is adequately covered without it. The proposed answer is that the phrase "with judgment of righteousness" introduces a new topic, namely, the issue of the "appointment of judges". Consequently, ṭšedeq is descriptive of one of the factors which must be taken into account in the choice of judges.

In Sifre Deut 144 on 16:19 (p. 199) there is an independent use of ṭšedeq.

Another interpretation: "For a bribe blinds the eyes of the sages" (Deut 16:19). They say that the unclean is clean and that the clean is unclean. "And subverts the words of the righteous (צִיוֹנוּת מְשִׁרְיָהוּ)" (Deut 16:19). They say that the forbidden is permitted and the permitted is forbidden.

Another interpretation: "For a bribe blinds the eyes of the
sages" (Deut 16:19): And he does not fulfill his obligation until he teaches righteousness in his decisions as teacher.

"וְזָרָה שִׁירֵי זֶרֶת בְּגוּרָלָה" (Deut 16:19). He does not fulfill his obligation until he knows what he is saying.

In the above passage, taedeq is a term signifying the correct decisions of the sages which are not distorted by bribery. Taedeq refers to everything that is right and therefore just.

In Sifre Deut 144 on 16:20 (pp. 199f.) the partial phrase נַפְרוֹת פָּדָר of Deut 16:20 is quoted once and the complete phrase נַפְרוֹת פָּדָר is quoted three times.

"Righteousness you shall pursue" (Deut 16:20). How do we know (that it) one leaves a court (having been declared) innocent (נַפְרוֹת), they do not reverse the decision to declare him guilty? Scripture says: "Righteousness and only righteousness you shall follow" (Deut 16:20). (If) he went out guilty, how do we know that they may reverse the decision to innocence (נַפְרוֹת)? It is said: "Righteousness and only righteousness you shall follow" (Deut 16:20). Another interpretation.

"Righteousness and only righteousness you shall follow" (Deut 16:20). Follow the court whose judgment is good; (i.e. follow) the court of Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai and the court of R. Eleazar.

---

31 Jastrow, Dictionary, I, p. 341, gives the following meanings for נַפְרוֹת: "decision, instruction; teacher's or judge's office".
The above discussion centers on the reason for the double occurrence of \textit{tsedeq}. In the first interpretation the problem is resolved by arguing that this refers to two distinct cases, that is, a person who is initially found innocent cannot at a later date be found guilty while a person initially found guilty may later be found innocent. \textsuperscript{32} The biblical phrase thus means "pursue leniency".

In the second interpretation the double reference to \textit{tsedeq} is said to refer to two specific courts. In this instance the meaning of \textit{tsedeq} is not as clearly brought out as in the first interpretation. It is to be expected, however, that the "good judgment" is the more lenient one. Consequently, it is probable that the meaning of \textit{tsedeq} is similar in both interpretations.

The occurrence of \textit{tsedeq} in the quotation of Ps 85:14 in Sifre Deut 277 on 24:13 (p. 295) will be discussed below in the section dealing with the term \textit{tsedagah}.

In Sifre Deut 278 on 24:14 (p. 296) there is an independent use of \textit{tsedeq} in the expression \textit{ger tsedeq}. The phrase \textit{גֵּר תְּשֵׁדֶק} (Deut 24:14) is interpreted as referring to the \textit{ger tsedeq}, the righteous proselyte. From the context, however, it is impossible to infer the specific meaning of this term.

In Sifre Deut 294 on 25:15 (p. 313) the term \textit{tsedeq} occurs twice in the quotation of Deut 25:15, "and it shall be righteousness to you" (זְכָרְתוֹ אֶל לָךְ). It should be noted that in Deut 25:15

\textsuperscript{32} Cf. Sanhedrin 4:1 where it is stated that this procedure applies to capital cases only.
tsedeq is actually used adjectively insofar as it describes the "weight" and "measure". "A full and just weight you shall have, a full and just measure you shall have" (Deut 25:15). In Sifre Deut, however, the term tsedeq is divorced from its biblical context and used substantively. Consequently, it can be argued that this is really an independent use. In its present context the statement "and it shall be righteousness to you" is used to refer to fair treatment so that justice prevails.

In Sifre Deut 334 on 32:44 (p. 384) there are six independent references to the term tsedeq, that is, the terms יְשַׁעַל and יְשַׁעַל each occur three times.

"He and Hoshea the son of Nun" (Deut 32:44). Why is (this passage) necessary? Has it not already been said: "And Moses called Hoshea the son of Nun Joshua" (Num 13:16)?

Why does scripture say: "He and Hoshea the son of Nun" (Deut 32:44)? (It is said) to make known the righteousness of Joshua. I might have thought that he was arrogant when he was appointed at first. (Therefore) scripture says:

"He and Hoshea the son of Nun" (Deut 32:44). Hoshea (was) in his righteousness. Although he was appointed leader over Israel, Hoshea (was still) in his righteousness. Similarly you say: "And Joseph was in Egypt" (Ex 1:5). But do we not (already) know that Joseph was in Egypt? But (this is said)

33 Note that the argument is based on the occurrence of two different spellings of the name in question; יְשַׁעַל (Hoshea) and יְשַׁעַל (Joshua).
to make known (to you) the righteousness of Joseph who was tending the flock of his father. Although he was appointed king in Egypt, he (was still) Joseph in his righteousness. Similarly (you say): "And David was the youngest" (1 Sam 17:14). But do we not (already) know that David was the youngest? But (this is said) to make known (to you) the righteousness of David who was tending the flock of his father. And although he was appointed king over Israel, he was (still) David in his smallness (םוספ עון).

In the above examples, the tsedeq of Joshua, Joseph and David consisted of the fact that although they had been appointed to high positions, they nevertheless remained humble. This is especially clear in the case of David where the terms מְלָאך and מְלֶאך are used with parallel meanings. Consequently, tsedeq designates the humble character appropriate to a righteous man.

In Sifre Deut 354 on 33:19 (p. 416) the expression "sacrifices of righteousness" found in Deut 33:19 is quoted. Regarding Deut 33:19, "They shall call the peoples unto the mountain", it is noted that the gentiles came to Jerusalem and saw that the nation of Israel was better off than they were. The discussion ends as follows:

How can you say that they do not move from there until they have offered sacrifices? Scripture says: "There shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness" (םיראש; Deut 33:19).

34 MS י reads מְלָאך. Finkelstein, however, has adopted the reading מְלֶאך into the actual text.
It is implied in the above discussion that on the basis of the proof text Deut 33:19, "There shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness", it can be deduced that the gentiles in question will become proselytes and will offer sacrifices. The latter deduction is obvious. But why can it be deduced that they will become proselytes? The key must lie with the term tsedaq. If sacrifices of righteousness are offered, this must indicate that the act was performed by bona fide religious persons. Consequently, the gentiles must have become proselytes. Tsedaq is a key term signifying proper religious behaviour.

The Noun Tsedaqah

The noun tsedaqah occurs 15 times in Sifre on Deuteronomy in eight passages. In seven cases tsedaqah occurs in direct biblical quotations and in eight cases it is used independently. Let us first of all discuss the three passages in which it occurs independently and has the meaning of charity.

In Sifre Deut 47 on 11:21 (pp. 105f.) Dan 12:3 is quoted:
"And those who turn the many to righteousness (ם""סב ר' ר""ח) are like the stars for ever and ever." In the first two interpretations this verse is seen as referring to the א""ש. In the third interpretation it is seen as referring to the נ""ב, the collectors of public charity.

35 This number does not take the independent reference to tsedaqah in Sifre Deut 116 on 15:7 (p. 175) into account. This occurrence does not have a good textual basis and is, for example, not included in the translations by: C. G. Montefiore, and H. Loeve, A Rabbinic Anthology (1938; rpt. New York, 1974), p. 422; H. L. Strack, and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (1926; rpt. München, 1974), I, p. 346.
In Sifre Deut 108 on 14:27 (p. 169) the welfare of the Levite is under discussion. It is concluded that if other means of support fail, then the Levite is to be supported from charity (נְפָדָּה יָד).

In Sifre Deut 143 on 16:16 (p. 196) the phrase נְפָדָּה יָד occurs in the discussion of Deut 16:16, "They shall not appear before the Lord empty handed." Since the ensuing discussion deals with money, it is certain that tsedaqah refers to charity.

In the following three passages it is difficult to determine the meaning of tsedaqah. In Sifre Deut 265 on 23:24\(^{36}\) (p. 286) there is an independent use of tsedaqah. Every part of Deut 23:24 is commented upon. "With your mouth" is interpreted as meaning נְפָדָּה יָד. Since a continuous theme does not run throughout the interpretation of the various parts of the verse, it is impossible to determine the meaning of tsedaqah from the context.

In Sifre Deut 49 on 11:22 (p. 114) the term tsedaqah occurs in the quotation of Ps 11:7. However, the term tsaddiq also occurs in Ps 11:7 and it is this term rather than tsedaqah which is relevant to the context. Similarly in Sifre Deut 307 on 32:4 (p. 345) the term tsedaqah occurs in the quotation of Ps 11:7 but in the context the term tsaddiq is stressed.

In the two remaining passages the discussion of the term tsedaqah is occasioned by the occurrence of this term in the text of Deuteronomy and the meaning of tsedaqah goes beyond that of charity.

\(^{36}\) Deut 23:23 in English Bible.
In Sifre Deut 277 on 24:13 (p. 295) the term *tsedaqah* occurs twice in direct quotations of Deut 24:13 and twice independently in the course of the discussion. The passage has to be quoted at length in order to understand the meaning of *tsedaqah*.

"When the sun goes down, you shall restore to him the pledge" (Deut 24:13). It teaches that he (must) return to him the object of the day for the day and the object of the night for the night. (He must return) the mattress for the night and the plough for the day but not the mattress for the day and the plough for the night. "That he may sleep in his cloak and bless you" (Deut 24:13). It teaches that he commands to bless you. You might conclude that if he blessed you, you are blessed and if (he did) not (bless you) you are not blessed. (Therefore) scripture says: "And it shall be righteousness (נָפָרָה) to you" (Deut 24:13). By yourself you do righteousness (נָפָרָה.secondary_name) נָפָרָה. "And it shall be righteousness (נָפָרָה) to you" (Deut 24:13). It teaches that righteousness (נָפָרָה) goes up before the throne of glory and thus it says: "Righteousness (*פָּרָה*) will go before him and make his footsteps a way" (Ps 85:15).37

In the above passage it is argued that *tsedaqah* is not dependent on the action of others. One can do *tsedaqah* and an example of such action is the returning of the proper objects at the proper time.

---

37Ps 85:14 in Hebrew Bible.
Tsedaqah refers to what is right with respect to human action. Tsedaqah is also the resultant quality which a person possesses once he has completed such action. In this passage tsedaqah should thus be translated as righteousness since it has the meaning which, as will be shown, is often associated with the term tsedaq. It should be noted that in the passage under discussion the terms tsedaqah and tsedaq are treated as synonyms, for the term tsedaq in Ps 85:15 is used by way of proof for the preceding argument in which the term tsedaqah is used.

In Sifre Deut 355 on 33:21 (pp. 418f.) the term tsedaqah occurs twice in direct quotations of Deut 33:21, once in the quotation of Is 56:1 and twice independently in the discussion.

"The righteousness of the Lord (יְהֹוּדֵי) he (Moses) did" (Deut 33:21). Is it really so? What righteousness (יְהֹוּדֵי) did Moses do in Israel? Did not all the forty years, that Israel was in the desert, the well rise up for them and the manna descend for them and (were not) quails found for them and (did not) the clouds of glory cover them? But it says: "If there is among you a poor man ... (you shall not harden your heart"; Deut 15:7). "The righteousness of the Lord (יְהֹוּדֵי) he did" (Deut 33:21). It teaches that righteousness (יְהֹוּדֵי) hangs beneath the court under the throne of glory, as it is said: "Thus says the Lord: 'Keep justice, and do righteousness'" (יְהֹוּדֵי; Is 56:1).

In the first interpretation Deut 33:21 is interpreted with respect to Moses. At first the following problem is posed: How could
Moses have done the righteousness of the Lord if, as it appears, the Lord himself took care of all Israel's wants? The problem is solved with reference to Deut 15:7 which states that there were poor people among the Israelites. Consequently, there was the possibility of doing righteousness and Moses' righteousness (tsedaqa) must have been evidenced by the fact that he cared for the poor.

It should be noted that in MS 38 the term הָלוֹם occurs instead of נֶפֶשׁ in the statement, "What righteousness did Moses do in Israel?" Billerbeck gives the following translation based on MS 7: "Wie, was für Wohltaten הָלוֹם (nach Art Jahves) hat er denn den Israeliten erwiesen?" It appears that the variant reading does capture the intended meaning, for with respect to Moses, righteousness does have the meaning of charitable deeds.

In the second interpretation Deut 33:21 is interpreted with respect to God. It is stated that tsedaqa plays a role in God's judgment. On the basis of the proof-text, Is 56:1, it appears that tsedaqa is contrasted to justice. The interpretation thus implies that God judges with mercy. In this context Is 56:1 should therefore be translated, "Keep justice and at the same time do mercy."

This passage illustrates the flexibility in the meaning of tsedaqa, for it is used side by side with different meanings. With respect to the first interpretation it should not be overlooked that there is a relationship between God's and man's tsedaqa. It is

---

38 Finkelstein, Sifre on Deuteronomy, p. 418.
39 Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, III, p. 163, n. 1.
clearly stated that Moses did the righteousness of the Lord.\(^{40}\)

The Adjective Tsaddiq

Let us begin by discussing a number of passages in which the singular form of the adjective \textit{tsaddiq} occurs. Sifre Deut 16 on 1:16 (p. 27) has already been discussed with respect to the meaning of \textit{tsedeq}. It should be noted again that this passage clearly states that the \textit{tsaddiq} has \textit{tsedeq}; thus establishing a close relationship between the righteous and righteousness.

Specific men and women are described as being righteous. For example, in Sifre Deut 352 on 33:12 (p. 413) Benjamin the righteous, \textit{משה ידידיה}, is mentioned, and in Sifre Deut 1 on 1:1 (p. 5) Miriam the righteous, \textit{מירה רמצית} \(^{41}\), is referred to. The plural \textit{משיח} is also used in this sense. For example, in Sifre Deut 33 on 6:6 (pp. 59f.) R. Josia refers to the \textit{משיח} and then specifically mentions Abraham, Boaz and Elisha.

Not only specific people but also God is called \textit{tsaddiq}. The following passage is especially significant insofar as it shows that there is no essential difference between the fact that both God and men are \textit{tsaddiq}. In Sifre Deut 49 on 11:22 (p. 114) Joel 2:32 \(^{42}\) is quoted: "All who call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered." The question is then posed: "How is it possible for man to be called

\(^{40}\) \textit{Ibid.}"... dann deutete man \textit{משיח} . . . - \textit{משיח} nach Art. Jahves."

\(^{41}\) The feminine of \textit{משיח} is \textit{משיח}.\(^{42}\) Joel 3:5 in Hebrew Bible.
by the name of God (ָנָה)?" Various illustrations are then given to answer this question. One of them is:

(Just as) God (ָנָה) is called righteous (מַעַם), as it is said: "For the Lord is righteous (מַעַם), he loves righteous deeds (הלמת)" (Ps 11:7), so you are righteous (מַעַם).

If men can be like God, even if only in the sense that they can imitate him, the question arises whether the tsaddiq can or ought to be without transgression like God.

Let us therefore examine the expression רָדָן מַעַם the perfectly righteous. In Sifre Deut 307 on 32:4 (p. 345) this expression occurs twice.

"A God of faithfulness" (Deut 32:4). Just as he pays the perfectly righteous (רָדָן מַעַם) the reward of a commandment (הלמת) which he fulfilled in this world (after he is) in the world to come, so he pays the perfectly wicked (לָשׁוּם מַעַם) the reward of a minor commandment which he fulfilled in this world (while he is) in this world. And just as he punishes the perfectly wicked (רָדָן מַעַם) in the world to come for a transgression which he committed in this world, so he punishes the perfectly righteous (רָדָן מַעַם) in this world for a minor transgression which he committed in this world.  

---

43 This expression is translated as "der vollkommene Gerechte" by both R. Nach, Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch (Leiden, 1957), p. 35 and by Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, IV, p. 1041.

44 Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, IV, p. 1041, suggest that this is the theory of R. Akiba. It is at least the theory of the school of R. Akiba.
As Mach 45 has pointed out, this passage shows that neither the righteous nor the wicked receive what they actually deserve in this world. Their just reward is stored up for them in the world to come. Another significant point raised by this passage is that neither the perfectly righteous nor the perfectly wicked are in actual fact perfect in their righteousness and perfect in their wickedness. It is taken for granted that the perfectly righteous one can commit a minor transgression and that the perfectly wicked one can fulfil a minor commandment. However, since both the minor transgressions of the perfectly righteous and the minor commandments of the perfectly wicked receive their fitting reward in this world, the perfectly righteous and the perfectly wicked are in a sense perfect when they enter the world to come. It should also be noted that only minor commandments and minor transgressions are referred to. It seems that it is taken for granted that the perfectly wicked cannot fulfil major commandments nor the perfectly righteous commit major transgressions. 46

There may be another reference to the perfectly righteous in Sifre Deut 40 on 11:12 (p. 81). The reading, however, is uncertain. 47

45 Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 35.

46 In Sifre Num 135 on Deut 3:26 (p. 181) it is explicitly stated that God prevents the righteous from committing a major transgression.

47 Finkalstein, Sifre on Deuteronomy, p. 81, does not include this reading in the text but notes in the apparatus that MS γ reads דִּישָׁנָה דִּישָׁנָה. G. Kittel, Sifre zu Deuteronomium (n.p., 1922), p. 87, gives the following translation: "Siehe, wenn die Israeliten am Anfang des Jahres vollkommene Gerecht sind..." M. Friedmann in his edition of Sifre on Deuteronomy (Vienna, 1864; rpt. 1968), has adopted the reading דִּישָׁנָה דִּישָׁנָה into his text (f. 75b).
The point raised in this passage is that if the people of Israel are perfectly righteous at the beginning of the year and God therefore decides to provide plenty of rain for them, he cannot change this decision even though the people change for the worse. God is, however, able to send the rain at an inopportune time.

It is obvious that people who are perfectly righteous at one time do not necessarily remain that way. Consequently, in this passage, as in the previous one, the term ḫâm does not imply a 100% type of perfection.

The last passage dealing with the singular adjective tsaddiq to be discussed is found in Sifre Deut 307 on 32:4 (pp. 344ff.). In this passage Deut 32:4, "just (פִּן) and right (☝) is he", is quoted three times. In the first case this statement is quoted as a proof that God did not create man to be wicked but to be righteous as he himself is. It should be noted that although the singular of the adjective tsaddiq occurs in the quotation, the plural forms tsaddiqim and resha'îm are used in the actual discussion. This reflects the general Rabbinic usage of contrasting the tsaddiqim with the resha'îm.

In the second case Deut 32:4 is interpreted in terms of Ps 11:7. In the third case the term tsaddiq is interpreted as signifying that God is a righteous judge and that he is so acknowledged by man.

Let us now turn to the use of the plural adjective tsaddiqim. As has already been noted, the terms tsaddiqim and resha'îm are used to

---

48 Cf. Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 41.
designate two types of people. For example, in Sifre Deut 33 on 6:6 (pp. 59f.) R. Josia notes that the righteous control their yetser while the wicked do not. In Sifre Deut 53 on 11:26 (p. 120) it is stated that the wicked prosper in this world while the righteous suffer. In Sifre Deut 357 on 34:5 (p. 428), however, it is stated that the righteous have a more pleasant death than the wicked.

There are many sayings which point to the importance of the righteous. In Sifre Deut 38 on 11:10 (p. 76) and in 47 on 11:21 (p. 107) it is stated that the world was created for the sake of the righteous. In Sifre Deut 47 on 11:2 (p. 106) it is noted that the righteous are high and exalted above all who come into the world and that they rule and have power from one end of the world to the other.

A number of passages point to the very admirable qualities of the righteous. In Sifre Deut 47 on 11:21 (p. 105) R. Akiba says that there is no enmity, hatred nor jealousy among the righteous. In Sifre Deut 38 on 11:10 (p. 75) it is noted that in every place where the righteous walk, a blessing follows their feet. Indeed, the presence of the righteous is readily noticeable, for according to Sifre Deut 47 on 11:21 (p. 104) the faces of the righteous are like the sun.49

The dominant view in the literature as we have it, however, is

49 קְצַל. Kittel, Sifre zu Deuteronomium, p. 117, n. 1, explains that in Aramaic קְצַל can have the meaning of sun. That this meaning is accurate appears from the reference to Judges 5:31, "But thy friends be like the sun as he rises in his might." The description of the righteous in terms of the sun also appears in Sifre Deut 10 on 1:10 (p. 18) where R. Simeon b. Yohai states that in the future the faces of the righteous can be compared to seven joys. One of the joys mentioned is that of the sun (קְצַל).
that the joy of the righteous is not to be had in this world but rather in the world to come.\textsuperscript{50} According to Sifre Deut 357 on 34:3 (p. 427) the righteous will be in the Garden of Eden. According to Sifre Deut 354 on 33:19 (p. 416) the righteous will in the future receive all the silver, gold and diamonds which are at the bottom of the sea.

Not all the righteous will be equal in the world to come. There are passages which indicate that there will be distinctions among them. In Sifre Deut 10 on 1:10 (p. 18) it is stated: "Seven classes of righteous men (there will be) in the Garden of Eden, one higher than the other."\textsuperscript{51} Then one or more biblical quotations are given to illustrate each class. The lowest class is described by Ps 140:13\textsuperscript{52}, "Surely the righteous shall give thanks to thy name; the upright shall dwell in thy presence." The highest class is described by Ps 24:3, "And who shall stand in his holy place?"

Immediately following the above passage, R. Simeon b. Yohai implies that the distinctions between the righteous will be according to the brilliance of their faces.\textsuperscript{53} "To seven joys the faces of the righteous (will be) similar in the future: to the sun, moon, sky, stars, lightning, lilies and candlesticks of the Temple."

\textsuperscript{50} This view reflects primarily R. Akiba and his school during the time of the Hadrianic persecution. Before and after this period there were also different views. Cf., E. P. Sanders, "R. Akiba's View of Suffering", JQR 63 (1972/73), pp. 336ff.

\textsuperscript{51} שבע חותם של瞋י ים כנון, זר לשמורת מצר.

\textsuperscript{52} Ps 140:14 in Hebrew Bible.

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 204.
In Sifre 47 on 11:21 (p. 105) R. Simeon b. Yohai is again quoted with respect to the seven distinctions among the righteous according to their faces. After this argument he adds the following proof. He interprets Ps 121:1, "A song for steps" (מָזוֹזְר) as referring to the various steps for the righteous in the future. That this interpretation definitely refers to class differences is borne out by the immediately following discussion. R. Akiba maintains that Ps 121:1 does not refer to a single step but to steps; for in the world to come one step is higher than the other. It is quickly added, however, that these class differences do not lead to enmity among the righteous.

3. Sifre on Numbers

The Noun Tsedeq

In Sifre on Numbers there is only one independent occurrence of the noun tsedeq. It is found in Sifre Num 133 on 27:1 (p. 176). R. Nathan says: Scripture teaches you that (with) every righteous person (פָּדֶש) who (according to scripture) grew up in the bosom of a wicked person (חפֵל) and did not do according to his deeds, (this is reported) to make known to you how great his righteousness (פָּדֶש) must have been that he grew up in the bosom of a wicked person (חפֵל) and did not do according to his deeds. And every wicked person (חפֵל) who (according

54 The page numbers refer to the edition by H. S. Horovitz, Siphre ad Numeros adiecto Siphra Zutta (1917; rpt, Jerusalem, 1966).
to scripture) grew up in the bosom of a righteous person (עֶדֶר) and did not do according to his deeds (this is reported) to make known to you how great his wickedness (לָשֶׁר) must have been that he grew up in the bosom of a righteous person (עֶדֶר) and did not do according to his deeds. 55

The above passage clearly shows that a tsaddiq has tsedeq and that both of these terms are to be understood on the basis of the nature of a person's deeds. Tsedeq is a quality in the righteous person which is manifested by his good deeds.

This meaning of tsedeq and tsaddiq is supported by Sifre Num. 106 on 12:15 (p. 105), a passage in which the term tsedeq occurs in a quotation which is directly related to the context. In this passage the fact that Moses took the bones of Joseph with him is under discussion. 56

At the end the following conclusion is reached.

And not Moses alone but all the righteous (עֶדֶר) the Holy One, Blessed be He, gathers to himself, for it is said: "Your righteousness (ףִּי) shall go before you, and the glory of the Lord shall gather you" (Is 58:8).

The "your" in "your righteousness" refers directly to the tsaddiqim. 57 Consequently, we again have the implication that the

55 Unless otherwise indicated, the English translations of Sifre on Numbers are those of the author.
56 Ex 13:19.
righteous have righteousness. Since the discussion deals with a deed of Moses, that is, the taking of the bones of Joseph, it is also the case that the terms tsedeq and tsaddiq are defined with respect to deeds of mercy. 58

The Noun Taedaqah

Similarly to the noun tsedeq, there is only one independent occurrence of the noun taedaqah in Sifre on Numbers. It is found in Sifre Num 42 on 6:26 (p. 47). Kuhn interprets taedaqah in this case as meaning charity.

Gross ist der Friede, denn er ist gegeben denen, die Wohltä-

tätigkeit üben. Denn er, heissst. "Und es wird das Werk der

Wohltätigkeit Friede sein" (Jes. 32,17). 59

The reason Kuhn gives for this translation is that אָפְרִי נַעְנֵה = Almosen geben". 60 This meaning, however, should not be taken for granted, for as has been shown above, in Sifre Deut 277 on 24:13 the phrase אָפְרִי נַעְנֵה has another meaning. Since we cannot determine the meaning of taedaqah from the context, this occurrence cannot be used

58 According to T. Peah 4:19 it is clear that gathering someone's bones would qualify as an act of lovingkindness (gemilut hasadim).

59 Kuhn, op. cit., p. 136. P. P. Levertov, Midrash Sifre on Numbers (New York, 1926), p. 38, gives the following translation: "Great is peace, for it is given as a gift to those who do righteousness". Levertov explains that "do righteousness" means "to give alms" (ibid., p. 38, n. 3).

60 Kuhn, Sifre zu Numeri, p. 136, n. 55. It should be noted that the text of Sifre Num 42 (p. 47) is not absolutely certain. Horovitz adopts the reading אָפְרִי נַעְנֵה, but indicates that MSס has וִיָּנַעְנֵה. 
to determine the meaning of this term.

In addition to the single independent occurrence of tsedaqah there are four occurrences of this term in biblical quotations. The use of tsedaqah in Is 32:17 has already been noted above. Ps 106: 30-31 and Is 45:23 which are quoted in Sifre Num 131 on 25:8-9 and Sifre Num 134 on Deut 3:24 respectively need not be discussed since the occurrence of the noun tsedaqah in these quotations has no significant bearing on the context. The dependent use of tsedaqah in Sifre Num 106 on 12:15 (p. 105), on the other hand, is significant.

And the ministering angels praised him (Moses) and said:

"The righteousness of the Lord he did (כְּשָרָה יָדוֹ), and his judgments with Israel" (Deut 33:21).

In this saying by R. Judah, Deut 33:21 is directly applied to Moses. It is thus implied that man, i.e. Moses, can do the righteousness of the Lord. Consequently, a relationship exists between man's and God's righteousness.

In this saying tsedaqah is understood in terms of the doing of deeds since the general context deals with the fact that Moses took the bones of Joseph with him. This meaning is also suggested by the use of the verb לְיַרְדֶן. Kuhn points out that this verb is here used as a technical term "für die Ausrufe, mit denen man bei einem Leichenzug die Verdienste und Tugenden des Verstorbenen pries."  

---

61 See discussion of Sifre Num 42 on 6:26 (p. 47).
62 Cf. Kuhn, Sifre zu Numeri, p. 280, n. 23.
63 Ibid., p. 280, n. 24.
The Adjective Tsaddiq

As was the case in Sifre on Deuteronomy, so in Sifre on Numbers both the singular and plural forms of tsaddiq are used to refer to specific persons. In Sifre Num 22 on 6:2 (p. 26) Simeon the Righteous (פִּרְזֹן יִשְׂאוּ) is mentioned. In Sifre Num 133 on 27:1 (p. 176) the term tsaddiqim refers to Isaac and Rebekah.

There are a number of passages in which the tsaddiqim are contrasted to the resha'im. In four cases this contrast is with respect to the future life. In Sifre Num 103 on 12:8 (p. 102) it is clearly stated that in the world to come the tsaddiqim will receive a reward while the resha'im will be punished.

In the two following passages the identification of the righteous and the wicked is noteworthy. In Sifre Num 88 on 11:6-7 (p. 88) these terms are used to distinguish between two groups among the Philistines. The ones who said: "Woe to us! Who can deliver us from the power of these mighty gods?" (1 Sam 4:8a) are portrayed as the tsaddiqim while the ones who said: "These are the gods who smote the Egyptians with every sort of plague in the wilderness" (1 Sam 4:8b), are portrayed as the resha'im. The term tsaddiq was therefore not confined to the description of the people of Israel.

Just as one might not have expected that a group of Philistines would be called righteous, so it is surprising to find that priests are called wicked in Sifre Num 119 on 18:20 (p. 144).

---

64 Sifre Num 40 on 6:24 (p. 44), Sifre Num 42 on 6:25 (p. 47), Sifre Num 103 on 12:8 (p. 102), Sifre Num 139 on 27:16 (p. 185).
Greater is the covenant that was made with Aaron than the covenant that was made with David. Aaron transmitted (the privilege of the priesthood) to the righteous (יְרוּם) and the wicked (יִשְׂרָאֵל) while David transmitted (the privilege of kingship) to the righteous and not the wicked.

It is implied in this passage that since the descendants of Aaron were automatically priests, there must have been wicked priests among them. 65

Let us now turn to a few passages in which the righteous are mentioned without being compared to the wicked. It is generalized from the example of Moses that the righteous are very selfless. 66

Rabbi notes that the righteous fear the commandments. 67 R. Eliezer points out that the righteous, just like Moses, will be able to see from one end of the world to the other. 68

We also learn that God is very gracious to the righteous. In Sifre Num 135 on Deut 3:26 (p. 181) God's word to Moses, "Let it suffice you", is interpreted that God prevents the righteous from committing a grave transgression (נַפְסָרָה נָרָא). 69 Such a sentiment is also

---

65 Kuhn, Sifre zu Numeri, p. 410, n. 80, suggests, "Auch darin liegt ein Urteil der rabbínischen Reflexion über das Priestertum, das als saddučäische vielfach 'gottlos' ist." It is doubtful, however, if one can show an anti-priest tendency in the Tannaitic literature.


67 Sifre Num 68 on 9:7 (p. 63).

68 Sifre Num 136 on Deut 3:27 (p. 182).

69 Cf. Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 90.
reflected when it is argued that if God is merciful with the righteous in the time of his anger, then he will definitely be so in the time of his good will.\(^{70}\) Indeed, God loves the righteous so much that he will not only take Moses but all the righteous to himself.\(^{71}\)

Despite such praise, it is nevertheless acknowledged that the righteous die as a result of sin. R. Eleazar of Modim states in Sifre Num 137 on 27:14 (p. 184) that when God announces the death of the righteous he at the same time reports their sin.\(^{72}\) The reporting of the sin is not viewed in an unfavorable way but rather as a gracious act. It is in this way that God lets it be known that a particular tsaddiq committed only a single sin. All speculation with respect to the hidden sins of the righteous is thus precluded. Yet the fact remains that this passage shows that the righteous die as the result of transgressions and thus are not thought of as being perfect.

4. Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael

The Noun Tsedeq

In the Mekilta the independent use of the noun tsedeq is restricted to the expression ger tsedeq. This expression occurs four times in the singular and once in the plural. Since the term tsedeq is not found in the absolute state but only in the genitive position of a construct-genitive expression, it cannot be established with

\(^{70}\) Sifre Num 105 on 12:10 (p. 103) and 137 on 27:14 (p. 184).

\(^{71}\) Sifre Num 106 on 12:15 (p. 105).

\(^{72}\) Cf. Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 154.
absolute certainty whether it is used adjectively or substantively.

It appears probable, however, that tsadeq is used adjectively in this expression. There are two indications which support this view. In Mek Kaspa 3 a variant for צד Governs ב is צד Governs ב73, indicating that צד is adjectival. A comparison of the expression צד ב with the expression צדни ב leads to the same conclusion. In the latter expression, צדני is definitely adjectival. The צדни ב is the resident alien.74 Consequently, Lauterbach's translation of צד Governs ב as "righteous proselyte",75 seems to be correct.

In Mek Kaspa 376 the expression ger tsadeq occurs twice. In this saying by R. Jose the Galilean the stress is on the ger toshab. Consequently, little can be learned about the meaning of tsadeq.

The two occurrences of the expression ger tsadeq in Mek Bahodesh 777, on the other hand, are relevant to this discussion. Here


74 Cf. Lauterbach, Mekilta, I, p. 121, n. 5.


76 On Ex 23:12; III, p. 178; p. 331. The Mekilta will be quoted according to the headings adopted in the edition by J. Z. Lauterbach, Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael (Philadelphia, 1933-35), and the first page reference will be to this edition. The second page reference will be to the edition by H. S. Horovitz, and I. A. Rabin, Mekilta d'Rabbi Ishmael (1931; rpt. Jerusalem, 1970).

77 On Ex 20:9; II, p. 255; p. 230.
the term יְלֵל found in Ex 20:10 is under discussion and it is concluded that יְלֵל refers to the פרָשָׁה יָל since in Ex 23:12 יְלֵל refers to the הָעַל יָל.

In order to comprehend the significance of the use of the term תְסֶדֶג we must discuss Ex 20:10 and 23:12. Winter\textsuperscript{78} points out that in Ex 23:12 the rationale behind the prohibition to work on the sabbath is that it is to be a day of rest. By saying that in this case גֵּר refers to the גֵּר תָּשָׁב it is implied that resting on the sabbath is to be observed even by resident aliens. In Ex 20:10, on the other hand, the rationale is the sanctification of the sabbath. The sanctification of the sabbath is of higher religious significance than the mere resting on the sabbath. Accordingly גֵּר cannot refer to a resident alien in this instance. It must refer to the גֵּר תְסֶדֶג who is fully like an Israelite. Such an explanation is in harmony with Lauterbach's definition that the גֵּר תָּשָׁב or resident alien is a heathen who has forsaken idolatry and is a potential proselyte whereas the גֵּר תְסֶדֶג or righteous proselyte is fully like an Israelite.\textsuperscript{79}

The plural form פרָשָׁה יָל is found in Mek Nezikin 18\textsuperscript{80}. In order to show that the proselytes (גֵּרָיִם) are beloved, it is pointed out that "you find them also among the four groups who respond and speak before Him by whose word the world came into being".\textsuperscript{81} Four groups

\textsuperscript{78} Winter and Wünsche, Mechiltha, p. 216, n. 4.

\textsuperscript{79} Lauterbach, Mekilta, I, p. 121, n. 5.

\textsuperscript{80} On Ex 22:20; III, p. 141; p. 312.

\textsuperscript{81} Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, III, p. 141.
corresponding to the four responses of Is 44:5 are then listed. The רְמָיָּה correspond to the statement, "And another shall call himself by the name of Jacob." Is 44:5 deals with the growth of Israel by way of proselytes. Thus in this passage as in Mek Bahodesh 7, the term צֶדֶק serves the function of showing that a specific category of people are to be regarded fully like Israelites.

In addition to the five independent occurrences of צֶדֶק there are seven dependent ones. Of these, three can be disregarded since the term צֶדֶק in the quotation is not directly related to the discussion in which it is found. The following four dependent occurrences, on the other hand, are significant. Is 45:19, "I the Lord speak righteousness (רְמָיָּה), I declare things that are right" (דַּרְכָּנָה), is quoted in both Mek Bahodesh 1 and 5.

R. Jose says: Behold it says: "I have not spoken in secret,"

---

82 Ibid.
84 Only six references are listed by B. Kosovsky, Concordantiae Verborum Quae in Mechilta D'Rabbi Ismael (Jerusalem, 1965). Mek Shabbata 1 is omitted.
85 Is 42:21 is quoted in Mek Pisha 16 on Ex 13:2; I, p. 132; p. 59 and in Mek Nezikin 18 on Ex 22:20; III, p. 140; p. 312. Is 41:2 is quoted in Mek Shirata 5 on Ex 15:7, II, p. 45; p. 135. It should be noted that Lauterbach does not carry the quotation of Is 41:2 far enough so that the term צדֶק does not appear in his text.
86 On Ex 19:2; II, p. 199; p. 206.
87 On Ex 20:2; II, p. 232; p. 220.
etc. (Isa. 45.19). When I gave the Torah from the very start, I gave it not in the place of a land of darkness, not in a secret place, not in an obscure place . . . Did I not give it in broad daylight? And thus it says: "I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right (ibid.)." Mek Bahodesh 88

In the above passage it is stressed that in giving the Torah, God acted above suspicion in every possible way. To clinch the argument Is 45:19 is quoted. In this quotation "righteousness" is parallel to "things that are right". Consequently, tsedeq has the meaning of truth. 89

In Mek Bahodesh 5 the quotation of Is 45:19 serves essentially the same function as in the previous passage. Rabbi Nathan gives a refutation of the heretics who claim that there are two powers. The quotation of Is 45:19 is used in the argument to point out that God is truthful in what he says.

In Mek Shabbata 90, Ps 89:15 and 97:2 91 are quoted to support the assertion that God's administration of justice (יִדּוּ) did not cease when he rested on the seventh day. In both Ps 89:15 and 97:2 the expression מַעֲשֵׂי פִּי occurs. It thus appears that tsedeq refers

88 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, II, pp. 198f.
89 In this case tsedeq may also refer to things that are normative.
90 On Ex. 31:17; III, p. 205; p. 344.
91 Lauterbach includes this quotation in his text while Horovitz has it in brackets.
to God's administration of strict justice (י"ע) in this case.

The Noun Tsedqaqah

In the Mekilta there is one independent use of the noun tsedqaqah in Mek Amalek 92. Tsedqaqah definitely has the meaning of charity in this case.

He who makes the other ignorant will in the end make him wise. Something similar you find in the matter of giving charity. 93

How so? If the poor man stretches out his hand towards the householder 94, and the householder gives willingly, then "the Lord giveth light to the eyes of both." 95

Seven biblical passages are quoted in the Mekilta in which the noun tsedqaqah occurs. In only four of these, however, is the term tsedqaqah directly related to the context. 96

92 On Ex 18:27; II, p. 190; p. 201.

93 Cf. Winter and Wünsche, Mechiltha, pp. 190ff., "Desgleichen findest du es bei den Almsgengebern."

94 Some MSS add at this point הַרְעָה יְפִלְתָּב, "to receive charity". Neither Lauterbach nor Horovitz incorporate this reading into their texts.

95 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, II, p. 190.

96 The three passages which are not relevant are: the quotation of Is 59:17 in Mek Shirata 4 on Ex 15:3; II, p. 30; p. 129, the quotation of Mal 3:20 in Mek Bahodesh 8 on Ex 20:12; II, p. 258; p. 232 and the quotation of Gen 15:6 in Mek Beshallah 7 on Ex 14:31; I, p. 253; p. 114. J. A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul (Cambridge, 1972), p. 125, indicates that the use of tsedqaqah in the last passage is relevant. It is quite clear, however, that the stress in this case is on the fact that Abraham believed and Gen 15:6 is quoted to support this fact. No stress is placed on the term tsedqaqah in the discussion.
In two cases the term tsedaqah in the quotation is taken to mean justice. Mek Shi'at 97 states:

From strife he fled to return to strife, (everywhere)
"executing the righteousness of the Lord and His ordinances with Israel" (Deut. 33:21). Lo then, because he gave over his life to the pursuit of justice, the judges go by his name. 99

Similarly in Mek Nezikin 100 the term tsedaqah found in the quotation of Is 56:1 has the meaning of justice. Is 56:1 is quoted to give support to the assertion that when you actually execute justice (י"ר) you will receive benefits.

In the two remaining occurrences, tsedaqah has the meaning of charity. In Mek Shi'at 101 the following discussion occurs:

Another interpretation: "Like a Stone," for like stone they hardened their hearts. — But as for Thee, Thy goodness, Thy manifold mercies ... and it is written, "By Myself have I sworn, the word is gone forth from My mouth in charity, and shall not come back" (etc.) (Isa. 45:23). 102

As Goldin points out in his commentary, the term tsedaqah of

97 On Ex 15:1; II, p. 5; p. 117.
98 תְּשַׁדְּקָה.
101 On Ex 15:5; II, p. 39; p. 133.
102 Tr. by Goldin, The Song at the Sea, pp. 145f.
Is 45:23 is here quoted with the understanding that it refers to "the rabbinc sense of charity, love."  

In Mek Nezikin the term tsedaqah of the quotation plays a crucial role in the argumentation of R. Ishmael.

R. Ishmael says: Come and see how merciful He by whose word the world came into being is to flesh and blood. For a man can redeem himself from the Heavenly judgment by paying money, as it is said:

Then among the proof texts Dan 4:27 is quoted: "Therefore, O King, let my counsel be acceptable to thee, and break off thy sins by almsgiving" (נָפָלָה). Von Rad has noted that in Dan 4:27 "there is heralded a decided narrowing and curtailment of the concept of נָפָלָה in so far as . . . the Aramaic נָפָלָה has the meaning of 'good works,' 'almsgiving,' with the aid of which a man can cancel out his sins."

Since in the one independent and the two most explicit dependent occurrences tsedaqah has the general meaning of charity and almsgiving, it must be granted that according to the Mekilta this is the primary meaning of this term. It must not be overlooked, however, that in two cases tsedaqah had the meaning of justice. Consequently, care

103 Ibid., p. 146.
104 On Ex 21:30; III, p. 86; p. 286.
105 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, III, p. 86.
106 Dan 4:24 in Hebrew Bible.
must be taken not to apply the meaning of charity indiscriminately to tsedaqah.

The Adjective Tsaddiq

Outside of biblical quotations the singular form of the adjective tsaddiq occurs six times in the Mekilta. Twice it is used as a descriptive term concerning God, three times with respect to Moses and once in contrast to the wicked.

In Mek Pisha 16\textsuperscript{108} the term tsaddiq is used with respect to God.

Rabbi says: "The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing" (Prov. 10.7), means, whenever one mentions the Righteous One, the Righteous One who lives eternally — as it is said: "The Lord is righteous in all His ways (Ps. 145.17), — give Him praise by saying Amen."\textsuperscript{109}

In Mek Amalek 3\textsuperscript{110} R. Jose refers to Moses as being tsaddiq and defends him for having neglected the duty of circumcision for a while. Despite this defence, the whole discussion shows that although Moses was righteous he was by no means perfect. Yet as Mek Shirata 9\textsuperscript{111} shows, Moses was thought of very highly.

On one occasion Rabbi sat holding a discourse to the effect that

\textsuperscript{108}On Ex 13:3; I, p. 138; p. 61.

\textsuperscript{109}Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, I, p. 138.

\textsuperscript{110}On Ex 18:3; II, p. 170; p. 192.

\textsuperscript{111}On Ex 15:13; II, p. 69; p. 146.
in Egypt one (Hebrew) woman gave birth to sixty myriads. One of the disciples in his company spoke up and said to him: "Master, what is of greater import, the world or a righteous man?" "The righteous man," Rabbi replied. "How so?" Said Rabbi to him: "Take the case of Jochebed, who gave birth to Moses, (and) he was the equal of them all."  

In Mek Pisha 1113 the singular adjective tsaddiq is not used with respect to God or a specific individual but in a general comparison between the righteous and the wicked. It is stated in explanation of Ex 12:22, "This tells that the angel, once permission to harm is given him, does not discriminate between the righteous and the wicked" (anness ṣadad Ye). 114

There are a number of significant passages in which the singular adjective tsaddiq occurs in quotations. From the quotation of Is 26:2 in Mek Beshallah 7115 and Hab 2:4 in Mek Beshallah 7116 it appears that the tsaddiq is a man of faith.

Both in Zeph 3:5 which is quoted in Mek Beshallah 6117 and in

---

112 Tr. by Goldin, The Song at the Sea, pp. 213f. On the topic of the importance of the righteous see also Mek Shira 1 on Ex 15:1; II, p. 6; p. 118, where it is stated that one righteous person is as important as the whole world.

113 On Ex 12:22; I, p. 85; p. 38.

114 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekhita, I, p. 85.

115 On Ex 14:31; I, p. 253; p. 115.

116 On Ex 14:31; I, p. 254; p. 115.

Ex 9:27 which is quoted in Shirata 9, God is referred to as being righteous. In Mek Beshallah 6 the fact that God is righteous means that "He will bring to light Israel's judgment every morning." In Mek Shirata 9, on the other hand, the fact that God is righteous is interpreted to mean that he tempers judgment with mercy.

By virtue of what was burial granted to them? By virtue of (Pharaoh's) having said, "The Lord is righteous" etc.

(Exod. 9:27). Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to them: "You acknowledged the justice of the sentence upon you, in turn I shall not shortchange you, and I will grant you burial." As it is said, "Thou stretchedst out Thy right hand - the earth swallowed them."

In Mek Nezikin 18, Is 57:1, "the righteous (יִשְׂרָאֵל) pentsheth" is quoted by R. Akiba with respect to the death of R. Simeon and R. Ishmael. This passage is significant insofar that it shows, even if only in an indirect way, that the designation tsaddiq could be used to refer to specific Tannaim and not just to persons who were removed in time from the Tannaitic period.

In Mek Kaspa 3, Ex 23:7, "And the innocent (יִשְׂרָאֵל) and righteous (יִשְׂרָאֵל) slay thou not" is quoted five times. At first the

---

118 On Ex 15:12; II, p. 67; p. 145.
119 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, I, p. 238.
120 Tr. by Goldin, The Song at the Sea, pp. 208f.
121 On Ex 22:22; III, p. 142; p. 313.
stress is on the meaning of 'P, but toward the end of the discussion
the following argument is advanced:

Suppose one comes out from the court acquitted ('קבר) and
after a while they find evidence of his guilt (הפחד). I
might understand that they should bring him back for a new
trial. But it says: "And the righteous (P,י) slay thou
not." You might think that just as he came out acquitted
('קבר), from your court, he also came out acquitted from
My court. It says however: "For I will not justify the wicked
(והי תי)," 124

In this passage a distinction is made between the one whom man
declares to be righteous and whom God declares to be so. As far as man
is concerned a person is considered to be innocent, i.e. 'קבר and
P,י, if he is acquitted by the court even though he is later found
to be guilty. God, however, does not consider such a person to be
tzialik but declares him to be rasha. 125

Mach points out that although tsaddek is seldom used with this
meaning, there are other passages which support it. He especially
notes the Rabbinic discussions of Gen 20:40. All these discussions,

123 The parallel in P. Samhedrin 22b (top) has tsaddek.
124 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, III, pp. 171f.
125 Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 3, points out that these two terms are
synonyms. Kuhn, Sifre zu Numeri, p. 535, n. 11, makes a similar
observation with respect to the use of these two terms in Sifre
Num 133 on 27:1 (p. 176).
126 Cf. Lauterbach, Mekilta, III, p. 172, n. 10.
however, occur outside of the Tannaitic literature. 127

Both Mach and Ziesler indicate that tsaddiq is here used in a forensic sense, that is, man is declared innocent. 128 It should be stressed, however, that in the passage under discussion this is only true with respect to the human court; not with respect to God.

Let us now turn to some of the passages in which there are independent occurrences of the plural adjective tsaddiqim. In three cases the discussion deals with the prayers of the righteous. In Mek Vayassa 129 the following statement is found: וְצִדְקֵי חָוְד הָדָעֵד לֹא יִלְכֹּלַן. Lauterbach translates this as, "From this you learn that the righteous are not hard to complain to." 130 Since the passage goes on to deal with the topic of prayer, it appears that Winter's translation is more accurate. "Von hier (ist zu entnehmen), dass die Gerechten keine Schwierigkeit haben, dass ihr Gebet angenommen werde." 131

In the continuing discussion it is then stated that the prayer of the righteous is short. But this opinion is not left unchallenged for the discussion is concluded as follows: "For R. Eliezer used to say: There is a time to be brief in prayer and a time to be lengthy." 132

127 Mach, Der Zaddik, pp. 12f. Pes R XLII, 176b; Gen R LII, 547 (om. הָדוּעֵד); Tanch. B. wajjera 25.
128 Mach, Der Zaddik, pp. 9-13; Ziesler, Righteousness, pp. 116f.
129 On Ex 15:25; II, p. 91; p. 155.
130 Lauterbach, Mekilta, II, p. 91.
131 Winter and Wünsche, Mechiltha, p. 148.
132 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, II, p. 92.
In Mek Beshallah it is concluded on the basis of Ex 14:24, "And it came to pass in the morning watch", that the prayers of the righteous are heard in the morning. This is viewed in contrast to the fact that God will punish the wicked (מִשְׁרָשֵׁה) in Gehinnom only in the morning.

There are a number of passages in which the tsaddiqim are contrasted to the resha'im. In Mek Pisha it is stated:

We find that the names of the righteous and their deeds are revealed before God even before they are born, as it is said:

"Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee," etc. (Jer. 1:5).

We thus learn that the names of the righteous and their deeds are revealed before God. How about those of the wicked? Scripture says: "The wicked are estranged from the womb," etc. (Ps 58:4).

It should be noted that it is taken for granted that the righteous perform good deeds.

In Mek Amalek the tsaddiqim and resha'im are also contrasted. In this case it is pointed out that God cares about both groups. R. Zadok is quoted as saying:

It is the Holy One, blessed be He, who gives to every one his wants and to everybody according to his needs. And not

---

134 On Ex 13:2; I, pp. 134f.; p. 60.
135 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, I, pp. 134f.
136 On Ex 18:12; II, p. 178; p. 196.
to good people (םיינכט) (and righteous people) alone, but also to wicked people (םיינכט) and even to people who are worshipping idols.

The last example of the independent use of the term tsaddiqim to be considered is found in Mek Beshallah 6. In a discussion by R. Tarfon and the elders at Jabneh, it is stated that the righteous (םיינכט) have merit ( dàyב). "This is to make known how very much the merit of the righteous is of help to them." The illustration given is that of Joseph who is said to have been fortunate to have been taken along by a caravan bearing gum, balm and myrrh for in this way he was not killed by the stench of the camels. In this passage zekut appears to have a meaning which is similar to that of tsedeq.

5. Sifra

The Noun Tsedeq

There are five independent occurrences of the noun tsedeq in Sifra. In two of these cases tsedeq occurs in the expression per tsedeq. In both Sifra Behar parasha 5.1 on Lev 25:35 and in Sifra Behar peraq 8.1.

137 שֵׁם־יְלָדָה; Lauterbach, Mekilta, II, p. 178, introduces this term only as a variant reading while Horovitz, Mechilta, p. 196, and Winter and Wünsche, Mechiltha, p. 185, adopt this reading into their texts.

138 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, II, p. 178.

139 On Ex 14:22; I, p. 235; p. 106.

140 Tr. by Lauterbach, Mekilta, I, p. 235.

141 It should be noted that zekut is viewed as helping in a very mundane way. There is no hint as to a doctrine of the transfer of merit.
on Lev 25:47 the term *ger* is identified with the *ger tsedeq* while the
term *toshash* is identified with the stranger (*ger*) who eats *nebelot,*
that is, meat that is not kosher. The distinction drawn is thus between
those who do and those who do not obey a certain dietary law. The term
chosen to identify the person who does obey the dietary law is *tsedeq.*

In Sifra Qedoshim perek 8.7 on Lev 19:36 the term *tsedeq* occurs
eight times.142 Six of these occurrences are in direct quotations of
Lev 19:36 and two are independent. In Lev 19:36 the expressions "just
balances" (*פֶּרֶשׂ תַּחַת*), "just weights" (*פֶּרֶשׂ עֲנָן*), "a just epha"
(*פֶּרֶשׂ נַפַל*), and "a just hin" (*פֶּרֶשׂ חָמִשָּׁה* and "a just hin" (*פֶּרֶשׂ חָמִשָּׁה*) are found. It is self-evident
that in these expressions the noun *tsedeq* is used adjectivally.

"Just balances." Make the balances exactly right.143 "Just
weights." Make the weights exactly right. "Just epha."
Make the ephorot exactly right. "Just hin." Make the hin
exactly right. R. Jose ben Judah144 says: "But was not hin
included in epha?" For it is said: "And a just epha." If
this is so, why is it said: "You shall have a just hin." (It
is said because you shall have a) righteous No and a righteous
Yes.145

---

142 The text for Sifra is based on an orthodox edition
(Jerusalem, 1959).

143 The verb פֶּרֶשׂ is used.

144 Moore, Judaism, II, p. 189, explains that this is "R. Jose
ben Judah (ben Ilia)".

145 Unless otherwise indicated, the translations of Sifra are
those of the author. For the last part of the translation cf. Moore,
Judaism, II, p. 189, "Let your Yes be righteous and your No be
The conclusion reached in this discussion is based on a play on words. R. Jose ben Judah argues that the term הָיָן is repeated because in the second case it is not meant to refer to the measure "hin" but to the Aramaic "hen" meaning yes. The noun תָּשֶׁדֶק, being used adjectively in the genitive position of the construct-genitive relationship, in this case has the meaning of honest.

The fifth independent occurrence of תָּשֶׁדֶק is in Sifra Emor parasha 1.13f. on Lev 21:3. Here R. Jose says: "A man should not defile himself for a (piece of) his father's bone the size of a barley grain." To illustrate this point, the following example is given. It is stated that Joseph b. Pakesas had a gangrenous swelling on his leg.

---


146 Cf. Baba Metzia 49a; I. Epstein, ed., The Babylonian Talmud (London, 1935-1948), p. 291, n. 7, "This is a play on words, 'hin', a measure being connected with 'hen', Aramaic for 'yes'."

147 Cf. Baba Metzia 49a, ibid., p. 291, "Abaye said: That means that one must not speak one thing with the mouth and another with the heart."

148 J. Winter, Sifra, p. 542, translates this passage as follows: "R. Jose sagt: Ein Mensch darf, sich nicht an dem Gebein von der Größe eines Gerstenkorns von seinem Vater verunreinigen. There are parallels to this story in P. Nazir 55d and שֵׁמָהוֹת pereq 4,15. In the latter the passage begins as follows: "A priest should defile himself for a piece of bone from his deceased father, the size of a barley grain, but not for a limb from a living person, even in the case of his father." E.t. by D. Zlotnick, The Tractate "Mourning" (Shemahot) (Yale Judaica Series 17; New Haven, 1966), p. 43. The example which now follows deals with Joseph b. Pakesas, that is, Sifra has רֹפֵא שֵׁמָהוֹת, P. Nazir has סוּכַל רֹפֵא שֵׁמָהוֹת and שֵׁמָהוֹת has סוּכַל רֹפֵא שֵׁמָהוֹת. Zlotnick, ibid., p. 116, states that "Joseph ben Piekam" was a priest. The interpretation and translation of this story is based largely on the work of Zlotnick."
When he went for an operation he told the doctor, "Let me know when the leg is hanging by a hair." The doctor then operated and told him when the leg was hanging by a hair. While still being technically whole, Joseph called his son, Nehunya (נְחֹנִי), and said to him, "My son, until now you were obligated to attend to me. From now on go away, for a man should not defile himself for the limb from a living person, (not even) from his father." The illustration concludes as follows:

And when the matter came to the attention of the sages they said: "About this one (Joseph b. Pakas) it is said: 'There is a righteous man (יְרֵשׁ) who perishes in his righteousness' (יְרֵשׁ; Eccles 7:15)." The righteous man (יְרֵשׁ) perishes but his righteousness (יְרֵשׁ) remains with him.

Zlotnick states that this story shows Joseph's devotion to the law. This interpretation is particularly brought out in the parallel in Se'ah 4 4, where not only Eccles 7:15 but also Ps 119:109 is given: "My soul is continually in my hand; yet have I not forgotten

---

149 J. Winter, Sifra, p. 542, translates this passage as follows: "Von nun an gehe hinaus, denn man darf sich nicht an dem Gliede eines Lebenden von seinem Vater verunreinigen." Cf. Nazir 43b, "For it has been taught: R. Judah said that he may defile himself for her, but not for her limbs; for he is forbidden to defile himself for limbs severed from his father whilst still alive; but he may defile himself for limbs severed from his father after death." (I, Epstein, ed., The Babylonian Talmud, p. 159). Zlotnick, The Tractate "Mourning", p. 116, explains that Joseph ordered his son to leave the house, because a limb from a living person causes tent defilement. For the custom of not severing something completely so that both patient and doctor could remain ritually clean see Kerithoth 3:8.

Thy Law." Indeed Joseph's devotion to the Law was so great that he did not fear the prospect of personal hardship on account of it. As Eccles 7:15 implies, not having his son care for him would lead to the end result that Joseph b. Paksas would perish. Despite such a prospect, Joseph did not deviate from the strict interpretation of the law that a man should not defile himself for the limb of a living person, not even his father. Because of such devotion to the law the sages noted that Joseph b. Paksas had righteousness (tsedeq). Tsedeq thus refers to the strict adherence to the law.

The foregoing interpretation is the one which arises most naturally out of the text as found in Sifra Emor parashah 1.13f. on Lev 21:3 and P. Nazir 55d. On the basis of a variant for Šemahot pereq 4.15, however, another interpretation is possible.

According to the text of Sifra and P. Nazir it is clear that Joseph b. Paksas acted as he did because he knew that a son should not defile himself for the limb of his father. On the basis of a variant for Šemahot pereq 4.15, on the other hand, it appears that it was only as a result of this particular incident that the sages ruled that a man should not defile himself from a living person, not even from his father. 131

On the basis of this reading Dr. A. Baumgarten has suggested that the righteousness of Joseph b. Paksas was based on the fact that he did more than the law required. According to this interpretation Joseph b. Paksas thought that his son would have to defile himself.

131 Ibid.
Joseph b. Paksas thus acted as he did in order to protect his son from defilement. In order to prevent this type of self-sacrifice which a father might be tempted to undergo for his son, the sages ruled that a son should not defile himself for the limb of his father.

The latter interpretation indeed appears to answer the question of Joseph's motivation more appropriately than the former interpretation. But in keeping with the adopted methodology of giving priority to the Tannaitic literature as defined above, preference will be given to the interpretation based on the text of Sifra.

In addition to the five independent occurrences just discussed, there are nine dependent occurrences of *tsedeq*. Seven of these have already been noted above. The two remaining references are in quotations of Lev 19:15 and they occur in adjoining interpretations in Sifra Qedoshim pereq 4.4 on Lev 19:15.

The text under discussion is, "With righteousness (יִשָּׂא) shall you judge your neighbor" (Lev 19:15). In the first interpretation יִשָּׂא is defined in terms of the equality of all persons in judgment. The examples given are the right of an equal opportunity to talk and of uniformity with respect to sitting and standing. For instance, R. Judah explains that it is not permitted that one person stands while the other sits. *Tsedeq* thus refers to equality of treatment in court.

In the second interpretation יִשָּׂא is interpreted to mean that all men are to be judged "in the scale of innocence" (לכְּךָ צְּדָק).

---

Consequently, "with righteousness" (צדק) is taken to be equivalent to "with mercy." Judging your neighbor with righteousness means to judge him leniently.

The Noun Tsedqaqah

There is one independent and one dependent occurrence of the noun tsedqaqah in Sifra. Is 48:18 is quoted in Sifra Behuqqotai parasha 1:1 on Lev 26:3 but the occurrence of tsedqaqah in this quotation is not significant for the context. In the independent use in Sifra Hohab parasha 12:12 on Lev 5:17, הָרְפֵּא means alms. Rabbi argues that if scripture (Deut 19:5) assures protection to the one who accidentally killed somebody, how much more will the person "who collects alms ( afterEach) and provides for the poor and is charitable be given life."

The Adjective Tsaddiq

There are four independent occurrences of the singular adjective tsaddiq in Sifra. Three times it refers to specific persons. In Sifra Emor parasha 1.14 on Lev 21:3, a passage which was discussed above with reference to the independent use of tsedeq, the term tsaddiq is applied to Joseph b. Paksas. In Sifra Ahare parasha 9.7 on Lev 18:3 and in Sifra Ahare pereq 13:8 on Lev 18:3 the term הָרְפֵּא refers to Abraham. In both of these passages it is stated that the Canaanites had peace because they honored the righteous one.153

153 Cf. Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 121.
The fourth reference to *tsaddiq* is found in Sifra Metsora' parasha 5:12 on Lev 14:36. Here the terms *tsaddiq* and *rasha* are contrasted to each other without specific persons being named.

Of the dependent occurrences of the singular adjective *tsaddiq* the quotation of Is 26:2 in Sifra Ahare pereq 13.13 on Lev 18:5 is significant. It should also be noted that the plural adjective *tsaddiqim* occurs in the quotations from Ps 118:20 and Ps 33:1.

R. Jeremiah said: Whence can you know that a Gentile who practises the Law is equal to the High Priest? Because it says, 'Which if a man do, he shall live through them' (Lev. XVIII,5). And it says, 'This is the Law [Torah] of man' (II Sam. VII,19). It does not say: 'The Law of Priests, Levites, Israelites,' but, 'This is the Law of man, O Lord God.' And it does not say, 'Open the gates, and let the Priests and Levites and Israel enter,' but it says, 'Open the gates that a righteous Gentile may enter' (Isa. XXVI,2); and it says, 'This is the gate of the Lord, the righteous shall enter it.' It does not say, 'The Priests and the Levites and Israel shall enter it,' but it says, 'The righteous shall enter it' (Ps. CXVIII,20). And it does not say, 'Rejoice ye, Priests and Levites and Israelites,' but it says, 'Rejoice ye righteous' (Ps. XXXIII,1). And it does not say, 'Do good, O Lord, to the Priests and the Levites

---

154 In Sanhedrin 59a, Baba Kamma 38a and Abodah Zarah 3a this passage is attributed to R. Meir.
and the Israelites,' but it says, 'Do good, O Lord, to the good' (Ps. CXXV, 4). So even a Gentile, if he practises the Law, is equal to the High Priest. 155

This passage states very forcefully that the determining factor for being a truly religious person such as a High Priest is not that one is a Priest, Levite or Israelite but that one is a person who practises the law. It is implied in this passage that one who practices the law is among the tsaddiqim. Moreover, it is clear that one does not have to be a Priest, Levite or Israelite in order to be classed among the righteous. It is possible to be a righteous gentile without becoming a proselyte. Moore sums this point up very well by using this passage to support the following assertion: "In content and intention the Law is universal; and, notwithstanding the collective rejection by the Gentiles, individual Gentiles who obey its commandments share in its promises." 156

Let us now discuss some of the independent occurrences of the plural adjective tsaddiqim. In Sifra Behuq'otah pereq 3, 3 on Lev 26:12 the term tsaddiqim occurs three times to describe those who will walk with God in the Garden of Eden. In Sifra Hobah parasha 12:9 on Lev 5:17, R. Jose mentions the reward which will be given in the future to the righteous who repent and fast on the Day of Atonement. It

---

155 Tr. by Montefiore and Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology, p. 564. This translation is based on the edition of Sifra by I. H. Weiss (Vienna, 1862), f. 86b. Weiss reads 'Gentile' while the traditional text has 'foreigner'.

156 Moore, Judaism, I, pp. 278f.
should be noted that in this passage repentance rather than deeds are stressed.

In Sifra Qedoshim pereq 11.6 on Lev 20:16 the tsaddiqim are compared to the rehashaim. It is argued that since God even cares about the wicked, he will all the more be considerate toward the righteous. In this case the righteous are defined as those who practise Torah and do the will of their father who is in heaven.

For our final example of the use of tsaddiqim we will consider Sifra Shemini Millu'im 22-27 on Lev 10:1-5. In this passage the death of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron is discussed. The discussion ends as follows: "If for those who offended him by bringing before him that which was not in accord with his will, God (יווה) acted thus, how much more (will he do good) for the rest of the righteous (ְַעִמָּלְמָלְה)." It is clearly implied that even though Nadab and Abihu sinned to the extent that God felt it necessary to put an immediate end to their lives, they nevertheless were considered among the righteous.157

6. The Mishnah

The Noun Tsedeq

There are no independent occurrences of the noun tsedeq in the Mishnah. In Sotah 1:9, however, this term does occur in a quotation of Is 58:8.

157Dr. E. F. Sanders suggests that their death atoned for their transgressions.
Moses was reckoned worthy to take the bones of Joseph, and none in Israel is greater than he, as it is written, "And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him" (Ex 13:19). Whom have we greater than Moses, for none other than the Almighty occupied himself with him, as it is written, "And he buried him in the valley" (Deut 34:6). And not of Moses alone have they spoken thus, but of all the righteous (כולהון זכריה) for it is written, "And thy righteousness (צדקתי) shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall gather thee [in death] (Is 58:8). 158

In this passage tsedeq is directly related to tsaddiqim. Consequently, it is implied that the righteous have righteousness. From the context it is possible to determine the meaning of the term tsedeq.

The discussion relevant to our passage starts with Sotah 1:7, "With what measure a man metes it shall be measured to him again." 159

In the remainder of 1:7-8 this general statement is illustrated with negative examples; that is, how bad deeds are punished. In 1:9 positive examples are given. They are introduced by the statement: נבוב לאכתיו בעבר. Blackman translates this as follows: "And thus

---

158 Tr. by H. Danby, The Mishnah (1933; rpt. London, 1967), p. 294. The biblical references and Hebrew equivalents have been incorporated into Danby's translation. Unless otherwise indicated the Hebrew text will be that of H. Albeck, Mishnah (Tel Aviv, 1958).

159 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 294.
also in the matter of a good deed."160 This is followed by examples of how good deeds are rewarded in the case of Miriam, Joseph and Moses. Tsedeq thus refers to the good deeds of the righteous which are rewarded by God.

The Noun Tsedeqah

There are six161 independent occurrences of the noun tsedeqah in the Mishnah. In the four following passages the meaning of tsedeqah falls within the general concept of charity.

None may take change for money from the counter of excisemen or from the wallet of tax-gatherers, or take any alms (ןפרו) from them . . . . 162 (Baba Kamma 10:1)

The School of Shamai say: Almoners (ןפרו י女兒)163 should give what has been tithed to them that do not give tithe and what is untithed to them that do give tithe; thus all will eat what is duly tithed.164 (Demai 3:1).

---


161 There would be seven if Aboth 6:6 were included. Since the sixth chapter of Aboth appears to be a late gloss, probably from the 11th century, this chapter will not be included in this discussion.

162 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 346.

163 Blackman, Mishnayoth, I, p. 147, translates this expression as "treasurers of charity". They were the collectors of charity in Jewish communities.

164 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 22.
... and all whose fathers are known to have held office as public officers or almoners (נְחוֹר בַּעֲלוֹת) may marry into the priestly stock and none need trace their descent. (Kiddushin 4:5)

In Aboth 5:13 it is noted that, "There are four types of almsgivers (נְחוֹר בַּעֲלוֹת)." The passage then goes on to describe the four types.

In the two remaining occurrences of the noun teadqah the meaning is not as easily determined as in the four previous passages. Danby translates the saying of Hillel in Aboth 2:7 as follows:

- He used to say: ... the more study of the Law the more life; the more schooling the more wisdom; the more counsel the more understanding; the more righteousness (נְחוֹר בַּעֲלוֹת) the more peace.

On the basis of the context it is impossible to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the meaning of teadqah. This is reflected in the lack of uniformity of the various English translations of this passage. Our only clue as to the meaning of teadqah may be

---

165 Blackman, Mishnayoth, III, p. 477, uses the translation, "official almoners" and explains further in n. 5 that this expression means, "collectors of charity".

166 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 328.

167 Ibid., p. 457.

168 Ibid., p. 448.

Is 32:17, a possible parallel to the passage under discussion. It appears that in Is 32:17 te'adaqah does not necessarily refer to charity. Consequently, it is possible that the term te'adaqah in Aboth 2:7 could also have a meaning other than charity.

In Aboth 2:2 it can be established with some certainty that te'adaqah does not refer to charity.

Rabban Gamaliel the son of R. Judah the Patriarch said:

... And let all them that labour with the congregation labour with them for the sake of Heaven, for the merit (נודא) of their fathers supports them and their righteousness (צדקא) endures for ever. And as for you, [will God say,] I count you worthy of great reward as ye [yourselves] had wrought. 171

Maimonides makes the following comment regarding those who labour with the congregation.

For at times, while they are engaged in the needs of the community they will be precluded from practicing a precept.

He said that the Lord, may He be blessed, will consider them worthy of recompense as though they had practiced that precept even though they did not practice it, since they

while R. T. Herford, The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers (New York, 1974), p. 48, translates it as charity. Blackman, Mishnayoth, IV, p. 500, suggests two translations. In the actual text he uses "charity" and in the explanation in n. 10 he states, "or righteousness".

170 ונהבד תעש הזדיך שלום

171 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, pp. 447f.
were engaged with the community for the sake of Heaven.\footnote{Maimonides, The Commentary to Mishnah Aboth, pp. 30f.}

It appears that Maimonides implies that 
\textit{tsedeqa}h refers to the practising of precepts. This may only be part of the real meaning. In this instance 
\textit{tsedeqa}h may also refer to the resultant quality a person possesses because he has done unselfish work.

The term 
\textit{tsedeqa}h also occurs in a scriptural quotation where it does not have the meaning of charity. In Aboth 5:18, Deut 33:21 is quoted as follows:

\begin{quote}
He that leads the many to virtue, through him shall no sin befall; but he that leads the many to sin, to him shall be given no means for repentance. Moses was virtuous and he led the many to virtue; the virtue (א"ר) of the many depended on him, as it is written, "He executed the justice of the Lord (י"ה וּהְוָה) and his judgements with Israel" (Deut 33:21).\footnote{Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 458.}
\end{quote}

In this passage the terms 
\textit{zekut} and 
\textit{tsedeqa}h are related insofar as the virtue of the many is dependent on the fact that Moses executed the righteousness of the Lord. These terms are not equivalent\footnote{Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, p. 94, and Blackman, Mishnayothen, IV, p. 535, translate 
\textit{zekut} as "righteousness" thereby indicating that these two terms are equivalent.} but rather 
\textit{zekut} is the result of doing 
\textit{tsedeqa}h. The concept of righteousness (\textit{tsedeqa}h) in this case may include the giving of charity but its meaning is definitely more comprehensive than this.
The Adjective Tsaddiq

There are six independent occurrences of the singular adjective tsaddiq in the Mishnah. In three cases tsaddiq is used in the description of specific individuals. In Aboth 1:2 and 1:3 Simeon the Tsaddiq is mentioned and in Nedarim 3:11 R. Joshua b. Karha refers to Moses the Tsaddiq.

In Uktzin 3:12 the expression דלעיל צדיקים occurs. Blackman translates this passage as follows: "R. Joshua ben Levi said, The Holy One, blessed be He, will at a future time cause all the righteous to inherit three hundred and ten worlds". Blackman points out that literally this expression means "every righteous one".

The sixth independent occurrence of the term tsaddiq is found in Negaim 12:5.

R. Meir said: ... If the Law thus takes thought for that property of a man that is of least worth, how much more for property that he prizes most! And if for his property how much more for the life of his sons and daughters! And if for what belongs to the wicked (יושבש) how much more for what belongs to the righteous (פורהש)! It should be noted that in the above passage the singular terms tsaddiq and rashan are used to compare the righteous and the wicked.

175 Blackman, Mishnayoth, VI, p. 796.

176 Ibid., VI, p. 796, n. 1. Cf. Danby, Mishnah, p. 789, "every saint".

177 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 692.
Generally the plural terms are used for this purpose. For example, in the Mishnah there are twelve independent occurrences of the term *tsaddiqim* and in ten of these the *tsaddiqim* are contrasted to the *resha'im*.

The occurrence of the term *tsaddiqim* in Sotah 1:9, where it is implied that the righteous have righteousness, has already been discussed. The eleven remaining independent occurrences are found in Aboth and Sanhedrin.

In Aboth 5:1 it is stated that the wicked destroy the world while the righteous sustain it. This idea is expressed in more detail in Sanhedrin 8:5 where it is explained how death, wine and sleep, dispersion, gathering together and peacefulness are or are not a benefit to the wicked and righteous and the world in general.

In Aboth 2:16 it is stated that the reward of the righteous is for the time to come. From Sanhedrin 10:3 it is evident that the distinction between the *tsaddiqim* and *resha'im* is all important for the world to come.

Although it is clear that God prefers the righteous, he nevertheless cares about the wicked. This is clear from the following saying by R. Meir in Sanhedrin 6:5, "If God is sore troubled at the blood of the ungodly that is shed, how much more at the blood of the righteous?" That there is reason to be concerned for the welfare of

---

178 The terms *resha'im* and *tsaddiqim* are each used five times.

179 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 391.
the righteous in this world is clear from the following saying in Aboth 4:15 by R. Yannai: "It is not in our power to explain the well-being of the wicked or the sorrows or the righteous."

7. The Tosefta

The Noun Tsedeq

There is only one independent occurrence of the noun tsedeq in the Tosefta. It occurs in the expression ger tsedeq in T. Arakin 5:9. In the interpretation of Lev 25:39 the following argument is presented:

"And if your brother becomes poor beside you, and sells himself to you" (Lev 25:39). (This does) not (mean that he sells himself) to you but to the stranger (የMari). For it is said: "And he sells himself" (Lev 25:47). (This means that he does) not (sell himself) to the righteous proselyte (የMari) but to the sojourner (የMari). For it is said: "And he sells himself to the sojourner" (Lev 25:47).

180 Ibid., p. 454, n. 10, Danby states that R. Yannai belongs to the post-Mishnaic era, and lived ca. 250 A.D. Herford, The Ethics of the Talmud, p. 114, claims that R. Yannai is the father of R. Dostai and therefore a contemporary of R. Meir. Blackman, Mishnayoth, IV, p. 522, n. 2, states, "Perhaps the father of R. Dostai quoted in 3:8." Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 37, mentions the "Tannait Yannai". It is quite probable that R. Yannai does belong to the Tanna'im and consequently his saying should be included in this discussion.

181 Tr. by Danby, Mishnah, p. 454.

182 Unless otherwise indicated the translations of the Tosefta are those of the author.

183 It appears that this discussion is based on the fact that
The intent of this argument is to show that an Israelite does not sell himself to another Israelite but only to a sojourner. The proof is dependent on the fact that a righteous proselyte (ger tzedeq) is fully like an Israelite. The term tzedeq thus is instrumental in pointing out that a certain type of person is properly religious so that he can be treated like an Israelite.

In addition to the one independent occurrence, the term tzedeq occurs at least 11 times in biblical quotations. In three cases tzedeq is interpreted as referring to alms. All three cases are found in T. Peah 4:18 in quotations of Ps 85:12(11), 89:15(14) and Is 58:8. In the same passage Deut 24:13 is quoted and the term tzedaqah is likewise interpreted as referring to alms. It should be noted that these interpretations occur in a context which specifically deals with the topic of alms, for in T. Peah 4:19 almsgiving (tzedaqah) and deeds of lovingkindness (gemilut hasadim) are discussed. In T. Maaser Shenai 5:25, Ps 85:12(11) is quoted once again. Here tzedeq, although not referring specifically to alms, has a related meaning insofar as it refers to God's gifts for man.

Lev 25:47 can be read either as זכאר לזרו וזכאר לזרו הזקן or as זכאר לזרו וזכאר לזרו הזקן. The former reading is adopted in Sifra Behar pereq 8.1 where זכאר is said to refer to the פזא וזרו and זכאר is said to refer to זכאר בזרו. The latter reading is preferred by T. Arakin 5:9. Unless otherwise indicated the text of the Tosefta is that of the edition by M. S. Zuckermandel, Tosefta (new edition with additional notes and corrections; Jerusalem, 1970).

184 Since the concordance to the Tosefta does not list the occurrences in biblical quotations, this count is based on the research of the author.

In the seven remaining occurrences, tzedeq has a meaning other than alms. In the quotation from Lev 19:36 in T. Baba Batra 5:7, the expressions יְדִּיב בָּשָׂר, יִדְמְרו יָדָק, יְדִיב נְדָדִים and יִדָּשׁ יָדָה occur.\textsuperscript{186} In this case יִדָּשׁ is used adjectively and should be translated as just balances, just weights, just epha and just hin. The stress is on honest weights and measures.

In Ps 58:2(1) quoted in T. Sotah 9:8, in Ps 119:164 quoted in T. Berakoth 7:25 and in Lev 19:15 quoted in T. Sanhedrin 6:2, the term tzedeq refers to proper judgment. In the latter passage the reference to tzedeq in the quotation is especially relevant to the Rabbinic discussion: Danby's translation of T. Sanhedrin 6:2 is as follows:

Men must stand when they pronounce sentence, or bear witness, or ask for absolution from vows, or when they remove any one from the status of priesthood or of Israelitish citizenship. The judges may not show forbearance to one man and strictness to another, nor suffer one to stand and another to sit; for it is written: "In righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour" (Lev 19:15).\textsuperscript{187}

The above interpretation of Lev 19:15 corresponds to that found in Sifra Qedoshim pereq 4.4 on Lev 19:15. In both passages tzedeq is interpreted as referring to the equality of all persons in judgment.

\textsuperscript{186} Cf. Sifra Qedoshim pereq 8.7 on Lev 19:36.

The Noun *Tsedaqah*

There are 36 independent occurrences of the noun *tsedaqah* in the Tosefta. In 31 instances *tsedaqah* is used with reference to the giving, receiving or administration of alms. In five instances it has the meaning of mercy.

Of the 31 uses with reference to the concept of alms, *tsedaqah* occurs 26 times in the singular *absolute* state, once in the plural *absolute* state and four times in the genitive position in the expression נַפְרֵיהֶנָּה, collectors of public charity. All of these references adhere to the definition of *tsedaqah* given in T. Peah 4:19, a passage in which the concepts of almsgiving (נַפְרֵיהֶנָּה) and deeds of lovingkindness (דְּבָרֵיהֶנָּה) are compared. Moore translates this passage as follows:

Almsgiving and deeds of lovingkindness are equal to all the commandments of the Law. Almsgiving is exercised toward the living, deeds of lovingkindness toward the living and the dead; almsgiving to the poor, deeds of lovingkindness to the poor and to the rich; almsgiving is done with a man’s money,

---

188. T. Baba Batra 8:14; T. Baba Kamma 10:22, 11:6; T. Ketubot 6:10 (twice), 9:3; T. Megillah 1:5, 3:4 (2 times); T. Middah 6:10 (twice); T. Peah 4:16, 19 (4 times), 20, 21 (3 times); T. Pesahim 7:16; T. Shabbat 16:22; T. Shehiit 7:9; T. Sotah 14:10; T. Terumot 1:10.

189. נַפְרֵיהֶנָּה; T. Arakin 3:17.

190. T. Baba Kamma 11:6; T. Baba Metzia 3:9 (twice); T. Demai 3:17.

deeds of lovingkindness either with money or personally.\textsuperscript{192}

The importance of almsgiving (teedaqah) cannot be stressed enough. Not only are almsgiving and deeds of lovingkindness equal to all the commandments of the law but according to T. Peah 4:21 they are a great intercessor and a great peace-maker between Israel and their Father in Heaven. As far as R. Joshua b. Karha is concerned, to refrain from almsgiving is tantamount to practising idolatry.\textsuperscript{193}

Due to the great importance of almsgiving, care must be taken in the designation of alms. For example, alms must not be collected from those who eat the fruit of the seventh year\textsuperscript{194} nor taken out of the poor-tithe money.\textsuperscript{195} The acceptance of ill-gotten alms can have dire consequences. For example, it is argued in T. Sotah 14:10 that ever since the Israelites accepted alms from the Gentiles, they decreased while the Gentiles increased.

Let us now turn to the five cases in which teedaqah refers to mercy. That the meanings almsgiving and mercy are closely related is indicated by T. Peah 4:21, where the occurrence of the term סְדָרִים in the quotation of Jer 16:5 is seen to point to the term וַדֶּאָ֣קָה, even though in this case וַדֶּאָ֣קָה has the meaning of almsgiving.\textsuperscript{196}

\textsuperscript{192}Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 19, notes that סְדָרִים are of a wider scope than almsgiving (טַדְּאָקָה) so that the former concept really includes the latter. Cf. Sukkah 49b.

\textsuperscript{193}T. Peah 4:20.
\textsuperscript{194}T. Demai 3:17.
\textsuperscript{195}T. Peah 4:16.
\textsuperscript{196}Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, II, p. 562, has the translation "Wohltätigkeit" for וַדֶּאָ֣קָה.
R. Eleazar said in the name of R. Jose. From where (do we know) that almsgiving (נפרדה) and deeds of loving-kindness (行為ה ברורת) are a great intercessor and a great peace (maker) between Israel and their Father in Heaven? Because it says: "For thus says the Lord: Do not enter the house of mourning, or go (to lament, or bemoan them; for I have taken away my peace from this people, says the Lord, my steadfast love and mercy)" (Jer 16:5). Steadfast love (דומת) that is deeds of lovingkindness (בסività תומכת) and mercy (רעות וחיים) that is almsgiving (קרוב).

In the above passage the relationship between the concepts of mercy and almsgiving could very well be based on the assumption that one shows mercy by giving alms to the poor. Such reasoning seems to lie behind the use of tsedeqah in T. Sanhedrin 1:4.

When judgment has been given in a case, justifying him who was in the right, and condemning him who was in the wrong, if it be a poor man who has been condemned the judge sends him away and gives him support out of his own pocket. He is thus found acting with judgment to the one and with mercy ( длור) to the other.


198 Tr. by Danby, Tractate Sanhedrin, p. 28, except for the substitution of mercy for charity as the translation of tsedeqah.
In the above passage tsedqah definitely has the meaning of mercy; mercy that is put into practice by the giving of money. In the immediately following passage in T. Sanhedrin 1:5, however, the meaning of tsedqah is based not on the giving of something but on the taking away of stolen property.

Rabbi says: When judgment has been given in a case, justifying him who was in the right, and condemning him who was in the wrong, kindness (נפר) is dealt to him who was in the wrong since what was stolen is taken from him; and judgment is meted out to him who was in the right, since what was his is restored to him.199

Just as is the case in T. Sanhedrin 1:5, so in 1:3 the term tsedqah is used with the meaning of kindness/mercy without strong overtones of the giving of material objects.

R. Joshua b. Kefa said: ... And it is written of David:

"And David administered (strict) justice (צדק) and mercy (נפר) to all his people" (2 Sam 8:15). And is it not the case that wherever there is (strict) justice (צדק) there is no mercy (נפר)? And where there is mercy (נפר) there is no (strict) justice (צדק)? Then what is (strict) justice (צדק) wherein there is mercy (נפר)? Say, that is mediation

199 Dr. E. P. Sanders has suggested that a kindness is done in punishing the crime, probably since the punishment atones.

200 Montefiore and Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology, p. 392, point out that tsedqah is here used "in its later Rabbinic sense of almsgiving or charity." The context, however, points to a comparison of strict justice with mercy, not charity.
As is clear from the context, the discussion is concerned with the relative merits of formal judgment according to the strict interpretation of halakah as opposed to informal judgment making use of the concept of mediation in order to arrive at a fair settlement. It is clear that ṭsedaqah refers to that type of judgment which is less harsh and consequently more merciful than strict justice.

In addition to the 36 independent occurrences, the term ṭsedaqah occurs at least five times in biblical quotations. The quotation of 2 Sam 8:15 in T. Sanhedrin 1:3 has already been noted above and it was concluded that David's ṭsedaqah referred to his mercy. The reference to ṭsedaqah in Deut 24:13 is interpreted in T. Peah 4:18 as referring to alms. These two meanings of ṭsedaqah correspond to those already discussed with respect to the independent occurrences. In the three remaining dependent occurrences, the meaning of ṭsedaqah seems to deviate from the meanings established thus far.

In Deut 33:21, as quoted in T. Sotah 4:9, ṭsedaqah appears to refer to the ordinances of God. In Ez 3:20, as quoted in T. Yom ha-Kippurim 5(4):12, ṭsedaqah appears to refer to proper conduct in the sight of God. In Ez 33:12 as quoted in T. Kiddushin 1:14, ṭsedaqah clearly refers to the resultant quality which a righteous man possesses.

---

201 ṭsedaqah is translated as "arbitration" by Danby, Tractate Sanhedrin, p. 28, and as "Vermittlung" by Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, III, p. 210.


203 See n. 184.
because he has lived according to a proper norm. On the basis of the foregoing discussion it is obvious that in the Tosefta the term tsedqah is not used with a consistent meaning. This is not to say that a primary meaning cannot be discerned. On the contrary, the primary meaning of tsedqah is without doubt that of almsgiving. Nevertheless, tsedqah does have a number of distinct secondary meanings. It does refer to mercy, both in the sense of the showing of kindness through the giving of material benefits or not, and in the sense of the opposite of judgment according to strict justice. Tsedqah is also used with reference to proper conduct according to God's norm.

The Adjective Tsaddiq

The singular adjective tsaddiq is used not only with reference to specific individuals but also in more general ways. In T. Kiddushin 1:14f., for example, R. Simeon compares the perfectly righteous man to the perfectly wicked man.

If a man has been perfectly righteous (יודע ידניק) all his days and rebels at the end, he destroys it all, for it is said, "The righteousness of the righteous man (יודע ידניק)

---

204 For a translation of T. Kiddushin 1:14 see discussion below of the adjective tsaddiq.


206 According to Kiddushin 40b and P. Peah 16b this is R. Simeon b. Yohai.
will not save him in the day when he transgresses" (Ezek 33:12).

If a man has been perfectly wicked (יְרֵעָה כלתוּם) all his days and repents at the end, God receives him, for it is said, "And as for the wickedness of the wicked (יְרֵעָה כלתוּם), he shall not fall by it when he turns from his wickedness" (Ezek 33:12).

Mach uses the above passage as proof for the view that every individual is judged according to the majority of his deeds. In actual fact this passage teaches nothing of the kind. Rather than referring to the weighing of good and bad deeds, this passage implies that a single transgression committed by a perfectly righteous man at the end of his life can undo the effect of all the good deeds which he had performed previously. Also, if this passage is seen in its context, that is, if 1:15 is taken into account, it is clear that a man's future is not only decided by his deeds, but by acts of repentance. Even if a man has been perfectly wicked, God will still receive him as long as he repents. Therefore, according to this passage, two avenues exist for man to inherit the world to come. He can strive to be a perfectly righteous man, and in this case perfect implies a 100% type of perfection, or he can repent of his transgressions. The way of a simple majority of good deeds is not left open by this passage.

---

207 Mach, Der Zaddik, p. 124.
The only other passage in the Tosefta in which the term ידיל occurs in relationship to the righteous or the wicked is T. Sanhedrin 13:3. Here the expression ידיל משא is found. According to the School of Shammai there are three classes of people, that is, those who will enter into everlasting life, those who will suffer shame and everlasting contempt and those who will go down to Gehenna but in the end receive healing. It is explicitly stated that the perfectly wicked make up the second class.

Although no specific name is attributed to the first class, Mach is probably right in stating that they are the perfectly righteous.208 On the other hand, Mach's assertion that the third class are those whose good and bad deeds are evenly balanced and that the whole passage provides proof for the general principle that every individual is judged according to the majority of his deeds, is not convincing. At best it can be said that this passage, rather than pointing to a generally accepted principle, points to a view held by the School of Shammai. As is clear from the ensuing discussion in T. Sanhedrin 13:3, the School of Hillel did not hold to this three-fold distinction but argued that God leans in the direction of mercy. Since T. Kiddushin 1:14f. also sees repentance as a criterion for the decision as to men's final judgment, it is unwarranted to take only the idea of the weighing

---

208 Ibid., p. 38. Cf. Montefiore and Loew, A Rabbinic Anthology, p. 601; J. Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70, II, p. 238. It should be noted that Zuckermandel, Tosephta, p. 434, refers to a variant in T. Sanhedrin 13:3 which reads ידיל משא. A parallel passage in Roash ha-Shamah 16b (end) also has this reading.
of good and bad deeds as the sole basis for the final judgment of the righteous and the wicked.

Let us now turn to the use of the plural adjective ṭsadḏiqîm. It appears that by far the most significant occurrences are found in T. Sanhedrin. In 8:4 it is made clear that being righteous or wicked is not simply an accident of birth. It is argued that only a single man was created in the beginning so that the righteous could not say that they were the children of a righteous man and the wicked that they were the children of a wicked man.

In T. Sanhedrin 13:2 the fate of the gentiles is under discussion. R. Eliezer holds that no gentiles have a share in the world to come. R. Joshua, on the other hand, holds that there are righteous persons among the gentiles, who have a share in the world to come.

According to T. Sanhedrin 11:8, R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon that, "Beauty and power and wisdom and wealth and old age and glory and honour and sons, are good for the righteous and good for the whole world."\(^{209}\) R. Simeon b. Menasya then goes on to say that, "These seven qualities which the wise have counted among the virtues of the righteous were all exemplified in Rabbi and his sons."\(^{210}\) It thus appears that at the end of the Tannaitic period, some of the righteous led a very comfortable existence.

\(^{209}\) Tr. by Danby, Tractate Sanhedrin, p. 111.

\(^{210}\) Ibid., p. 112.
8. Summary and Conclusions

The most obvious conclusion emerging from the foregoing discussion is that the term τσαδדικ plays a crucial role in defining who is or is not properly religious. It is also clear that there are no major differences in the use of this term in the Tannaitic midrashim and the Mishnah and Tosefta. Consequently, the following conclusions apply to the Tannaitic literature as a whole.

In the singular, the adjective τσαδדικ is used both with respect to God and man. Just as God is righteous so man is to be righteous. 211 The righteous man practises the law and thus is a man of good deeds. Indeed, even if it leads to personal hardships, the righteous man follows the demands of the law, thereby having righteousness (τσεדד). 212

The fact that the righteous man is to imitate God does not necessarily mean that he is to be perfect. There are some passages 213 which seem to indicate that it is desirable and possible to be perfect and in this way inherit the world to come. This is not, however, held out to be the only way of having a share in the world to come. There is also the way of repentance. It is explicitly stated that the righteous who repent will receive a reward in the future. 214

211. This idea is expressed very clearly in Sifra Deut 49 on 11:22 (p. 114).

212. E.g. Sifra Emor parasha 1.14 on Lev 21:3.

213. E.g. T. Kiddushin 1:14f.

Consequently, we see indirectly from the fact that repentance is required, that the righteous are not thought of as having to be without transgression.

There is also direct evidence for this conclusion. For example, it is stated that the righteous die as a result of having committed a transgression,\(^{215}\) that they take God's punishment for transgressions upon themselves as being righteous\(^ {216}\) and that even the so-called perfectly righteous do commit minor transgressions.\(^ {217}\) It should be noted that with respect to the minor transgressions not repentance but the fact that God punishes the righteous in this world for these transgressions is stressed.

Although it is granted that the righteous are not necessarily perfect, the general thrust of the passages concerning the righteous is not in terms of their faults nor their need for repentance, but in terms of their great deeds. It is on account of their deeds that Moses, Joseph, Miriam and other men and women are called tsaddiq.\(^ {218}\) It should be noted that although the singular term tsaddiq is primarily used to refer to people of the remote past, there are also some references, even if only indirect ones, to persons living in the Tannaitic

\(^{215}\) Sifre Num 137 on 27:14 (p. 184).

\(^{216}\) Sifre Shemini Milu'im 23 on Lev 10:3.

\(^{217}\) Sifre Deut 307 on 32:4 (p. 345).

\(^{218}\) For a complete list of the biblical personalities who are called tsaddiq see Mach, Der Zaddik, pp. 242-245.
Even more prevalent than the use of the singular adjective **tsaddiq** with respect to God and man is the use of the plural adjective **tsaddiqim**. The righteous are those who are properly religious and as such are opposed to the wicked (**resha’tim**) who are not properly religious. These two terms are used in making the all-important distinction between those who practise the law, are a benefit to the whole world and will have a share in the world to come and those who do not follow the precepts of the law, lead to the destruction of the world and have no share in the world to come.

The distinction between the righteous and the wicked is not simply a distinction between Israelites and gentiles. There are the righteous among the Philistines and the wicked among the descendants of Aaron, the priests. Although the view is not unanimously...

---

219 The term **tsaddiq** as found in biblical quotations is applied to R. Simeon and R. Ishmael in Mek Nezikin 18 on Ex 22:22; III, p. 142; p. 313; and to Joseph b. Paksas in Sifra Emor parasha 11,14 on Lev 21:3.

220 Usually the plural forms of the adjectives are used. There are three instances, however, in which the singular forms occur: Mek Pisha 11 on Ex 12:22; I, p. 85; p. 38, Sifra Metsora parasha 5:12 on Lev 14:36 and Negaim 12:5.

221 It should not be concluded that **תִּתְנָה** and **יתנ** are the only terms which are used in contrasting two opposing types of people. For example, in Aboth 5:13 the **יתנ** is contrasted to the **יתנ**. It is true, however, that the terms **תִּתְנָה** and **יתנ** are by far the major terms which are used for this function.

222 Sifre Num 88 on 11:6-7.

accepted, the opinion is expressed that there are gentiles who have a share in the world to come. It is also stated that a gentile who practises the law is a righteous gentile and as such is equal to the High Priest. The determining factor of who is righteous and who is wicked is thus not related to nationality but to the practise of the law.

Such a distinction in terms of the type of deeds of the righteous and the wicked is made in Sifre Num 133 on 27:1 (p. 176). It is stated that the righteous one (tsāddiq) has righteousness (tsedeq) while the wicked one (rasha') has wickedness (rasha') and the terms righteousness and wickedness are defined with respect to deeds.

Such a close relationship between the tsāddiq and tsedeq is not only expressed in the passage just discussed but in a number of other passages. Before turning to the discussion of the meaning of the noun tsedeq, it is necessary to deal with the frequency with which this noun occurs in the Tannaitic literature. It has been stated that the whole concept of human righteousness is narrowed down in the Rabbinic literature to the idea of almsgiving. In other words, it is suggested that the term tsedeq really has no significant role in

---

224 In T. Sanhedrin 13:2 R. Eliezer states that no gentiles have a share in the world to come while R. Joshua claims the opposite.

225 Sifra Ḥapar pereq 13.13 on Lev 18:5.

226 Sifre Deut 16 on 1:16 (p. 27); Sifre Num 106 on 12:15 (p. 105); Sifre Emor parasha 1.14 on Lev 21:3; Sotah 1:9.

227 So Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 81.
this literature.

It is a fact that outside of direct biblical quotations the noun tsedeq occurs only 22 times in the Tannaitic literature. Of these, 21 occurrences are in the Tannaitic midrashim and one in the Mishnah and Tosefta. Let us first of all look at the Tannaitic midrashim.

Of the 21 independent occurrences of the noun tsedeq in the Tannaitic midrashim, eight are found in the expression ger tsedeq. Of the remaining 13, five are in the discussion of passages in which the term tsedeq occurs in a biblical quotation. Thus it could be argued that there actually are only eight completely independent references to the noun tsedeq insofar as it occurs in an absolute state. It can also be pointed out that these eight references are found in only three distinct passages. The conclusion could then be drawn that such a few occurrences cannot be significant.

But this conclusion can easily be refuted. While it is true that the noun tsedeq in its absolute state is only found in three passages in which it bears no relationship to the term tsedeq of biblical quotations, it is by no means true that only such occurrences are relevant in determining the significance of this term in the Tannaitic literature.

Passages in which the term tsedeq in the course of the discussion is given a different meaning from that which it has in the biblical

---

228 Sifre Deut 144 on 16:19 (p. 199); Sifre Deut 334 on 32:44 (p. 384) six times; Sifre Num 133 on 27:1 (p. 176).
quotation are highly significant. The mere fact that the term tsedeq is used at all in the course of the discussion is significant, for if the term had fallen into disuse then another term could have been substituted for it.

Occurrences of tsedeq in biblical quotations are also significant when they are used in support of a specific argument. In determining the use, it is possible to see what meaning was bestowed on the term in the Tannaitic period. The eight cases in which tsedeq occurs in the expression ger tsedeq are also significant in determining the meaning of the term tsedeq.

Although we thus have a significant number of passages in which the term tsedeq is used, it is granted that this is not a great number. The reason for this relatively small number is easily discernible. The Tannaitic midrashim are largely limited in their subject matter by the topics which are found in the biblical books which they are commenting upon. It should therefore be noted that in Exodus and Numbers, the books which form the basis for the Mekilta and Sifre on Numbers respectively, the noun tsedeq does not occur. Consequently, it is significant that despite this fact, the expression ger tsedeq occurs five times in the Mekilta and the noun tsedeq occurs once in Sifre on Numbers in a completely independent way.

In Leviticus the noun tsedeq occurs twice and both passages

---

229 E.g. Sifre Deut 294 on 25:15 (p. 313).
230 Lev 19:15, 36.
are commented upon in Sifra. In addition to these passages the term tsedeq occurs in the discussion of Eccles 7:15, a passage in which the term tsedeq occurs, and in two additional passages in the expression ger tsedeq.

In Deuteronomy the noun tsedeq occurs six times and all these references are discussed in Sifre on Deuteronomy. In addition there are two passages in which the term tsedeq is used in a completely independent way and one passage in which the expression ger tsedeq occurs.

It can therefore be concluded that not only are all references to the noun tsedeq occurring in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy commented upon in the Tannaitic midrashim, but in each of the midrashim the use of tsedeq goes beyond the subject matter suggested by the biblical material. It should also be noted that the Tannaitic midrashim do not comment on all parts of their respective biblical books. Consequently, the fact that all occurrences of tsedeq are commented upon shows that there is absolutely no reticence in the

231 Sifra Qedoshim perek 4.4 on Lev 19:15 and perek 8:7 on Lev 19:36.
235 Sifre Deut 16 on 1:16 (pp. 25ff.), 144 on 16:18 (p. 198), 144 on 16:20 (pp. 199f.), 294 on 25:15 (p. 313), 354 on 33:19 (p. 416).
236 Sifre Deut 144 on 16:19 (p. 199), 334 on 32:44 (p. 384).
237 Sifre Deut 278 on 24:14 (p. 296).
use of this term.

With respect to the seemingly small number of occurrences of tsedeq, the example of the use of tsedaqah is very informative. It is generally acknowledged that tsedaqah is a very significant term in the thought-world of the Tannaim. It should therefore be noted that outside of direct biblical quotations there are only 11 references to this term in the Tannaitic midrashim, that is, 10 fewer than the references to tsedeq.

In the Mishnah and Tosefta there is only a single independent reference to the term tsedeq and it occurs in the expression ger tsedeq in T. Arakin 5:9. In addition, however, there are one and eleven references to the term tsedeq in the Mishnah and Tosefta respectively which occur in biblical quotations. It was also noted that the term tsedaqah is at times used with the meaning of tsedeq. Although the term and concept of tsedeq is by no means absent in the Mishnah and Tosefta, the low frequency of usage may appear peculiar if one is unfamiliar with the character of these writings. These two writings are even of a more halakic character than the Tannaitic midrashim and it is a well known fact that halakah deals primarily with specific details rather than with comprehensive concepts. Since righteousness is a very comprehensive concept, it is therefore not surprising that little use is made of it in the Mishnah and Tosefta.

Let us now turn to the meaning of the term tsedeq in the

---

238 Eight in Sifre on Deuteronomy and one in each of the other Tannaitic midrashim.
Tannaitic literature. This literature can be discussed as a whole since the difference in the use of the term тsедeq between the Tannaitic midrashim and the Mishnah and Tosefta only relates to the frequency of use rather than to the meaning of this term.

Let us first of all consider those passages in which the term тsедeq occurs without any influence from the use of this term in biblical quotations. From the eight occurrences of тsедeq in the expression гer тsедeq it can be concluded that the term тsедeq has the function of showing that the гer in question is to be regarded fully like an Israelite. In a sense тsедeq is a symbol which signifies adherence to the proper religious practice of Israel. 239 A righteous proselyte (гer тsедeq) is a gentile who has turned to тsедeq, meaning the proper religious practice of Israel.

In Sifre Deut 144 on 16:19 (p. 199), a passage in which тsедeq is completely independent of the influence of biblical quotations, the meaning of тsедeq corresponds to a large extent to that in the expression гer тsедeq. Here тsедeq is a comprehensive term referring to the totality of correct teaching relating to proper religious practice. In the two remaining passages 240 where the noun тsедeq is used without any reference to biblical quotations, its meaning falls within the comprehensive meaning noted above, for тsедeq refers to the deeds or


240 Sifre Deut 334 on 32:44 (p. 384); Sifre Num 132 on 27:1 (p. 176). The dependent use of тsедeq in Sotah 1:9 also has such a meaning.
the resulting quality which a person possesses because he has performed the deeds.

In six passages the term ṭsedeq is used with reference to the concept of justice.²⁴¹ There is to be fair treatment²⁴² and uniformity in judicial procedure.²⁴³ All action by the righteous is to be based on strict evidence.²⁴⁴ In the cases just mentioned, ṭsedeq seems to refer to strict justice rather than mercy. There are two other passages,²⁴⁵ however, in which ṭsedeq refers to a very lenient view of justice.

The three passages²⁴⁶ in which ṭsedeq has the meaning of truth could, on the one hand, be classified under the general concept of justice. It is more probable, however, that this use of ṭsedeq is related to that aspect of the concept of righteousness which is seen as the resultant quality which a righteous person possesses after he has performed good deeds. This quality is viewed as a force which motivates the thoughts and deeds of the righteous person.

As was the case with ṭsedeq, so the term ṭsedaqah is used with

²⁴¹ In Mek Shabbata 1 on Ex 31:17; III, p. 205; p. 344, it refers to God's justice while in the other passages it refers to the sphere of man.

²⁴² Sifre Deut 294 on 25:15 (p. 313).

²⁴³ Sifra Qedoshim pereq 4.4 on Lev 19:15.

²⁴⁴ Sifre Deut 16 on 1:16 (pp. 25ff.).

²⁴⁵ Sifre Deut 144 on 16:20 (pp. 199ff.); Sifra Qedoshim pereq 4.4 on Lev 19:15.

²⁴⁶ Sifra Qedoshim pereq 8.7 on Lev 19:36; Mek Bahodesh 1 on Ex 19:2; II, p. 199; p. 206; Mek Bahodesh 5 on Ex 20:2; II, p. 232; p. 220.
similar meanings but with a greatly different frequency in the Tannaitic midrashim and in the Mishnah and Tosefta. In the Tannaitic midrashim there are only 11 independent occurrences of the term tsedaqah. Since this term is not found in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, it is not surprising that there is only one independent reference to it in each of the midrashim which deal with these biblical books. In Sifre on Deuteronomy there are eight independent occurrences of the term tsedaqah. Four of these occur in the discussion of Deut 24:13 and 33:21, verses in which the term tsedaqah occurs. Consequently, the frequency of the use of tsedaqah in the Tannaitic midrashim is directly proportional to the frequency with which this term occurs in the relevant biblical books.

The term tsedaqah occurs in the Mishnah and Tosefta six and 36 times respectively. Why this difference in frequency? The answer is very simple. The term occurs much more frequently in the Tosefta than in the Mishnah because the Tosefta deals much more with the concept of almsgiving.

It appears that frequency of occurrence is not really an important factor in the consideration of the terms tsedeq and tsedaqah. The important factor is that despite differences in frequency, the meaning of these terms is homogeneous in the whole Tannaitic literature.

The primary meaning of the term tsedaqah in the Tannaitic literature is without doubt that of almsgiving as defined in T. Peah

\[247\] The term tsedaqah also occurs in Deut 6:25; 9:4, 5, 6 but these verses are not covered by Sifre on Deuteronomy.
4:19. This meaning, however, is not so well established that it is to be inferred wherever this term is found. **Tsedaqah** also has some secondary meanings.

A secondary meaning closely related to almsgiving is that of mercy. **Tsedaqah** refers to mercy both in the sense of showing kindness by giving material benefits and in the sense of the opposite of judgment according to strict justice.

The meanings of **tsedaqah** discussed thus far and also the meaning of love could be included in the general concept of charity. It should be noted, however, that not even this general concept covers all the uses of the term **tsedaqah** in the Tannaitic literature.

There are cases in which **tsedaqah** is used with meanings which overlap with those of **teqeeq**. For example, **tsedaqah** is used with reference to the doing of deeds and the resultant effect of such action and with respect to the concept of strict justice. It should also be noted that in two passages it is stressed that Moses did the righteousness of the Lord (**p. 47**). In this case **tsedaqah**

---


249 T. Sanhedrin 1:3.

250 Mek Shirata 5 on Ex 15:5; II, p. 39; p. 133.

251 E.g. Aboth 2:2, 5:18; Sifre Deut 277 on 24:13 (p. 295); T. Kiddushin 1:14.

252 E.g. Sifre Deut 355 on 33:21 (p. 419); Mek Shirata 1 on Ex 15:1; II, p. 5; p. 117; Mek Nezikin 18 on Ex 22:23; III, p. 145; p. 314.

253 Sifre Num 106 on 12:15 (p. 105); Sifre Deut 355 on 33:21 (pp. 418f.).
appears to refer to conduct which is proper in the sight of God.\textsuperscript{254}

The foregoing data shows that the meanings of \textit{tsedeq} and \textit{tsedaqah} overlap to some extent. Yet \textit{tsedeq} never specifically has the meaning of almsgiving. In general \textit{tsedeq} seems to be more comprehensive in its scope of meaning. Insofar as \textit{tsedeq} refers to the totality of proper religious practice, the primary meaning of \textit{tsedaqah} is included in that of \textit{tsedeq}. Almsgiving is simply one of the deeds with which \textit{tsedeq} is concerned. Consequently, it is probable that \textit{tsedeq} had an influence on \textit{tsedaqah} as far as the secondary meanings not relating to the concept of charity are concerned.

As far as their primary meanings are concerned, the relationship between the terms \textit{tsedeq}, \textit{tsedaqah} and \textit{tsaddiq} can be summarized as follows. By performing deeds which are in conformity to the intent and content of the law, and almsgiving (\textit{tsedaqah}) is included in this, the righteous one (\textit{tsaddiq}) in effect not only does righteousness (\textit{tsedeq}) but also shows that he has righteousness (\textit{tsedeq}).

\textsuperscript{254} It should be noted that the foregoing investigation of the terms \textit{tsedeq}, \textit{tsedaqah} and \textit{tsaddiq} in the Tannaitic literature does not support R. Bultmann's contention that the Jewish conception of the formal meaning of righteousness is "forensic-eschatological". See Theology of the New Testament, E.t. by K. Grobel (New York, 1951-1955), I, p. 273.
CHAPTER IV

THE MEANING OF DIKAIOSyne, Eleemosyne AND
Dikaios in the Gospel of Matthew

1. Introduction

It has been demonstrated that in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature the terms tsedeq, tsedqah and tsaddiq represent the righteousness-terminology. In turning to the Gospel of Matthew the question thus emerges: Are these Hebrew terms related to the Matthaean righteousness-terminology?

As will become evident as this study progresses, tsedeq is in fact equivalent to dikaiosyne, tsedqah in its meaning of alms to eleemosynah and tsaddiq to dikaios.1 While in the final analysis only the foregoing conclusion based on the Gospel of Matthew itself provides a definitive answer to the question posed above, a look at the Greek translation equivalents employed in the LXX for the Hebrew terms under discussion is also illuminating inasmuch as the Septuagintal usage points to trends reflected in the Gospel of Matthew.

It should not be surprising that Matthaean usage corresponds

---

1 As was stated in ch. I, sec. 2, the whole question as to the Jewish-Christian or Gentile-Christian character of the Gospel of Matthew is not prejudged in this study. One of the conclusions emerging out of this study is, however, that the Jewish-Palestinian writings, as represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature, provide an adequate background for an understanding of the Matthaean concept of righteousness.
to Septuagintal usage in this case. Not only has the general conclusion
been drawn that the "LXX constitutes the bridge between the OT and the
NT" and that it provides the "vocabulary for the NT writers"² but it
has also been specifically demonstrated that Matthew³ made use of the
LXX in the writing of his gospel.⁴

In the Hebrew OT there are 116 occurrences of the noun ṭsedaq, 157 of the noun ṭesdaqaḥ and 206 of the adjective ṭeddiq.⁵ Ziesler
has noted that out of the total number of occurrences of these three
terms "only about 32 are not represented in LXX by some form of
镴oxal-.⁶ Ziesler goes on to explain that this number is effectively
reduced from 32 to 23 because in some cases the relevant verses do not
occur in the LXX or the difference is so great that a different Hebrew

Righteousness in Paul (Society for NTS Monograph Series 20; Cambridge,
1972), p. 52; the "LXX was the OT Greek version which the Church made
peculiarly its own". K. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew and its
Use of the Old Testament (Uppsala, 1954), p. 205, calls the LXX "the
accepted edition of the O.T. in everyday church life."

³In this study the designation Matthew stands for the person or
group of persons who carried out the final redaction of the Gospel of
Matthew.

⁴Thus Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew, pp. 150f. R. H.
Special Reference to the Messianic Hope (Suppl. NovTest 18; Leiden,
1967), does not agree with this conclusion (p. 148). Yet he never-
thessless points to an influence of the LXX by stating that of "the
twenty formal quotations peculiar to Mt, seven are Septuagintal"
(p. 149) and of "the forty-two allusive quotations peculiar to Mt,
fifteen are Septuagintal" (pp. 14f.).

⁵This count is based on R. Young, Analytical Concordance to the
Bible (22nd American ed.; Grand Rapids, n.d.).

⁶Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 59.
text must underlie the Greek.\textsuperscript{7}

Ziesler comments that in this small number of exceptions "no

trend is perceptible, except the very notable one of using \textit{έλεημοσύνη}
or \textit{έλεος} instead of a δικαιο- word."\textsuperscript{8} Specifically \textit{έλεημοσύνη} is used

for \textit{tsedqah} nine times\textsuperscript{9} and \textit{eleos} three times.\textsuperscript{10} It should be noted

that it is only \textit{tsedqah}, never \textit{tsedeq}, which is translated by

\textit{έλεημοσύνη} and \textit{έλεος}.\textsuperscript{11}

According to Septuagintal usage, \textit{dikaiosynē} is the primary

Greek equivalent for \textit{tsedeq} and \textit{dikaios} for \textit{tsaddiq}.\textsuperscript{12} Although the

primary Greek equivalent for \textit{tsedqah} is also \textit{dikaiosynē}, it is significant that the Greek term \textit{έλεημοσύνη} is used nine times as a trans-

lation equivalent.\textsuperscript{13} Consequently, it appears advisable that in

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{8}Ibid., p. 60.

\textsuperscript{9}Deut 6:25, 24:13; Ps 23(24):5, 32(33):5; 102(103):6; Is 1:27,


\textsuperscript{10}Is 56:1; Ez 18:19, 21.


\textsuperscript{12}It should be noted that although \textit{tsedeq} and \textit{tsaddiq} are gen-

erally translated in the LXX by some form of \textit{δικαίος}, conversely there

are 28 cases where \textit{dikaiosynē} and 35 cases where \textit{dikaios} render words

which are not based on the root \textit{ts-d-q}. (So Ziesler, \textit{Righteousness},

pp. 60-66.) Consequently, it is not a foregone conclusion that the term

\textit{dikaiosynē} in the Gospel of Matthew necessarily stands for \textit{tsedeq}. For

a discussion of the use of \textit{dikaiosynē} in the LXX see also M. J. Fiedler,
"Der Begriff \textit{δικαίοσυνή} im Matthäus-Evangelium auf seine Grundlagen

untersucht" (Ph.D. dissertation, Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-


\textsuperscript{13}It was also noted that \textit{eleos} is used three times to translate

\textit{tsedqah}. Since the meaning of \textit{eleos} does not form an integral part of

the Matthaean concept of righteousness, this term will not be discussed

separately but simply in conjunction with the term \textit{έλεημοσύνη}.
studying the concept of righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew, special
attention should be directed to the significance of these three Greek
terms.

2. Dikaiosyne

The noun dikaiosyne occurs seven times (Mt 3:15; 5:6, 10, 20;
6:1, 33; 21:32) in the Gospel of Matthew. It should be noted, however,
that some scholars have expressed reservations regarding the use of this
term in Mt 6:1. In this passage some MSS read δικαιοσύνην while
others read ἔλεγμοσύνην.

Of those scholars who claim that ἔλεγμοσύνην represents the
better reading, W. Nagel has presented the strongest case. He argues
that one should not assume that the great MSS of the fourth century
always give the best NT text. In other words, just because K and B
have δικαιοσύνην it cannot be assumed that this is the correct reading.
Nagel also argues that Mt 6:1-18 consists of an introductory warning
and a concluding instruction. In this overall structure v. 1 is the
introductory statement for vv. 2-4. In vv. 2-4 the term ἔλεγμοσύνη
is found three times. Nagel concludes that ἔλεγμοσύνη represents the
correct reading because the same term is required in the introductory
warning as in the concluding instruction.

---

14 E.g. B, K, D.
15 E.g. Koine, Θ.
16 "Gerechtigkeit – oder Almosen?", VigChr 15 (1961), pp. 141-
145.
17 Cf. M. Smith, Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels (JBL
Monograph Series VI; Philadelphia, corrected reprint, 1968), p. 161,
The overwhelming majority of New Testament scholars, however, claim that δικαιοσύνη represents the better reading. This conclusion is supported not only by the better manuscript evidence for the reading δικαιοσύνη but also on other grounds. Rather than being an introductory statement for vv. 2–4, v.1 in actual fact appears to be a heading for vv. 2–18. Consequently, a more inclusive term than ελπημοσύνη is required in v. 1. The maxim "choose the reading which best explains the origin of the others" also supports this conclusion. For example, Zahn has noted that because of the double meaning of ἀρεπασάρα ἀλατικοσύνη in 6:1 could have been understood in the sense of ἐλπημοσύνη so that the latter was adopted into the text. The reverse process, on the other hand, would be impossible to understand.

notes that in Mt 6:1 "to do righteousness" means "give alms". This does not necessarily mean that Smith accepts the reading ελπημοσύνη. Rather, it probably means that Smith thinks that in this case δικαιοσύνη refers to righteousness in the sense of alms. Cf. H. H. Hobbs, The Gospel of Matthew (Grand Rapids, 1963), p. 39, who explains with respect to his translation of Mt 6:1, "'Alms' translates the word for 'righteousness'."


20 Matthäus, pp. 261f., n. 42.
On the basis of the foregoing discussion it does appear that ἰδιαίοςυνη represents the best reading in Mt 6:1. The noun dikaiosynē thus occurs seven times in the Gospel of Matthew. Since in the rest of the Synoptic Gospels this noun occurs only once, it has been noted that righteousness (dikaiosynē) is a characteristically Matthaean term.

A number of scholars explicitly state that all seven occurrences of dikaiosynē in the Gospel of Matthew are redactional. The analyses of the dikaiosynē-passages by Strecker and Fiedler indeed provide convincing support for this conclusion. Nevertheless, the only absolutely certain conclusion which can be reached is that the Matthaean use of the term dikaiosynē is not based on extant synoptic sources.

21 Lk 1:75.


23 Thus Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 102; Strecker, Weg, p. 153; H. Hübner, Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition. Studien zur These einer progressiven Quaranisierung und Judaisierung innerhalb der synoptischen Tradition (Witten, 1973), p. 35; P. Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus (FRLANT 87; 2nd rev. ed.; Göttingen, 1966), p. 188. E. A. Abbott, "Righteousness in the Gospels", Proceedings of the British Academy 8 (1917/18), on the other hand, has proposed that Matthew did not interpolate but rather preserved the words of Jesus while Luke omitted all these traditions as being too technical (pp. 362f.). Abbott's view is based primarily on the rather subjective argument that it is improbable "that Matthew, without any authority, interpolated all of these in Christ's doctrine" (p. 363).

24 Weg, pp. 150-153.

Even such a limited conclusion can indeed be of value in this study, for although no absolutely valid conclusion can be reached, differentiations can be made on the basis of varying degrees of probability. Specifically, on the basis of a redaction-critical analysis it is clear that the seven dikaiosyne-passages can be divided into three distinct groups, reflecting varying degrees of redactional probability.

Strecker and Fiedler both indicate that in Mt 5:6 and 6:33 the term dikaiosyne is inserted by Matthew by way of interpolation. This is indeed probable; for Lk 6:21 and 12:31 are parallel to Mt 5:6 and 6:33 respectively, the only major variation being the occurrence of the noun dikaiosyne in Matthew.

Strecker and Fiedler also agree that in Mt 5:20 and 6:1 not only the occurrence of the noun dikaiosyne is redactional but also the context in which this term is found. This conclusion is also probable, for Mt 5:19-23 and 6:1-8 have no synoptic parallels and in addition 5:20 and 6:1 play a significant role in the structure of their respective contexts insofar as they are headings or general statements which introduce that which follows.

It is thus highly probable that in 5:20 and 6:1 Matthew had

---

26 Weg, p. 153.

27 "Der Begriff", I, p. 103.


29 "Der Begriff", I, p. 103.

30 For documentation of this view see the discussion of the respective verses below.
complete freedom in the use of the term dikaiosyne and that consequently these passages may best reflect the meaning which Matthew, as the final redactor, attached to this term. By the same token, it appears that in 5:6 and 6:33 Matthew could have experienced great constraint in the use of the term dikaiosyne because this term had to be interpolated into a Vorlage. As the result of such constraint the meaning which Matthew attached to this term may not be as explicit in these two passages as in 5:20 and 6:1.

The three remaining dikaiosyne passages (i.e. 3:15, 5:10, 21:32) fall between the two extreme positions mentioned above. The term dikaiosyne does not seem to occur in these passages simply by way of interpolation; for Mt 3:14-15, 5:8-10 and 21:28-33 do not have synoptic parallels, yet 3:15, 5:10 and 21:32 do not play as crucial a role in the overall development of their respective contexts as is the case with 5:20 and 6:1. 31

On the basis of the foregoing redaction-critical considerations it thus appears that the occurrences of dikaiosyne in Mt 5:20 and 6:1 may provide the best evidence for the meaning which Matthew attached to this term. Consequently, the following investigation of the meaning of dikaiosyne will begin with these two passages.

31 Strecker and Fiedler disagree as to the degree of redactional activity inherent in Mt 3:15, 5:10 and 21:32. Strecker (Weg, p. 153) argues that the term dikaiosyne is interpolated into a Vorlage in Mt 3:15 while in 5:10 and 21:32 it occurs in contexts which originate with the redactor. Fiedler ("Der Begriff", I, p. 103), on the other hand, argues that in 3:15 dikaiosyne is used as a thematic element in an independently formulated passage while in 5:10 and 21:32 it is used in an interpretive way, although more independently than in 5:6 and 6:33. The disagreement between Strecker and Fiedler points out that in
Matthew 5:20

It has been suggested by many scholars that Mt 5:20 is an introductory statement or heading for 5:21-48. 32 In 5:20 Jesus is represented as telling his disciples 33: "For I tell you, unless your righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven."

In Mt 5:21-48 examples of this greater righteousness are given. These examples are generally referred to as the antitheses. Let us see how the antitheses have been viewed as defining the term dikaiosyne.

G. Barth states, "It is plain that the antitheses are not directed primarily against the Old Testament itself, but against the interpretation of it in the Rabbinate." 34 Specifically, Mt 5:21-48 "provides a marked radicalising of the demand of God." 35 On the basis of this interpretation Barth concludes that in Mt 5:20 dikaiosyne

3:15, 5:10 and 21:32 it is simply impossible to be certain as to the extent of the redactional activity.


33 According to Mt 7:28 the Sermon on the Mount is not just directed at the disciples but at the crowds in general.

34 G. Barth, "Law", pp. 93ff.

35 Ibid., p. 95.
refers to "the conduct demanded of the disciples", that is, a conduct reflecting the radicalised demand of God upon discipleship.

Bornkamm also understands Mt 5:21-48 as a radicalising of the divine command. In contrast to Barth, however, who argues that Mt 5:21-48 does not show that the law which is valid for Matthew is opposed to the Sinaitic Law, Bornkamm argues that the third, fifth and sixth antitheses not only show a sharpening of the law as is the case in the first, second and fourth, but the abolition of the law. Consequently, according to Bornkamm the "better righteousness" of Mt 5:20 is at least partly concerned with a new law.

Strecker, like Bornkamm, supports the view that the antitheses largely supplant the demands of the Old Testament by way of new regulations. Dikaiosyne refers to the sum total of such new commandments.

36 Ibid., p. 139.

37 Zieseler's view seems to correspond to that of Barth for he states that the greater righteousness "is not in opposition to law-righteousness, but is its fulfilment, and is more inward, more thorough-going, more demanding." (Righteousness, p. 134.)

38 Bornkamm, "End-Expectation", p. 25.


40 Bornkamm, "End-Expectation", p. 25.

41 Ibid., p. 16.

42 Strecker, Weg, p. 146.

Fiedler views the antitheses as the commandments of the νόμος. He agrees with Windisch that Matthew sees the Sermon on the Mount as the "new legislation for the eschatological Kingdom of God." Fiedler therefore concludes that in Mt 5:20 δικαιοσύνη must be understood as an eschatological possibility which can only be realized by the church (Gemeinde) of the Messiah, for the righteousness demanded by the Messiah is radically different from that of the Pharisees.

Which of the foregoing divergent views is in fact the correct one? Do the antitheses reflect a new interpretation of the old law or do they herald the coming of a new law?

In order to answer this question we must differentiate between two levels of meaning. We must attempt to discover how Matthew himself viewed the antitheses and how they were understood by his audience.

It is easy to imagine that a saying such as Mt 5:29, "If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and throw it away", could be viewed as an extremely radicalised demand of God; a demand so qualitatively different from the requirement of the old law that it appears to be part of a new law. For the purpose of this study, however, the crucial point is not how the antitheses are interpreted by others, but how Matthew himself viewed them.

---

44 "Der Begriff", I, p. 124.


46 "Der Begriff", I, p. 127.
When the antitheses are viewed from the latter perspective, it indeed becomes evident that Matthew himself viewed them as being representative of a new interpretation of the old law. There are a number of factors which point to this conclusion.

One factor which suggests that the antitheses reflect a new interpretation of the old law is that it appears that Matthew is applying the Rabbinic principle of making a fence around Torah in Mt 5:21-48. Moore explains that this was a hermeneutical principle used to protect the law "by surrounding it with cautionary rules to halt a man like a danger signal before he gets within breaking distance of the divine statute itself."\(^{47}\)

An example of the application of this principle is found in Berakoth 1:1. As Moore explains, "things which by the letter of the law must be completed before morning (e.g., Lev 7, 15; 22, 30), by rabbinical rule must be done before midnight, 'to keep a man far

---

\(^{47}\) Moore, Judaism, I, p. 259. In the Tannaitic literature the principle of fencing Torah is mentioned in Aboth 1:1: "They said three things: Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence around the Law (כתובת ופי נפר providence)." E.t. by Danby, The Mishnah, p. 446. Cf. Sifre Deut 16 on 1:16, p. 23; Sifre Num 78 on 10:29, p. 74. J. Goldin, "The End of Ecclesiastes: Literal Exegesis and Its Transformation", in A. Altmann, ed., Biblical Motifs (Studies and Texts 3; Cambridge, 1966), p. 141, has suggested that the reference to making a fence around Torah in Aboth 1:1 refers to "the proper protection and preservation of the text of the Torah (almost certainly the five books of Moses) lest it be corrupted by false or inferior readings." It should be noted, however, that Goldin does not deny that the principle here described as making a fence around Torah existed. Goldin only denies that this principle is designated by the expressionAscii(223,248) . Consequently, even if the minority opinion expressed by Goldin is correct, it does not negate that the Tannaitic literature and Matthew make use of the principle of setting up a barricade to keep a man far from sin.
removed from transgression'. In this example the fence consists of the recommendation that one should do things earlier than required, for then one will definitely have completed them by the required time.

Let us now see how the principle of making a fence around Torah is applied in Mt 5:21-48. In 5:21-26 the fence consists of the recommendation that one should not even be angry with his brother, for in this way one will definitely obey the commandment "You shall not kill".

In 5:27-30 it is suggested that one should not even look at a woman lustfully for in this way one will never reach the stage of breaking the commandment "you shall not commit adultery".

In Mt 5:31-32 the problem appears to be the legality of a bill of divorce. On what grounds can a bill of divorce be based? It is implied that a bill of divorce should be based solely on the grounds of unchastity. The fence in this case consists of the suggestion that in order to prevent somebody else from marrying a not properly divorced woman (even though she may have a certificate of divorce) and thus committing adultery, one should not divorce one's wife on any questionable grounds but only for the grassest possible reason, that is, unchastity.

In 5:33-37 it is argued that in order not to break the commandment "You shall not swear falsely" it is best not to swear at all.

---

48 Moore, Judaism, I, p. 33. Cf. Aboth 3:14 where R. Akiba states: "The tradition is a fence around the Law; Tithes are a fence around riches; vows are a fence around abstinence; a fence around wisdom is silence." E.t. by Danby, The Mishnah, p. 452.
In 5:38-42 the underlying problem is the uncertainty which is necessarily involved in the application of the principle "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth". Can one ever be sure that one has done exactly what has been demanded? The implicit answer is, no!

Consequently, depending on the situation, it is best not to retaliate at all or to do more than is required.

In 5:43-47 the dilemma which is to be resolved is the uncertainty of defining who in fact is one's neighbor and one's enemy. Since one can never be absolutely certain, it is thought to be best to treat everybody as one's neighbour.

That the principle of making a fence around Torah underlies Mt 5:21-48 is not only suggested by the passage itself but is consistent with the context in which this passage is found. Mt 5:19 warns against the relaxing of "one of the least of these commandments". Manson explains that the verb λαού refers to relaxing with a view to "one who permits less than the Law requires either by allowing what it forbids or by exempting men from some of its positive requirements." The logical antidote to the practice of the relaxing of the commandments would be to make a fence around Torah.

It was noted above that by an outsider the saying in Mt 5:29, "If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and throw it away", could easily be understood as pointing to a new law rather than to a new interpretation of an old law. How could Matthew himself have

---

49 Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 154.
viewed this statement?

It is probable that Matthew did not view this saying in a literal way but conceived of it as a hortatory device employed to demonstrate the gravity of the situation discussed in Mt 5:27-30. On the other hand, it should also be taken into account that the discussion of the Tannaitic literature has shown that it was not unheard of that a person would not shirk back from hardship in the course of the meticulous observance of the law. For example, Sifra Emor parasha 1.14 on Lev 21:3 shows that Joseph b. Paksas was praised for his righteousness (tzedeq) because despite the prospect of personal hardship he did not deviate from the strict observance of the law. Consequently, although it is conceivable that Mt 5:29 could be interpreted as pointing to a new law, this is by no means the only reasonable interpretation.

Another factor which indicates that Matthew viewed the antitheses as representing a new interpretation of the old law is found in Mt 5:17-18. Here it is stated that Jesus has not come to abolish the law and that "not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished." Although a number of points in Mt 5:17-18 are difficult to interpret, the point relevant to our discussion is clear. This passage definitely announces that Jesus does not intend to discard the old law and establish a new law.

On the basis of the foregoing discussion we must therefore conclude that from Matthew's perspective the antitheses reflect not a new law but a new interpretation of the existing law. This new
interpretation of the law is representative of an extremely meticulous observance of the law. I would suggest that if this type of interpretation does not correspond directly to the hermeneutical principle of making a fence around Torah, it has at least been strongly influenced by this particular principle.

As was shown above the term dikaiosyne in Mt 5:20 is defined by the antitheses. Consequently, the righteousness that is to exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees is a righteousness that is representative of an extremely meticulous observance of the law, an observance that is derived on the basis of an interpretation reminiscent of the principle of making a fence around Torah.

That the term righteousness can indeed be used in conjunction with the principle of making a fence around Torah is supported by examples from both the Tannaitic literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

In Sifre Deut 16 on 1:16 (p. 25) the statement "Hear the cases between your brethren, and judge righteousness" is discussed and the conclusion is reached that the saying by the men of the Great Synagogue, "Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence around the law" is applicable to the act of judging righteousness.

In 1QS 10:25 it is implied that in order to preserve faith and strong judgment in accordance with the righteousness (tsedqah) of God, it is necessary to fence in knowledge within a firm boundary. Leaney

---

has suggested that the author of this passage may be referring to the principle of making a fence around Torah. 51

On the basis of the foregoing discussion it is thus clear that in Mt 5:20 righteousness (dikaiosynē) refers to the conduct demanded of the disciples 52, a conduct characterized by the meticulous observance of the law. The genitive ὑπὲρ clearly shows that Mt 5:20 deals with man's righteousness. Yet there is no scholarly consensus whether it is man's righteousness in the sense that it is demanded of man by God or in the sense that it is God's gift for man.

Many scholars suggest that 5:20 deals exclusively with righteousness as the demand of God upon man. 53 Others claim that in this passage righteousness must be viewed as both God's demand upon man and God's eschatological gift for man. For example, Fiedler claims that Mt 5:20 refers back to Mt 3:15 with the effect that it is only possible for men to do righteousness because the Messiah has fulfilled all

---

51 Leaney, Rule of Qumran, p. 251.

52 It should be noted that this saying is directed to the disciples within the context of general teaching to the crowds. See Mt 7:28.

righteousness.  

The views of various other scholars are confusing insofar as it is not clear whether they think that in Matthew the double meaning of demand and gift is applicable to each δικαιοσύνη-passage or whether these are separate meanings applicable only to specific passages. In other words, it is not clear whether they view δικαιοσύνη as having a uniform meaning in the Gospel of Matthew.

For example, Barth notes on the one hand, that in Mt 5:20 δικαιοσύνη refers to "the conduct demanded of the disciples" while on the other hand, he argues that on the basis of Mt 3:15 it is clear that for Matthew "righteousness is at the same time a demand and an eschatological gift".

Similarly, Zieseler's position is unclear. On the one hand, he lists Mt 3:15; 5:6, 10, 20; 6:1, 33 as "cases where 'righteousness' means Christian behaviour" and specifically with respect to the occurrence of δικαιοσύνη in 5:20 he states that "There is no suggestion that it is anything but man's activity, unless one supposes that 5,6 implies

---


55 G. Barth, "Law", p. 139.

56 Ibid., p. 140.

57 Zieseler, Righteousness, p. 133.
that it is also God's gift." On the other hand, he states that in Mt 5:6 righteousness is viewed as a divine gift and thus generalizes that for Matthew "Righteousness is thus both demand and eschatological gift".

Although the exact position of some scholars with respect to the meaning of dikaiosyne as the gift of God cannot be ascertained, it is nevertheless clear in all the interpretations that it is only on the basis of other dikaiosyne-passages that Mt 5:20 is given such a meaning. Consequently, a final decision as to whether or not the term dikaiosyne is used with reference to the gift of God in the Gospel of Matthew must be postponed until all the dikaiosyne-passages have been examined.

It must be pointed out, however, that there are additional factors which cast doubt on the possibility of the term dikaiosyne in Mt 5:20 referring to righteousness as the gift of God. In 5:20 it is implied that not only the disciples but also the scribes and Pharisees have righteousness. Consequently, if dikaiosyne is to refer to the gift of God, then this meaning must apply both to the righteousness of the disciples and to that of the scribes and Pharisees. Since the whole point of Mt 5:20 is that the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees is not sufficient to enter the kingdom of heaven, it is

58 Ibid., p. 134.
59 Ibid., p. 142.
60 Ibid., pp. 142f. Also Schrenk's viewpoint is not clear with respect to the point under discussion (TDNT, II, pp. 198f.).

It could conceivably be argued that in 5:20 a qualitative distinction is made between two kinds of righteousness; the righteousness of the Pharisees being related solely to the demand of God while the greater righteousness is seen as the gift of God. While it is true that a qualitative distinction is inherent in 5:20, this distinction is not in terms of demand versus gift but in terms of adherence to two distinct norms of conduct which are based on different interpretations of the same general law. The greater righteousness is based on a very meticulous observance of the law.

It should be noted, however, that the meaning of Mt 5:20 is not exhausted by a qualitative distinction. The terms ἁρματικός and πλέον also point to a quantitative distinction. Banks has pointed out with respect to the use of δικαιοσύνη in 5:20 that "the comparative construction in which it occurs can lexically be understood in a quantitative, not a qualitative sense."\footnote{Banks, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law", p. 242. Cf. Strecker, NEG, pp. 141ff., who notes that πλέον is to be understood in the quantitative sense of more.}

While it is true that exegesis cannot limit itself to lexical understanding, it would be surprising if the two terms just mentioned were used without any reference to a quantitative distinction.

That the contrast between the righteousness of the disciples
and that of the scribes and Pharisees should not only be viewed in qualitative but also in quantitative terms is supported by Mt 5:48: "You, therefore must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."

Some commentators suggest that the term perfect (τέλειος) should be defined by its immediate context. Since 5:43-47 deals with the concept of love, it has therefore been suggested that 5:48 refers to perfection in love. 63

It appears, however, that the term τέλειος governs more than its immediate context. As was noted previously, Mt 5:20 is a heading for vv. 21-48. In the latter passage vv. 21-47 give examples of the greater righteousness. Verse 48 functions as a concluding statement for vv. 21-47. Zahn is correct in stating that with the idea of perfection the climax of the discourse is reached. 64

Mt 5:48 thus appears to be a restatement of 5:20. By the greater righteousness Matthew really points toward perfection and the idea of perfection in turn applies to all the examples in vv. 21-47.

That Mt 5:21-48 was indeed understood in this way by an author in the early centuries is shown by the Didache. Didache 1:4 states, "If any man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other cheek also, and thou wilt be perfect." 65 Here the author of the Didache

63 E.g. Allen, Matthew, p. 56.


seems to have combined Mt 5:39 and 48. In other words, the tradition in the Didache shows that the concept of perfection in Mt 5:48 was understood as governing more than just the teaching about love.

Another indication that τέλειος refers to all the examples is provided by the choice of the word τέλειος itself. It should be noted that the parallel passage in Lk 6:36 states, "Be merciful, even as your Father is merciful." It appears that Luke rather than Matthew preserves the traditional reading. Thus τέλειος is redactional. Why did Matthew make this redactional change? The reason seems to be that he wanted a concluding statement for 5:21-47 and only the use of the adjective τέλειος rather than ὁμοθυμόω could contribute to this purpose.

Having established the function of the term perfect in its broader framework let us now consider its meaning. A number of commentators have suggested that τέλειος refers solely to wholeness. This suggestion, however, seems to be based not so much on an actual

---

66 Thus G. Barth, "Law", p. 97, n. 1; "Matt. 5.48 = Luke 6.36 forms in Matthew the summary of the preceding section (οἵτω). If the Matthaean form had stood in Q, Luke would have turned a good conclusion into a worse. But in the Luke-form it is the beginning of the next section; the alteration by Matthew, who made of it a concluding verse to what was said about loving enemies, or alternatively to the whole of 5.21-47, in this way becomes intelligible."

interpretation of the Gospel of Matthew than on the supposition that Matthew's usage reflects that of the LXX.

In the Gospel of Matthew τέλειος refers to more than wholeness. It should be noted that the term τέλειος in Mt 5:48 is immediately linked with the term περισσόν in 5:47. Being perfect involves doing more than others, for v. 47 states, "And if you salute only your brethren, what more are you doing than others?" In this context περισσόν and consequently τέλειος definitely do not only point to a qualitative distinction but also to a quantitative one.

That perfection in Mt 5:48 can indeed be understood in a quantitative rather than merely in the qualitative sense of wholeness is borne out by the Didache. It was shown above that Didache 1:4 combined Mt 5:39 and 48, thus reflecting the Matthaean use of τέλειος. In Didache 6:2 the meaning of this adjective became very clear, "For if thou canst bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou wilt be perfect, but if thou cannot do what thou canst."68 Here τέλειος refers to the attainment of the highest rank according to a specific standard.

The similarity between the concept of perfection in the Gospel of Matthew and the Dead Sea Scrolls should also be noted. W. D. Davies has commented as follows upon the use of τέλειος in Mt 5:48. "In the DSS the Hebrew equivalent or its cognates occur frequently, and it may be urged that the usage of the DSS illumines that of Matthew. Thus DSD I:13 which reads: 'To direct their strength according to the

---

perfection of His ways' recalls directly Matthew 5:48."\(^{69}\) Davies explains further that "In several passages degrees of perfection appear to be recognized. Thus DSD V:24 implies that there is a yearly examination to ascertain the degree of perfection achieved".\(^ {70}\)

Although the qualitative meaning of wholeness should by no means be ruled out in Mt 5:48, it is evident that there is also a quantitative meaning. In Mt 5:48 perfection not only refers to conduct according to a norm which is qualitatively different from another norm but also to the quantitative idea of the attainment of the highest rank. In addition to the foregoing arguments this fact is also borne out by the Matthean use of all (\(\pi\alpha\gamma\zeta\)).

Mt 28:20 states that the disciples are to teach "them to observe all that I have commanded you"; Mt 3:15 states that Jesus told John "for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness"; Mt 5:18 states "till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished". The use of \(\pi\alpha\gamma\zeta\) appears to be redactional in all three cases\(^ {71}\) and these passages refer to activity which is measured in a quantitative sense. Consequently, the use of \(\pi\alpha\gamma\zeta\) further corroborates the conclusion that Mt 5:20 and 48 have a quantitative force.\(^ {72}\)

\(^{69}\) W. D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30", HTR 46 (1953) p. 115.

\(^{70}\) Ibid.

\(^{71}\) Thus G. Barth, "Law", p. 71. Cf. Strecker, Weg, p. 141.

\(^{72}\) There are yet other indications that Matthew puts an emphasis not only on the qualitative but also on the quantitative aspects of
We are now able to reach a conclusion as to the meaning of dikaiosynē in Mt 5:20. Dikaiosynē is a term which refers to conduct according to a norm which in this case is the law. Both the disciples and the scribes and Pharisees have righteousness insofar as both groups live according to the demands of the law. This, however, does not mean that the righteousness of the two groups is identical. Jesus demands that the righteousness of the disciples is to exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees. This does not mean that the disciples are to live according to a different law but that they are to live according to a different interpretation of the law, namely, an extremely meticulous and strict interpretation which appears to be derived on the basis of a principle related to making a fence around Torah. The goal of this type of conduct is perfection. In this case perfection is not only to be understood in the qualitative sense of observing a different norm but also in the sense of the attainment of the highest rank. The disciples are to observe everything that Jesus commanded.

Matthew 6:1

The expression τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑπών in Mt 6:1 is very similar to the expression ὑπών ἡ δικαιοσύνη which is found in 5:20. Since conduct. E.g. Jesus came to fulfil the law and the prophets (Mt 5:17); "Fill up, then, the measure of your fathers" (Mt 23:32).

73 R. Hummel, Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium (BEvTh 33; München, 1966), p. 69, states that it was self-evident to Matthew that there could be no righteousness without the law.
Mt 6:1 just like 5:20 refers to the righteousness of the disciples it is obvious that Mt 6:1 refers back to 5:20.  

The function of Mt 6:1 with respect to its context is also similar to that of Mt 5:20. Just as 5:20 was a heading for 5:21-48, so 6:1 is generally thought of as a heading for 6:2-18. Consequently, just as the meaning of dikaiosyne in 5:20 could be determined on the basis of vv. 21-48, so the meaning of this term in 6:1 can be determined on the basis of vv. 2-18. Indeed, a continuous argument is presented in Mt 6:1-18.

Mt 6:1 is concerned with the motives underlying the doing of righteousness. The disciples are warned not to practise their righteousness in order to be seen by men, for such action will preclude receiving a reward from God. Following this warning, three illustrations of the doing of righteousness are given. These are the giving of alms (vv. 2-4), praying (vv. 5-15) and fasting (vv. 16-18). It thus seems that the doing of righteousness in 6:1 refers to the practical side of man's religion. In 6:1 dikaiosyne is thus a very

---

74 Thus Allen, Matthew, p. 56; Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, pp. 127ff.; Zahn, Matthäus, p. 261.
75 Thus Barth, "Law", p. 139, n. 2; Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, pp. 307ff.; Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 127; Caechter, Matthäus, p. 201; Hill, Matthew, p. 132; Schaff, Matthew, p. 68; Strecker, Weg, p. 153; Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, I, p. 386.
76 Hill, Matthew, p. 132, suggests that these are the "three fundamental acts of Jewish piety". Cf. Zahn, Matthäus, p. 260; Schaff, Matthew, p. 68.
77 Cf. Allen, Matthew, p. 57; Hill, Matthew, p. 132; Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 57.
comprehensive term. W. D. Davies' suggestion that δικαιοσύνη should be translated as "religion" in this case is therefore very fitting.

It was mentioned above that Mt 6:1 refers back to 5:20. What is the exact nature of this relationship? Schniewind has suggested that in 5:20 righteousness is seen with reference to the interpretation of the law while in 6:1 the righteousness which one does in everyday life is judged. Billerbeck has proposed that 5:20 deals with the nature of true righteousness while 6:1 deals with the pitfalls of practising righteousness. The latter suggestion is persuasive, especially since Mt 5:19 stresses that teaching and doing must always go hand in hand. The rationale behind Mt 6:1 thus appears to be that even if one knows the nature of true righteousness, one will not receive a reward unless one adheres to the proper practice of righteousness.

Theory and practice must go hand in hand. Taken together, Mt 5:20 and 6:1 thus show that δικαιοσύνη is a very comprehensive term.

78 The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, p. 307.
79 Mathäus, p. 76.
80 Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, I, p. 386.
81 The verb ποιεῖται occurs in 5:19 and 6:1.
82 This argument is reminiscent of a point of contention between the Shammaites and Hillelites over the relationship between studying and doing. For example, in Aboth 1:15 Shammai states, "say little and do much" thus exalting doing over studying, while in Aboth 1:17 Simeon b. Gamailiel states that "not the expounding [of the Law] is the chief thing but the doing [of it]" (E.t. by Danby, The Mishnah, p. 447).
83 For the importance of the balance between theory and practice see also Mt 7:24 and 23:3.
encompassing both the theoretical and practical aspects of the right
court of man.

Whereas most commentators agree that in Mt 6:1 righteousness is
viewed in terms of God's demand upon man, there are some who claim that
even here righteousness is God's gift to man. For example, Fiedler
states that Mt 6:1 should be viewed in the light of the Old Testament
teaching that man can only do righteousness because God does rightous-
ness and imputes it to man. This conclusion is unwarranted, for there
are absolutely no indications in the text itself which would suggest an
interpretation in terms of this Old Testament teaching. Mt 6:1 states
clearly that man can do righteousness. There is no reference to the
gift of God.

The occurrences of the term dikaiosyne in Mt 5:20 and 6:1 were
discussed first because, on the basis of redaction-critical consider-
ations it appeared that in these passages Matthew had the greatest
amount of freedom in the use of this term. The foregoing investigation
has shown that it is indeed possible to gain a precise definition of
this term on the basis of these two passages.

Let us now turn to those dikaiosyne-passages in which it
appears that Matthew's use of this term was much more restricted. It
is most logical to start with Mt 6:33 since this passage occurs in a
context which is still governed by the same general framework in which
5:20 and 6:1 are found.

84Der Begriff, I, p. 133.
Matthew 6:33

It was noted above that Mt 6:1 is a heading which governs vv. 2-18. In actual fact, this is only correct as far as the first part of 6:1 is concerned, namely, the three illustrations in vv. 2-18 refer to 6:1a. Mt 6:1b, on the other hand, deals with the giving of rewards and this theme is taken up in vv. 19-33. In this passage the discussions concerning wealth and anxiety serve to illustrate the point that one's primary concern should be with future rather than present rewards.

With this background as to the general structure of chapter 6, let us now turn to v. 33 in particular. It is generally assumed that v. 33 refers back to v. 32 so that ὅτιος in the phrase ἡν δικαιοσύνην ὅτιος is governed by the expression ὅ τι πάντως ὑμᾶς ὁ οὐράνιος. Although it is generally acknowledged that Mt 6:33 deals with the concept of the righteousness of God, there is no consensus of opinion as to the meaning of this concept in this particular context.

Some commentators have argued that God's righteousness here refers to his vindicating activity, particularly as this pertains to

---

85 As Gaechter, Matthäus, p. 233, has pointed out, Mt 6:34 is simply an addendum.

the Kingdom. 87 This interpretation is by no means obvious from the context. Hill has pointed out that "This interpretation would necessitate understanding the Kingdom as wholly eschatological". 88

Mt 6:33 specifically exhorts the disciples to seek God's righteousness. It is thus clear that this passage deals with a relationship between God and man. The disciples are encouraged to live according to the righteousness of God. The point of contention in the interpretation of this relationship is whether righteousness is to be viewed as God's gift or as a demand upon man.

Although they do not agree as to the degree of involvement, the majority of commentators do suggest that the idea of righteousness as being a gift of God is included in Mt 6:33. Some scholars state that in this instance righteousness is both demand and eschatological gift, 89 while others claim that it is to be viewed primarily as the gift of God. 90 Fiedler even claims that Mt 6:33 provides unequivocal proof that Matthew adopted the Old Testament idea of interpreting the tsedakah of God as meaning salvation (Reif). 91


88 Hill, Matthew, p. 145.


90 E.g. Fiedler, "Der Begriff", p. 139; Kertelge, 'Rechtfertigung' bei Paulus, p. 47, n. 130; Schläffer, Matthäus, p. 106; Schrenk, TDNT, II, p. 199.

91 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 140.
The main proof on which this view is based hinges on the meaning of the verb προστεθήσεται. For example, Ziesler argues that "προστεθήσεται points to righteousness as God's gift and not only the object of man's search". 92 This proof is not convincing; for, as was shown above, it appears that in Mt 6:33 only the phrase καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ is redactional. 93 The verb προστεθήσεται, on the other hand, is not redactional. 94 Since this verb formed part of the Vorlage it is unwarranted to base Matthew's understanding of righteousness on it.

To find the meaning of dikaiosyne in Mt 6:33 we must ask the question: Why did the redactor interpolate this expression? In order to answer this question it is necessary to look again at the structure of chapters 5 and 6.

It was noted that in ch. 6, v. 20 was a heading for vv. 21-48 with v. 48 forming the culmination to the train of thought started in v. 20. In ch. 6 a similar structure exists. Mt 6:1 is a heading which governs and in turn is made explicit by vv. 2-33, with v. 33 representing the climax of the discourse.


94 Lk 12:31 also reads προστεθήσεται.

95 Cf. Schaff, Matthew, p. 82; Mt 6:33 "contains the crowning thought of this chapter".
While Mt 6:1 stated the negative side of the argument, that is, if the disciples practise their righteousness before men they will not receive a reward, 6:33 states the positive side, that is, if they do seek God's righteousness then they will receive a reward. Since it has already been shown that a close relationship exists between Mt 5:20 and 6:1, it is thus clear that this relationship extends to Mt 6:33.\footnote{For a discussion of the interconnection of Mt 5:20; 6:1, 33 see also Gaechter, Matthäus, p. 232; Trilling, Israel, pp. 146f.}

Mt 5:20 - 6:33 comprises a continuous argument.

It was shown above that Mt 5:48 and 6:33 perform similar functions as far as their roles in the structure of their respective chapters is concerned. It should also be noted that this parallelism even extends to a similarity of meaning.\footnote{For the suggestion that Mt 6:33 echoes 5:48 see Schaff, Matthew, p. 82; Stuhlmann, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus, p. 189.} In both of the verses the disciples are urged to imitate God. Seeking God's righteousness (6:33) is essentially the same as being perfect as God is perfect (5:48). Consequently, just as in 5:20, 48 and 6:1 righteousness/perfection was not thought of as the gift of God so in 6:33 it is not viewed in this way. Trilling is correct in stating that Mt 6:33 is so bound up in the general thought of the Sermon on the Mount that it is out of the question to interpret dikaiosynē in the Pauline sense of God's righteousness through which man is justified.\footnote{Trilling, Israel, pp. 146f.}

God's righteousness in 6:33 must be understood as a norm for
man's conduct. It is "righteousness of life in agreement with the will of God". 99

Such an understanding of God's righteousness is not peculiar to Matthew. It is clear that in James 1:20 God's righteousness is not the righteousness which is freely imputed to man but that righteousness which is demanded of man. 100

It should also be noted that in Sifre Deut 49 on 11:22 101 it is stated that man can be righteous (tsaddiq) just as God is righteous (tsaddiq). Just as in Mt 6:33 man is urged to imitate God's righteousness, so this passage tells us that man can indeed be righteous just as God is righteous.

On the basis of the preceding discussion it is possible to conclude that the meaning of dikaiosyne in Mt 6:33 corresponds to that in 5:20 and 6:1. In all three passages righteousness is seen as the demand of God upon man rather than God's gift to man. Rather than contradicting the meaning of dikaiosyne in 5:20 and 6:1, 6:33 simply makes the meaning more explicit. On the basis of 5:20 and 6:1 it was clear that the norm for the disciple's conduct was a certain interpretation of the law. On the basis of 6:33 it is now clear that this interpretation is nothing less than God's righteousness, or in other


101 For a discussion of this passage see ch. III, sec 2.
words, God's own interpretation.

Matthew 3:15

It has been shown that in Mt 5:20, 6:1 and 6:33 righteousness refers to man's conduct according to a specific interpretation of the law. It is a demand upon man. It is not the gift of God. With respect to the latter, Mt 3:15 is crucial; for G. Barth claims, "That righteousness is at the same time a demand and an eschatological gift has its basis here." Barth's argument is as follows:

In the context of Matthew's Gospel a special emphasis lies upon τάσσαν; it has to do with the whole will of God, with the whole righteousness. But this righteousness is not understood legally; Jesus fulfills it precisely in that he, as the Messiah-'judge-of-the-worlds', humbles himself and enters into the ranks of sinners, acts for sinners. The unity of righteousness and mercy demonstrated above has its Christological basis here.

Does Mt 3:15 really teach this or is Barth reading this passage in the light of the baptismal teaching of Romans 6? It appears that Barth anticipated such criticism, for he attacks Bartsch for doing the latter.

---


103 G. Barth, "Law", p. 140.

104 Ibid., pp. 140f.
H. W. Bartsch ("Die Taufe im NT", Ev Th, 1948/49, pp. 89f.) goes too far, however, when he deduces: 'The baptism is not only a pointer to the atoning deed of Christ that was to follow, but is the sacramental execution of his death and resurrection.' That is to import the baptismal teaching of Rom. 6 into Matthew. Matt. 3.15 does not say that Jesus now, in his baptism, fulfils all obedience which he has ever to accomplish.105

Although Barth does not interpret Mt 3:15 as crassly in the light of Paul's view of baptism as Bartsch, he nevertheless does interpret this verse in a Pauline sense, for Barth goes beyond the supposition that the baptism is "only a pointer to the atoning deed of Christ that was to follow"106 when he states that "there is contained in the baptism of Jesus that he does this for sinners, that he fulfils all righteousness for them."107

This interpretation clearly imposes Pauline conceptions on Mt 3:15, for it is in tension with this text. It must be noted that Mt 3:15 reads: "οὐτος γὰρ πρέπον ἢν ἡμῖν εἰρηνάοι φασιν ἀληθώς δικαιοσύνην." Barth himself explains that ἢν "can hardly be understood as a plural of majesty; it rather links Jesus and the Baptist".108

105 Ibid., p. 140, n. 3.
106 Ibid.
107 Ibid., p. 141, n. 4.
Consequently, not only Jesus but also John should be seen as fulfilling all righteousness for sinners. This fact points to a weakness in Barth's interpretation, for the explanation that "the Baptist is a Christological organ" hardly explains this discrepancy.

Of the many other scholars who in effect paulinize Mt 3:15 we shall deal only with Fiedler and Cullmann since they go into more detail than the others. Fiedler states that in Mt 3:15 dikaiosyne is a term embracing the total demand of the will of God. He then goes on to make the assertion that the only parallel to such a concept is found in connection with the expectation concerning the activity of the Messiah which is not only found in the Old Testament but

(Expositor's Bible; Toronto, 1890), p. 33, claims that the "us" refers strictly to Jesus himself and points to the fact that Jesus at this time reckons himself not as the Messiah but simply one of Israel. McNeile, Matthew, p. 31, states: "By ηυμίν the Lord associates Himself with the Jewish people". C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (2nd rev. ed.; London, 1927), II, pp. 16ff., sees ηυμίν as referring to all Israelites, not just to Jesus and John. Strecker, Weg, p. 180, and B. Weiss, Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lucas-Parallelen (Halle, 1876), p. 110, on the other hand, hold the same view as G. Barth and this view appears to be the one which has the soundest grammatical basis.


generally in Judaism.\footnote{Ibid., I, p. 111.}

Fiedler therefore concludes:

Das "Erfüllen aller Gerechtigkeit", das Jesus als die eine Forderung Gottes an ihn selbst und an den Täufer Johannes erkennt, das er erkennt als die Forderung, die das ganze Wollen Gottes über seinem Wege und also auch über seiner Taufe bezeichnet, ist nichts anderes als die besondere Aufgabe des Messias und seines "Vorläufers".\footnote{Ibid., I, p. 112.}

Fiedler argues that because dikaiosyne in Mt 3:15 is associated with the activity of the Messiah it refers not only to the demand made by God upon man but also to the eschatological gift of God.\footnote{Ibid., I, p. 113.}

This interpretation has two major weaknesses which render it invalid. Fiedler's claim that a general belief existed in Palestinian Judaism to the effect that the Messiah was to fulfill the entire will of God (all righteousness), is not supported by the evidence presented.\footnote{Ibid., I, p. 113.}

Even if the claim were substantiated, Fiedler's assertion that there is no parallel for this comprehensive meaning of dikaiosyne other than that in which this term is used in conjunction with the activity of the Messiah is demonstrated as being true; this does not prove that it was a generally accepted belief that the task of the Messiah was to fulfill all righteousness in the sense that Fiedler attributes to Mt 3:15.

\footnote{While Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 111, and Schrenk, TDNT, II, pp. 186f., undoubtedly show that in a number of writings the Messiah is designated as being righteous and as doing righteousness, this does not prove that it was a generally accepted belief that the task of the Messiah was to fulfill all righteousness in the sense that Fiedler attributes to Mt 3:15.}
Messiah would nevertheless be incorrect. As has been shown in the
discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature, there
are instances where tädeq has such a comprehensive meaning and is not
used in a messianic context. Fiedler also makes the methodological
mistake of looking outside the Gospel of Matthew for an interpretation
of 3:15 when in actual fact the clear meaning of dikaiosynē as found in
Mt 5:20 and 6:1 is sufficient for an interpretation of this passage.

Cullmann writes with respect to Mt 3:15:

The Baptism of Jesus is related to δικαιοσύνη, not only his
own but also that of the whole people. The word δίκαιος is
probably to be underlined here. Jesus' reply which exegetes
have always found difficult to explain, acquires a concrete
meaning: Jesus will effect a general forgiveness.

Hill notes that Cullman's view "involves a Pauline under-
standing of dikaiosynē and of pasan ('for all')" and it is indeed
suggestive that Cullman does not support this interpretation using the
Gospel of Matthew but using the other gospels and Paul.

Cullmann explains that on the basis of Mk 10:38 and Lk 12:50

---

116 For example, in Siffer Deut 144 on 16:19 (p. 199) tädeq
refers to everything that is right (see ch. III, sec. 2). Tsedeq
embraces the total will of God which is to be taught by the sages. On
the basis of the Damascus Document (see ch. II, sec. 2) it is clear
that the Teacher of Righteousness teaches righteousness in the sense
of teaching the entire will of God. See especially CD 1:1, 11ff., 16;

Reid (SBT 1; London, 1950), p. 18.

it is clear that for Jesus the verb παριζω has the meaning "die". It should be noted that the major textual variation between Mt 20:20-28 and Mk 10:35-45 is that Matthew does not contain the two references to the theme of baptism found in Mark. Also Mt 10:34 is parallel to Lk 12:51 but Matthew does not have the reference to baptism which is found in Lk 12:50. Consequently, rather than supporting the interpretation that Mt 3:15 points to the fact that Jesus will effect a general forgiveness, Mk 10:38 and Lk 12:50 cast doubt on such an interpretation, for these two passages may very well have been purposely omitted by Matthew.

Cullmann's claim that the baptismal doctrine of Rom 6:1ff. is traceable throughout the whole New Testament and "that Christian Baptism in the New Testament is participation in the death and resurrection of Christ" also does not relate directly to Mt 3:15. Neither does Jn 1:29, "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world!" necessarily reflect Matthew's view of baptism.

Thus the plain fact remains that in order to show that righteousness in Mt 3:15 is to be seen in the general sense of the gift of God, proof must be derived from sources extraneous to the Gospel of Matthew. This type of argumentation is used despite the possibility that such proof-texts may have been intentionally omitted by Matthew or that such proof is directly in conflict with the elements in the text.

---

119 Cullmann, Baptism, p. 19.
120 Ibid., p. 20.
121 Ibid.
such as the use of the plural pronoun ἡμιν. Rather than starting with an outside explanation it would appear to be more logical to resort to such a procedure only after other methods of exegesis have proven unsuccessful. Before basing an interpretation on sources outside the Gospel of Matthew it is necessary to ascertain whether the immediate context or other passages in Matthew can lead to a satisfactory explanation.

On the basis of the storyline in Mt 3:13-17 it is obvious that the act of baptism must be included in the meaning of the expression "to fulfill all righteousness". Some exegesis have even suggested that the meaning of dikaiosyne is exclusively concerned with the act of baptism so that instead of δικαιοσύνη the text should read δικαίωμα. Although it is clear that the act of baptism is stressed, the reference to all (πᾶσαν) righteousness in Mt 3:15 suggests a more inclusive meaning for dikaiosyne. The act of baptism is just one aspect of the righteousness which Jesus and John are to fulfill.

It is thus possible to conclude that in Mt 3:15 righteousness does not refer to the gift of God but to God's demand upon man.

122 So Zahn, Matthäus, p. 144. Cf. Klostermann, Matthäus-evangelium, p. 25; E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Matthäus (Göttingen, 1956), p. 51: "So ist also die Taufe die letzte und höchste Forderung, die Gott jetzt zu allen Geboten des Gesetzes noch auferlegt; mit ihr ist dann 'alle Gerechtigkeit erfüllt'."

123 Attempts to translate πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην as "righteousness of all" or "righteousness for all" do violence to Greek syntax and seem to be motivated by a desire to bring Mt 3:15 into harmony with Pauline theology. E.g. A. Descamps, Les Justes et la Justice, pp. 116-118.

124 Cf. Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus, p. 191; "In dem πληρώσας πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην ist ja auch nicht, paulinisch, Jesu
John and Jesus are to carry out the total will of God. They are "to leave nothing undone that had been revealed as the righteous will of God." Righteousness is the norm for the conduct of John the Baptist and Jesus.

Matthew 21:32

Mt 3:15 is not the only passage in the Gospel of Matthew where the term dikaiosyne is used in conjunction with John the Baptist. A similar use is found in Mt 21:32. Indeed a number of commentators have pointed to a relationship between these two passages and it would thus be logical to continue this study of the dikaiosyne-passages by turning to Mt 21:32.

Mt 21:32 states: "For John came to you in the way of righteousness (ἐν ὀδῷ δικαιοσύνης), and you did not believe him". Some commentators have suggested that the expression "the way of righteousness"

stellvertretende Gesetzeserfüllung, sondern sein urbildlicher Toragehorsam betont."


126 Windisch, Sermon on the Mount, p. 66. Suggests that "The phrase 'to fulfill all righteousness' in ch. 3:15, also, means 'to evince righteousness by means of a specific deed.'" Cf. Trilling, Israel, p. 176. This interpretation is unconvincing since πληρώσαι here means fulfill in the sense of observe rather than evince.

127 E.g. Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 149; Hill, Matthew, p. 96.
is a technical term. J. A. T. Robinson, for example, writes:

Just as both the covenanters (IQS ix, 18) and the Christians (Acts ix, 2) knew themselves as "the way," and dwelt strongly on the two ways (IQS iii, 13 - iv, 26; Didache 1 - vi; Matthew vii, 13f.), so "the way of righteousness" may well have been the popular name for John's movement. 

128

Fiedler claims that Mt 21:2 will always remain a crux interpretum unless one delves into the background of the expression "the way of righteousness". 129 He attempts to show that on the basis of the Old Testament and a number of Jewish-Palestinian writings it is clear that "the ways of righteousness" are the ways which correspond to proper conduct in the sight of God. However, insofar as righteousness is the goal of these ways, it is understood not simply as an achievement of man but as the way of salvation (Heil). 130

Fiedler thus concludes that in Mt 21:32 the way of righteousness is the way upon which righteousness and salvation (Heil) are won. 132

---

129 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 145.
130 Ibid., I, pp. 141-144.
131 Ibid., I, pp. 143f.
Fiedler's interpretation of Mt 21:32 in the light of specific texts drawn from the Old Testament and a number of Jewish-Palestinian writings is not convincing. If it were true that the expression "the way of righteousness" was a well-defined formulaic term, then such an interpretation might be justified. But Fiedler himself admits that it is only possible to speak in terms of a formulaic term with respect to the LXX version of Proverbs. 133 It should be noted that in Prov 8:20; 12:28; 16:17,31; 17:23 ὁδὸς is in the plural, while in 21:16,21 it is in the singular. Consequently, even Fiedler's assertion that we are dealing with a formulaic term in the LXX version of Proverbs is suspect. It should also be noted that while the evidence in Proverbs is five to two in favour of the plural, in Mt 21:32 the singular is found. 134 These facts militate against the validity of interpreting Mt 21:32 in terms of Proverbs.

It should be noted that in his analysis of the Old Testament and the Jewish-Palestinian literature, Fiedler does not distinguish between the nouns ἀλεθία and ἀλεθεία. Therefore his general conclusion that righteousness in the expression "the way of righteousness" means "Heil" is suspect. Since Mt 21:32 itself does not in any way imply that righteousness is the gift of God, it seems that Fiedler's analysis is simply an attempt to attribute this meaning to the Matthaean use of the term.

133 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 142.
134 Zahn, Matthäus, p. 626, n. 27, even claims that "ἐν ὁδῷ ἀληθείας ist ein ungriechischer Ausdruck".
The foregoing discussion has shown that although expressions similar to "the way of righteousness" exist, these expressions by no means provide the basis for a definitive interpretation of Mt 21:32. We must turn to the Gospel of Matthew itself in order to understand the meaning of this expression.

There is no reason to suppose that in Mt 21:32 the meaning of the term dikaiosyne is not essentially the same as in the four dikaiosyne-passages just discussed. Here, as in the other passages, dikaiosyne refers to conduct which is in agreement with the will of God.

This interpretation is indeed suggested by two factors other than the argument of the continuity of meaning. Lk 7:30, a passage parallel to Mt 21:32, states, "but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the purpose of God (τὴν σωφροσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ) for themselves". The expression "the way of righteousness" is thus parallel to "the purpose of God". If, as has been proposed, righteousness refers to the will of God, then these two verses of the same tradition do in fact carry the same meaning.

Secondly, it should not be overlooked that Mt 21:31 uses the expression "the will of his father". It is therefore possible that the concept of the will of God may govern v. 32.135

A large number of scholars agree that righteousness refers to

---

135 It could also be that Mt 21:32 is meant in an ironical way. The opponents of Jesus are told that John came to them with their own teaching and they did not believe him.
conduct which is in agreement with the will of God. There is, however, disagreement amongst them whether ὁδὸς is to be viewed as a way of life or as a subject of preaching. In other words, does it refer to the conduct of John the Baptist or to the content of his message?

Michaelis writes, "The construction ᾧ λαβόν ἐν ὁδὸν demands that ὁδὸς be referred to the Baptist himself. What is meant is that he came to you in the way of righteousness, as a righteous man, and yet you did not believe him."136 On the other hand, Ziesler states, "Probably ἐν here means 'with', and the whole phrase means 'with the message of righteousness', i.e. the message of the standard which God demands of men, the life of obedience to the divine will."137

The fact that Mt 21:32 states "you did not believe him" indicates that John the Baptist presented a message which was refused. This would support the premise that ὁδὸς refers to the subject of John's preaching. One must not forget, however, that Mt 5:19 stresses that teaching and doing must not be separated: Accordingly, it is possible that not only the idea of John's message but also that of his conduct is connoted in Mt 21:32. John practised what he preached.138

Matthew 5:6

Whereas Barth 139 claims that Mt 3:15 is the decisive passage showing that righteousness should not only be viewed as a demand but also as an eschatological gift, Fiedler appears to attach such a significance to Mt 5:6. He claims that in this passage righteousness refers solely to the eschatological gift of God. 140 It is a "fremde Gerechtigkeit." 141 Indeed a number of exegetes claim that in Mt 5:6 dikaiosynē is regarded as a gift which God gives to those who ask for it. 142

Some commentators suggest that in Mt 5:6 dikaiosynē means justification. For example, Bultmann writes: "By those who 'hunger and thirst after righteousness,' Mt. 5:6 obviously does not mean those who 'ever striving, endeavor' to attain ethical perfection, but those who long to have God pronounce the verdict 'righteous' as His decision over them in judgment." 143

139 "Law", p. 140.

140 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 117. Cf. Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 144; "It is probably no accident that 5.6 precedes 5.20; human righteousness is inadequate, and what is needed is not a more thoroughgoing kind, but one which comes as God's gift to those who long for it."


142 E.g. Grundmann, Matthäus, p. 127; Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 87f., McNeile, Matthew, pp. 51f.; Schaff, Matthew, p. 52; Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 44; Schrenk, TDNT, II, p. 198; Zahn, Matthäus, p. 189; Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 142.

Another interpretation of Mt 5:6 which is similar to the ones mentioned above inasmuch as it too views dikaiosyne as God's rather than man's activity is suggested by Dodd. He argues that if this saying is put back into "its presumed original Aramaic" 144 then נַחֲלָת or נַחֲלַה, the equivalent to δικαιοσύνη, could refer to God's vindicating activity with respect to his elect. 145

There is, however, by no means a general consensus of scholarly opinion that dikaiosyne in Mt 5:6 refers solely to God's activity. There are exegetes who suggest that this passage refers to both the demand and gift of God. For example, Manson writes with respect to the meaning of dikaiosyne in Mt 5:6, "It is the fulfilment by man of God's will and the fulfilment by God of His own purposes of grace and mercy." 146

All of the foregoing interpretations are at variance with the meaning of the term righteousness as found in the dikaiosyne-passages discussed thus far. Are these interpretations incorrect or does the meaning of the term dikaiosyne in actual fact vary within the Gospel of Matthew?

A detailed investigation shows that the interpretations of


Mt 5:6 discussed thus far are misleading. It should be noted that the interpretations discussed above are not in agreement with each other. Why? It was noted previously that it is extremely probable that in Mt 5:6 the term dikaiosyne was inserted by Matthew by way of interpolation. Matthew thus experienced great constraint in the use of this term.

In dealing with the meaning of this interpolated term, the question must be asked: Should the meaning be derived from the immediate context, which after all is not redactional but belongs to the Vorlage, or should the meaning be derived from the larger context of the whole gospel?

The interpretations given above are based on the former method of interpretation. The immediate context mentions "those who hunger and thirst" and it is argued that one hungers and thirsts for something which one hopes to receive. Consequently, righteousness is seen specifically as the gift of God or at least as referring to God's action.

Let us now see what results are obtained when the use of the term dikaiosyne in 5:6 is viewed in the broader context of Matthew's thought. Whereas Mt 5:6 reads "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied", the parallel passage in Lk 6:21 reads, "Blessed are you that hunger now, for you shall be satisfied." Why does Matthew, in comparison to Luke, include an expanded saying of the same tradition in his gospel?

Hill answers this question when he states, "Matthew expands the
shorter form in the interests of clarification.\footnote{147} The saying in Lk 6:21 is vague. The object of the hunger is unspecified. Matthew, in order to clarify this saying, adds the term righteousness.

What effect does this clarification have? Weiss makes the astute observation that this term is added to make this passage subordinate to Mt 5:20.\footnote{148} This suggestion is very convincing. The concept of righteousness plays a significant role not only in Mt 5:20 but also in 6:1 and 33, two passages directly related to 5:20. It is indeed fitting that this concept should be used to govern and define the object of the hunger. Consequently, just as in Mt 5:20, 6:1, 33, \textit{dikaiosyne} refers to man's conduct in accordance to the will of God, so it probably has the same meaning in 5:6. Since there are no compelling reasons to suggest that the term \textit{dikaiosyne} must have different meanings in 5:6 and 5:20, it is reasonable to assume that Matthew used this term in a consistent way.\footnote{149}

Matthew 5:10

In Mt 5:10 righteousness is regarded as a cause for persecution.\footnote{150} In this passage it is clear that righteousness refers to

\footnote{147}Hill, Matthew, p. 112. Cf. Grundmann, Matthäus, p. 126.


\footnote{149}The view that in Mt 5:6 righteousness refers to man's conduct rather than God's gift is supported by: Strecker, Weg, p. 158; Allen, Matthew, p. 41; Fenton, Matthew, p. 81; Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, p. 37; Weiss, Matthäusevangelium, p. 202.

\footnote{150}Cf. Grundmann, Matthäus, p. 132. Although this appears to be the most logical explanation, the following suggestion by Hare,
something which a person has, for one is usually persecuted for one's own action. 151 Even Fiedler, who has attempted to interpret all the foregoing dikaiosyne passages as referring to the gift of God, notes that there appears to be a contradiction between 5:6 and 5:10, since 5:10 refers to something which a person has. 152

For a solution to this seeming contradiction, Fiedler draws attention to the three following factors. He first of all suggests that it should not be expected that there must be uniformity of usage among the seven occurrences of the term dikaiosyne in the Gospel of Matthew. 153

Secondly, Fiedler notes that the interpretation given by W. Michaelis could be correct. "Weil sie als Gerechte gelten, auch wenn sie selbst nach 5,6 sich nicht so ansehen können, werden sie verfolgt, unschuldig zwar, aber doch nicht ohne Grund." 154

Thirdly, Fiedler argues that it may be possible that Mt 5:10

---

Jewish Persecution of Christians, p. 131, should not be ruled out completely: "The phrase may be descriptive rather than interpretive; that is to say, ἐνεκὼ δίκαιον τῆς σωτηρίας may serve simply to identify the persecuted ('Blessed are the persecuted righteous') rather than to indicate the cause of persecution".

151 It has been suggested that the absence of the definite article in ἐνεκὼ δίκαιον τῆς σωτηρίας indicates that this expression refers to human conduct. Thus Strecker, Weg, p. 154; Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus, p. 190.

152 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 118.

153 Ibid., I, pp. 118f.

154 W. Michaelis, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Zürich, 1948-49), I, p. 225, as quoted by Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 119.
refers to persons who were persecuted for a righteousness which they
did not possess. The people had no righteousness but knew that they
could expect everything on the basis of the eschatological gift of
God. This angered those who thought that they had righteousness and
consequently the latter persecuted the former. 155

Fiedler concludes that the third suggestion leads to the
correct understanding of Mt 5:10. Consequently, there is no contra-
diction between 5:6 and 5:10 after all. According to 5:10 a person only
has righteousness in the sense that it has been given to him as the
gift of God. 156

What Fiedler has in actual fact done is interpret Mt 5:10 in
terms of the meaning which he attached to 5:6. Since it has been
shown that the term ἰδιωτικὴ ἁμαρτία in 5:6 probably does not refer to the
gift of God, this proof is unconvincing.

The majority of scholars agree that in 5:10 righteousness
refers to man's conduct, that is to say, to the demand rather than the
gift of God. 157

All seven ἰδιωτικὴ ἁμαρτία-passages in the Gospel of Matthew have
now been analysed and it is possible to conclude that Matthew's usage
of the term ἰδιωτικὴ ἁμαρτία is consistent. In all seven passages,

155 Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, p. 179.
156 Ibid., I, pp. 120ff.
157 E.g., Barth, "Law", p. 139; Strecker, Heg., p. 154; Ziesler,
Righteousness, p. 142; Hill, Matthew, p. 113; McNeill, Matthew, p. 53;
Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus, p. 190; Schrenk, TDNT,
II, p. 199.
righteousness is seen as God's demand upon man. Righteousness refers to proper conduct before God.

3. Eleemosyne

As was discussed above, Ziesler has shown that "the LXX translators considered δίκαιος to represent τσε-τσαq adequately" for there are only 23 exceptions to such usage. With respect to the exceptions, Ziesler has found that "no trend is perceptible, except the very notable one of using ἐλεημοσύνη or ἔλεος instead of a δίκαιος word." Eleemosyne is used nine times, and eleos three times, for tsedaqah. It should be noted that eleemosyne and eleos never stand for tsedeq.

Ziesler warns that on the basis of these facts it would be precarious "to conclude that δίκαιος-νή cannot bear the 'gracious' connotation of tsedaqah." After all, dikaiosyne is used nine times in the LXX to render the term chesed. Ziesler especially points out that in Prov 20:28 "chesed occurs twice with the same meaning, but once is rendered ἐλεημοσύνη and once δίκαιος-νή." 162

158 Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 59.
159 Ibid., p. 60.
160 Ibid.
161 Ibid., p. 61; "It 4 times renders chesed when referring to man's righteousness (Gen. 19.19; 20.13; 21.13; Prov. 20.28), and 5 times when referring to God's... (Gen. 24.27; 32.11(10); Ex 15.13; 34.7; Isa. 63.7 - where chesed occurs twice, the first case being rendered by ἔλεος))."
162 Ibid., p. 61.
On the basis of this evidence Ziesler reaches the conclusion that "it is clear that δικαιοσύνη and ἐλεημοσύνη can be used interchangeably for ἁγιορεία and χαίρειν." 163

Dodd, on the other hand, states with respect to the usage in the Septuagint, "Thus two aspects of Ἁγιορεία are polarized into δικαιοσύνη and ἐλεημοσύνη. In place of the comprehensive virtue of Ἁγιορεία, we have justice on the one hand, mercy on the other." 164

To substantiate this conclusion, Dodd cites the following examples. In Dan 4:24(27) and Ps 32(35):5, ἀμφισκέψει, referring to human benevolence, is translated by ἐλεονομία in the LXX. 165 In Ps 24:5, Deut 6:25, 24:13; Ps 102(103):6 and Ps 32(33):5, ἀμφισκέψει, referring to the gracious activity of God, is again rendered by ἐλεονομία in the LXX. 166

Which of these two opposing views is in fact the correct one? It should be noted that the nine cases cited by Ziesler are in the category of exceptions, for Hatch has shown that in the LXX ἁγιορεία is generally rendered by ἐλεονομία or ἐλεος. 167 In addition it must be noted that in the Old Testament the terms ἁγιορεία and ἀμφισκέψει are used almost interchangeably. Consequently, the fact that in some instances

---

163 Ibid., p. 61, n. 3. For support Ziesler cites E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford, 1889), p. 50, who states that the meanings of these two words had interpenetrated each other.

164 Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 56.

165 Ibid., pp. 45f.

166 Ibid., pp. 55f.

167 Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 49.
dictyosyne and eleemosyne are used interchangeably in the LXX may
simply reflect the usage in the Hebrew Old Testament.

The view promulgated by Dodd, on the other hand, appears to be
significant insofar as it isolates the beginning of a trend. As was
shown above, in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature,
although there was some overlap it was nevertheless clear that the
terms tsadq and tsadaqah were generally used with distinct meanings.
In both literatures tsadq was used primarily to refer to man's conduct
while tsadaqah was used to designate benevolent activity, namely God's
gracious, saving activity in the Dead Sea Scrolls and alms in the
Tannaitic literature.

With respect to the usage in the LXX of rendering tsadaqah by
eleemosyne, Ziesler himself notes that this shows "that the Rabbinic
tendency to give tsadaqah the meaning 'benevolence', 'charity' or even
'almsgiving', was extant as early as this". 168 As a matter of fact it
appears that not only this specific trend but also the more general one
that "two aspects of ἡτα are polarized into δίκαιοσύνη and
ἐλεημοσύνη"169 is indeed evident in the LXX. Despite Ziesler's claim
to the contrary, it does appear that the usage of the LXX points to the
trend that δίκαιοσύνη tends not to bear "the 'gracious' connotation of

168 Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 59. For the view that in the LXX
eleemosyne as a translation of tsadaqah reflects the specialized mean-
ing of the latter as alms see also F. Rosenthal, "Sedakah, Charity".
HUCA 23 (1950-51), I, p. 429.

169 Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 56.
Let us now see how the Matthaean use of the term *eleemosyne* relates to the Septuagintal usage. This term occurs three times in the Gospel of Matthew, i.e. Mt 6:2, 3, 4. In all three cases *eleemosyne* is used to refer to almsgiving. It is thus clear that the Matthaean use of *eleemosyne* is equivalent to the way *tsedaqah* is used in the Tannaitic literature.

The discussion of Mt 6:1 showed that the doing of righteousness (*dikaiosyne*) included almsgiving, praying and fasting. Consequently, there is a relationship between the usage of the terms *eleemosyne* and *dikaiosyne*, namely, the giving of alms is simply one aspect of doing righteousness. Similarly, in the Tannaitic literature, almsgiving (*tsedaqah*) is included in the doing of righteousness (*tsedeq*).

As has been shown, in the Gospel of Matthew, the meanings of the terms *dikaiosyne* and *eleemosyne* are distinct and well defined. *Dikaiosyne* refers strictly to the demand of God upon man, never to the gift of God. Matthaean usage thus reflects the trend visible in the LXX, namely that *dikaiosyne* tends not to bear the gracious connotation of *tsedaqah*. The gracious connotation of *tsedaqah*, however, is visible in the use of the term *eleemosyne*, although only in the limited sense of almsgiving. While the doing of *dikaiosyne* includes *eleemosyne*, there is no reference to God's saving, gracious activity but only to

---


man's gracious activity in the form of almsgiving.

Does Matthew completely neglect the concept of God's gracious, saving activity which was expressed by the Hebrew term tsedaqah? It was noted that in the LXX the term eleos was used three times to translate tsedaqah.\textsuperscript{173} Let us see how Matthew uses this term.

The noun eleos occurs three times in the Gospel of Matthew. In Mt 9:13 and 12:7 it occurs in the quotation of Hos 6:6, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." This quotation is used in both instances with the implication that the Pharisees have not shown mercy to others. In Mt 23:23 it is explicitly stated that the scribes and Pharisees have neglected mercy. In all three cases the noun eleos is used not with respect to God's saving, gracious activity but with respect to God's demand that men should show mercy toward one another.

The verb eleeo, on the other hand, is used with reference to God's saving, gracious activity, at least insofar as such activity is centered in Jesus. For example, in Mt 9:27, 15:22, 17:15, 20:30f., this verb is used in the pleas of various people imploring Jesus to have mercy on them. Thus Matthew does not neglect the theme of God's saving, gracious activity. What is clear, however, is that Matthew does not use righteousness-terminology such as dikaiosyne and the subordinate term eleemosyne to express this theme.

4. Dikaios

There are 17 occurrences of the adjective dikaios in the Gospel.

\textsuperscript{173} See Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 59.
of Matthew. In Mark and Luke, on the other hand, there are only two
and 11 occurrences respectively. Of the 17 cases in Matthew there is
only a single instance where the Matthaean usage is parallel to Mark
and/or Luke, namely Mt 9:13 (=Mk 2:17=Lk 5:32), "For I came not to call
the righteous, but sinners."

Of the 16 occurrences which have no synoptic parallels, six are
found in completely unique Matthaean pericopae; six in uniquely
Matthaean material occurring in pericopae having synoptic parallels and
four in passages where the immediate context in which the adjective
is found has a synoptic parallel. Consequently, there are only four
occurrences of the adjective dikaios which lend themselves to redaction-
critical analysis.

Lk 10:24 refers to "prophets and kings" while Mt 13:17 refers
to "prophets and righteous men". Lk 11:47 mentions the "tombs of the
prophets" while Mt 23:29 not only refers to the latter but also to the
"monuments of the righteous". Lk 11:50 refers to the "blood of all the
prophets" while Mt 23:35 refers to "all the righteous blood" (καὶ αἷμα δύο
σαλαμ. Lk 11:51 refers to the "blood of Abel" while Mt 23:35

---

174 If the variant readings in Mt 20:7; 27:4,24 are taken into
account then there are 20.

175 Mt 1:19 in "The Birth of Jesus" (1:18-25); Mt 13:43 in "The
Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds" (13:36-43); Mt 13:49 in
"The Parable of the Net" (13:47-50); Mt 20:4 in "The Parable of the
Labourers in the Vineyard" (20:1-16); Mt 25:37,46 in "The Last
Judgment" (Mt 25:31-46).


177 Mt 13:17 - Lk 10:24; Mt 23:29 - Lk 11:47; Mt 23:35 (twice) -
Lk 11:50f.
has the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαιοῦ. This phrase has been translated as either "from the blood of innocent Abel" or "from the blood of Abel the righteous". The latter translation appears to express the real intention of the text most clearly.

On the basis of these four uses of the adjective dikaios, a redactional trend can be isolated, namely, when referring to those who in the past were properly religious, Matthew likes to use the designation righteous (dikaios).

Let us now attempt to classify the 17 occurrences of the adjective dikaios in the Gospel of Matthew. As was shown above, Matthew uses this term to describe those who were properly religious in the past or as Ziesler has noted "the pious, God-fearing, upright people of the O.T". The occurrences of dikaios in Mt 13:17 and 23:29,35 (twice), belong to this category. Ziesler also includes Mt 10:41


180 Kilpatrick, "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke xxiii.47", p. 35, claims that in Mt 23:35, innocent is at least as suitable a translation as righteous. Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 138, states, "but more probably Abel is righteous because, in contrast to his lawless contemporaries, he did God's will."


in this category. In the latter passage, however, the reference is to the present. Consequently, the pious of the Old Testament can hardly be included.

The adjective dikaios is also used to describe a certain group of religious contemporaries of Jesus and/or Matthew, namely, those who observed the law but were not necessarily properly religious as far as the teaching of Jesus was concerned. Ziesler suggests that in Mt 1:19, 5:45, 9:13 and 23:28 dikaios means "obeying the law". This is certainly true in the case of Mt 1:19, for Joseph is righteous because he acted according to the teaching of the law.

With respect to Mt 5:45 Ziesler notes that "it is disputable whether righteous under the old or the new covenant is intended". He is probably right, however, in placing it in this category rather than the "Christian righteous" category.

In Mt 9:13 dikaios again refers to the observance of the law. This verse implies that the Pharisees are righteous and on the basis

183 Righteousness, p. 138.
184 Ibid., p. 140.
185 Cf. Allen, Matthew, p. 9; Hill, Matthew, p. 78, and Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms (Cambridge, 1967), p. 124; McNeile, Matthew, p. 7. The view expressed by Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 51 and C. Spicq, "Joseph, son mar, étant juste . . . (Mt. I,19)" , RB 71 (1964), pp. 231f., that dikaios refers to Joseph's kindness toward Mary is not explicit in the text. As Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 140, points out, this adjective appears as a whole not to have such a meaning. On the other hand, insofar as the law is good, treatment according to the law is in fact compassionate.
186 Righteousness, p. 140.
of Mt 5:20 we know that the Pharisees have a righteousness which is obtained by obedience to the law. 187 The meaning of dikaios in Mt 23:28 is quite similar to that in 9:13. As Descamps has pointed out, ὑπάρχει could imply an external rather than a false righteousness. 188 Consequently, here as in 9:13 the Pharisees are viewed as being righteous in much the same sense.

In addition to the four passages just discussed, the occurrences of dikaios in Mt 10:41 and 27:19 also belong to this category. With respect to Mt 10:41, Montefiore has suggested that "the righteous" may refer to the whole body of Christians. 189 Ziesler, on the other hand, does not classify Mt 10:41 in the category of the "Christian righteous". 190 Ziesler's view is to be preferred for it appears that in this passage a distinction is made between the righteous and the disciples. The latter are those who are properly religious in the Christian sense.

The reference to Jesus as being righteous, found in Mt 27:19, also belongs to the category referring to properly religious contemporaries, who are not necessarily Christian. After all, it is stated that the wife of Pilate referred to Jesus as "that righteous one" (τὸ δικαίως ἐκείνῳ). This in effect means that in the eyes of a non-believer, Jesus appeared to be a properly religious person with

187 Cf. Allen, Matthew, p. 91; Hill, Matthew, p. 175.
190 Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 141. Hill, Matthew, p. 196, suggests that this saying belongs to the period of Jewish Christianity.
reference to contemporary religious standards. Such a statement may also have implied that being properly religious, Jesus must be innocent of the charges levied against him. 191

Interpretations of Mt 27:19 to the effect that "Jesus is for Matthew the exemplary Just One." 192 or that this verse shows that the passion of Jesus should be viewed from the perspective of the suffering righteous one 193, read a significance into this verse which in no way harmonizes with the general usage of the term dikaios in the Gospel of Matthew. Even discussing Mt 27:19 under the special heading "Christ as Righteous" rather than "Man as Righteous", as Ziesler has done, is not justified. 194

In the passages discussed up to this point the adjective dikaios has not been used specifically to designate those who are properly religious in the sense that they followed the teachings of Jesus. Let us now turn to those passages which Ziesler claims deal with the

191 For the view that dikaios = innocent in 27:19 see Grundmann, Matthew, p. 554; Hill, Matthew, p. 350. For the view that dikaios has the double meaning of righteous and innocent in this case, see Ziesler, Righteousness, pp. 137f.; Schrenk, TDNT, II, p. 187.

192 G. Barth, "Law", p. 144, n. 5.

193 E.g. E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship (London, 1960), p. 33, cites Mt 27:19 as proof that "there is no doubt that the early Church has seen Jesus in the character of the Righteous One suffering in obedience." However, L. Ruppert, Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 59; Stuttgart, 1972), p. 74, has shown that if Jesus attributed an atoning efficacy to his suffering, it was in his capacity as suffering prophet rather than as suffering Righteous One.

"Christian righteous", namely, "those who live in obedience to Jesus, and so receive his verdict of approval". The passages which Ziesler lists as belonging to this category are Mt 13:43, 49; 25:37, 46.

It should be noted that, rather than referring to the past or the writer's contemporary situation, as was the case with the passages discussed up to this point, these passages all refer to the future. Specifically, these four passages refer to the future judgment and the hope of eternal life.

It is not to be denied that in these passages the righteous are indeed the "Christian righteous" as defined by Ziesler. This fact is especially obvious in the case of Mt 25:46 where the righteous (οἱ δίκαιοι) are said to enter eternal life as opposed to eternal punishment.

It is to be expected that with respect to the writer's past, there are no references to the Christian righteous. It is indeed perplexing, however, that the expression δίκαιος is used only with reference to the Christian righteous of the future and not of the present. What is the reason behind this peculiar usage?

Bultmann has noted that "it is impossible to avoid thinking that Matt. 25:31-46 derives from Jewish tradition," This conclusion is indeed convincing. In the discussion of the Talmudic literature it was seen that those who were to inherit life in the world to come

195 Ibid., p. 141.
were known as the righteous. In the four passages under discussion Matthew does not emphasize that those who are properly religious in the Christian sense are to be known as the righteous, but rather, using traditional Jewish teaching, Matthew emphasizes that the properly religious will inherit eternal life. Once it is realized that these passages derive largely from Jewish tradition which Matthew incorporated into his gospel, it is clear that no great significance can be attached to the fact that in a few passages dealing with the future hope of eternal life, the righteous are the Christian righteous.

It is therefore possible to conclude that in the Gospel of Matthew, the term dikaios is not used with the express purpose of designating those who are properly religious in the sense that they follow the teaching of Jesus. The righteous are basically those who obey the law. This does not mean that one who is properly religious in the Christian sense could not also be referred to as being righteous. It does mean, however, that in the Gospel of Matthew the term dikaios is not a technical term for those who are properly religious in the Christian sense.

That dikaios is indeed not such a technical term is supported by the way it is used in Mt 20:4, "You go into the vineyard too, and whatever is right (δικαιοῦ) I will give you." Here dikaios is not used to define the religious status of a person. As Ziesler points out, in this case dikaios refers to a just or proper payment. 197

197 Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 138.
Schrenk also notes that Mt 20:4 is among those passages in which dikaios follows everyday usage and does not reflect any new or distinctive early Christian understanding. 198

---

198 Schrenk, TDNT, II, p. 188; Cf. Hill, Matthew, p. 286; "There is no need to suggest a hint of Paulinism here."
CHAPTER V

THE RELATIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONCEPT OF
RIGHTTEOUSNESS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Having analysed the meaning of the component terms of the
concept of righteousness, we are now in a position to discuss the
question: What significance is attached to the use of the concept of
righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew?

In the previous chapter it was demonstrated that the terms
dikaiosynē, eleēmosynē and dikaios are used to describe the demand of
God upon man to live according to a certain norm, the law. Although
the nature of the norm never changes,¹ the possibility of varying
interpretations of the law is taken into account. Consequently,
there are degrees of righteousness, the righteousness that exceeds
that of the scribes and Pharisees being that which corresponds to the
interpretation of the law given by Jesus.

It should be noted that even the reference to God's righteous-
ness in Mt 6:33 does not provide an exception to this general meaning
of righteousness. God's righteousness is seen primarily as a norm for
man's conduct. Consequently, the view expressed by scholars such as

¹Cf. Mt 5:17-18.
Ziesler\textsuperscript{2}, Schrenk\textsuperscript{3}, Fiedler\textsuperscript{4} and Bornkamm\textsuperscript{5}, for example, that the concept of righteousness plays a significant role in Matthew's theology insofar as it relates both to the demand made upon man and God's eschatological gift for man, is not supported by the facts.

If this view does not have a foundation in the actual text of the Gospel of Matthew, why has it been promulgated by a large number of scholars? This writer has come to the following conclusion as to the basis of this view. Whether consciously or unconsciously, these scholars have read the Gospel of Matthew in the light of the Pauline writings. In other words, they have paulinized the Matthaean concept of righteousness.

It is generally accepted that righteousness is one of the primary soteriological terms in the Pauline writings and that this term refers solely to the gift of God for man. Indeed, this view is so well-established that it has led to the assumption that righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew must have the same function and meaning as it has in the Pauline writings. To effect such an agreement, it is argued that the Matthaean concept of righteousness not only includes the idea that righteousness is God's demand upon man but also God's gift for man.

Having reached such a conclusion, it is recognized by some

\textsuperscript{2}Righteousness, pp. 142-144.
\textsuperscript{3}TDNT, II, pp. 198-200.
\textsuperscript{4}"Der Begriff", I, p. 150.
\textsuperscript{5}"End-Expectation", p. 31.
scholars that the component parts of this double meaning are in fact in tension. In order to resolve this tension it is generally assumed that the idea of the gift is the more important component. In other words, it is concluded that the gift must precede the demand. This solution is essentially proposed by Ziesler, Schrenk, Fiedler and Kertelge. It should be noted that this solution is based on a value judgment, namely, that the gift supersedes the demand. In other words, a pseudo-problem has been given an arbitrary answer.

Stuhlmacher, on the other hand, having created the same problem as the scholars just discussed, at least treats it as a real problem. He admits that there is a theological problem with respect to Matthew's teaching about righteousness. The problem is the imbalance between the aspects of righteousness as divine gift and human action. Stuhlmacher concludes that because of this imbalance in the Matthean concept of righteousness it was impossible for Matthew unmistakably to lend expression to a sola gratia.

Is Stuhlmacher's conclusion valid? After all, if simply on the basis of an imbalance between the gift and demand aspects of

---

6 Righteousness, p. 144: "It is probably no accident that 5.6 precedes 5.20: human righteousness is inadequate, and what is needed is not only a more thoroughgoing kind, but one which comes as God's gift to those who long for it."

7 TDNT, II, p. 200.

8 "Der Begriff", I, passim.

9 'Rechtfertigung' bei Paulus, p. 47. See ch. I, sec. 1, for a discussion of Kertelge's view.

10 Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus, pp. 190f.
Righteousness, Stuhlmacher comes to the conclusion that Matthew could not lend a clear expression to a sola gratia view of salvation, how much more would this hold true if Stuhlmacher had realized that the Matthaean concept of righteousness deals solely with God's demand rather than gift?

Does this mean that the Pauline and Matthaean concepts of salvation are diametrically opposed to each other? That in effect Paul teaches justification by faith while Matthew teaches justification by man's own better righteousness? 11

No! Matthew does teach that salvation is the gift of God. It was already pointed out 12 that the verb ελέεω is used with reference to God's saving, gracious activity through the ministry of Jesus. But the clearest statement in the Gospel of Matthew to the effect that salvation is the gift of God is found in Mt 1:21. This passage, which has no synoptic parallel, states, "and you shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins."

The idea that salvation is made possible because of the gift of God through Jesus is also evident in Mt 26:28. Compared to Mk 14:24, Mt 26:28 adds the phrase 'εις δια παντας των μαθητων. Matthew thus makes it absolutely clear that the blood of the covenant which is poured out for many is indeed poured out "for the forgiveness of sins." Because of this emphasis on the salvific role of Jesus it is understandable why

---

11 Cf. Ziesler, Righteousness, p. 144, who notes that if righteousness is not both demand and gift in Matthew then this is true.

12 See ch. IV, sec 3.
Matthew, like Mark, has incorporated into his gospel the teaching that "the Son of man came ... to give his life as a ransom for many."\textsuperscript{13}

Passages such as the ones just mentioned show beyond doubt that Matthew views salvation as the gift of God. In contrast to Paul, however, who expresses this idea using the concept of righteousness, Matthew expresses this idea without reference to the concept of righteousness.

It is therefore clear that Paul and Matthew are not in conflict as to the teaching that salvation is the gift of God. The apparent conflict is artificially created when instead of comparing the Pauline and Matthaean concepts of salvation, their respective concepts of righteousness are contrasted.

As suggested previously, the interpretation of the Matthaean concept of righteousness as having the double meaning of demand and gift rested on the conscious or unconscious desire to make the Matthaean teaching concerning the nature of salvation compatible with that of Paul. It is now clear that despite their disagreement concerning the meaning of the term dikaiosynē, Paul and Matthew agree that salvation is the gift of God. Consequently, the theological reason underlying the attempt to bring the meaning of the Matthaean righteousness-terminology into agreement with that of Paul has been obviated.

Not all scholars, however, attributed a double meaning to the Matthaean understanding of righteousness. The foregoing discussion has

\textsuperscript{13} Mt 20:28 = Mk 10:45.
shown that some commentators, notably Strecker, do consistently interpret dikaiosyne as referring to the demand rather than the gift of God. What overall significance does Strecker attach to this concept in the Gospel of Matthew?

The title of Strecker's book, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, is indeed descriptive of the importance which Strecker attaches to the concept of righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew. The Gospel of Matthew shows the way of righteousness insofar as all major aspects of Matthew's theology are related to this concept. Strecker states that discipleship must be seen as the realization of the dikaiosyne-demand. Baptism is the first step which imposes the obligation upon the church (Gemeinde) to put righteousness into practice in the same way as was done by its earthly Lord. Indeed, the exalted Lord is present precisely where the demand of righteousness is proclaimed and put into practice by the post-Easter church.

Does the concept of righteousness really play such a decisive role in the Gospel of Matthew? Does the message of this gospel really concentrate on giving a detailed account of righteousness as the norm for the ethical behavior of the disciples?

No! Strecker overstates the importance of the concept of

---

15 Strecker, Weg, p. 231.
16 Ibid., p. 181.
17 Ibid., p. 213.
righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew. Other ideas such as the gift of salvation are also important. Since the Matthaean concept of righteousness does not include this teaching, it cannot be viewed as being an all-encompassing concept in the Gospel of Matthew.

That Matthew indeed does not view the concept of righteousness in this manner is especially clear when one considers his terminology designating those who are properly religious in the Christian sense. The discussion of the terms *dikaiodynē* and *dikaios* has shown that these two terms are closely related. The former refers to a type of conduct and the latter to the person who participates in that conduct. It was also noted that Matthew at no point stresses that the people who are properly religious in the Christian sense are to be known as the righteous. This negative conclusion is supported by the positive conclusion, that Matthew does have a designation for those who are properly religious in the Christian sense, namely, disciple.

It has often been argued that in the Gospel of Matthew the term disciple (*μαθητής*) is a technical term referring strictly to the twelve (οἱ δώδεκα).\(^{18}\) Sheridan deviates from this absolute interpretation. He admits that while "Matthew has restricted the usage of the term disciple exclusively to the twelve"\(^{19}\) it is nevertheless true that "the twelve can represent or be an example for the Christian community."\(^{20}\)

A thorough examination of the Gospel of Matthew reveals that

---


the term disciple is not only used to refer to the twelve but to all believers. Even Strecker, who claims that this term refers only to the twelve, acknowledges a few passages which at first appear to negate this conclusion. 21

Let us look at these passages. Strecker maintains that if Mt 8:21 is seen apart from its context then the term disciple could refer to one of the twelve. 22 Yet the fact remains, when Mt 8:21 is seen within its context, the expression ἐκπροσ ὑμῶν implies that the scribe mentioned in v. 19 is a disciple and it is unlikely that the scribe was one of the twelve. It is probable that he was a follower of Jesus, a Christian.

It should be noted that the parallel passage in Luke is not as explicit. The scribe of Mt 8:19 is simply someone (τοις) in Lk 9:57 and "another of his disciples" in Mt 8:21 is simply "another" (ἐκπροσ) in Lk 9:59. It is possible that Matthew added the term disciple to make clear that both of the people under discussion were followers of Jesus, namely Christians.

With respect to Mt 10:24f. Strecker admits that the term disciples is used in a very general sense. 23 He points out, however, that this saying is of a pre-Matthean origin (cf. Lk 6:40) and thus not relevant to the point under discussion.

Since Mt 10:24f. has a synoptic parallel in Lk 6:40, it is

---

21 Strecker, Heg. p. 191; Mt 8:21; 10:24f., 42.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.
indeed true that this saying rests on traditional materials. Yet, the fact that Mt 10:24f. presents this material in a much expanded form in comparison to Lk 6:40 may indicate that the view expressed in Mt 10:24f. is redactionally significant.

Strecker's interpretation of Mt 10:42 is even less convincing than his interpretations of 8:21 and 10:24f. Mt 10:42 and Mk 9:41 seem to originate from a single source. There is, however, one major discrepancy between these two accounts. Mk 9:41 reads, "because you bear the name of Christ" (ἐν ὑμημάτι ὑμῖν Χριστοῦ ὄνομα), while Mt 10:42 reads, "because he is a disciple" (ἐστι ὄνομα μαθητῶν). Strecker states that it cannot be substantiated that the expression ὄνομα μαθητῶν originates with the redactor. While absolute certainty can never be attained with respect to redactional activity, the most logical explanation of the textual discrepancy between Mt 10:42 and Mk 9:41 is nevertheless in terms of Matthaean redactional activity. As far as Matthew is concerned, bearing the name of Christ, i.e. being a properly religious person in the Christian sense, is best expressed by the inclusive term disciple.

24 Ibid.

25 Cf. U. Luz, "Die Jünger im Matthäusevangelium", ZNW 62 (1971), p. 145, who comments with respect to Mt 10:42: "... hier muss μαθητής eindeutig von der matthäischen Gemeinde her, also transparent verstanden werden." It should also be noted that there are a number of passages which, while not actually providing proof that the term disciple has an inclusive meaning, are best explained in terms of this meaning. E.g. Lk 24:9 states that the women "told all this to the eleven and to all the rest." Mt 28:8 simply states: "and ran to tell his disciples." It appears that the term "disciples" could refer to "the eleven and all the rest" in this case. The fact that the Gospel
The use of the verb μαθητεύω indicates that the term disciple has a very inclusive meaning. This verb occurs in Mt 13:52, 27:57 and 28:19. In Mt 28:19 Jesus is represented as saying to the eleven disciples (οι δὲ ἐν οἴκῳ μαθηταὶ, v. 16): "Go therefore and make disciples (μαθητεύσατε) of all nations". In this passage no distinction is made between the close circle of the eleven disciples and all the disciples of the future. Just as Jesus made disciples, so the disciples themselves are to make disciples. In other words, the followers of Jesus, present and future, are known as disciples.

In order to adhere to the view that the term disciples refers only to the Twelve, Strecker and Albright/Mann resort to some very curious explanations. Strecker admits that there is no difference between the noun μαθητής and the verb μαθητεύω as far as meaning is concerned. There is, however, a distinction as far as use is of Matthew does not contain the tradition found in Mk 5:18f. is also noteworthy. Cf. G. Barth, "Law", pp. 99f.; "In Mark not all who believe on Jesus enter into discipleship. The wish of the possessed man who was healed (Mark 5.18f.) to enter into discipleship is turned down. Matthew omits these verses."


H. Kasting, Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission (BENV Th 55; München, 1969), p. 36, notes that the emphasis in vv. 19-20 is on μαθητεύσατε.


C. Rogers, "The Great Commission", BibSac 130 (1973), p. 263, explains that the verb means "to practice the duties of a μαθητής that is, to be a disciple". The verb can also have a "causative meaning, 'to make a disciple'".
concerned. The verb is never used with reference to the Twelve, thus showing that the noun is reserved to designate them. 30

Strecker's conclusion is unwarranted, for Mt 13:52 shows that the verb is in fact used to designate the narrow circle of the Twelve. Albright/Mann interpret this passage as follows: "The verbal form of Matt xiii 52, bearing in mind its context, might very properly be translated by a phrase which gave the narrower meaning of 'disciple': 'the scribe who has been made a disciple of the kingdom . . . '." 31 With respect to Mt 27:57 and 28:19, on the other hand, Albright/Mann note that the use of the verbal form may indicate a wider use of the noun disciple. However, they favour the possibility "that the evangelist here used the verb form precisely in order to avoid a noun which for him had specialized meanings." 32 They therefore suggest the translation "a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who had been taught by Jesus" 33 for Mt 27:57 and "teach all nations" 34 for Mt 28:19.

Having suggested such a translation in the "Introduction" of their book, Albright/Mann then promptly go ahead and give a different translation in the main part of their book. For the actual translation of Mt 28:19f. they give, "Therefore go and make disciples of all

---

30 Strecker, Weg, p. 192.
31 Albright/Mann, Matthew, p. LXXVII. Cf. Allen, Matthew, pp. 154f.
32 Albright/Mann, Matthew, p. LXXVII.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
peoples ... teaching them to observe ... .”  

What underlies this change of view? The reason is obvious. When v. 19 is translated by itself, the translation of μαθητεύειτε as "teach all nations" seems appropriate. Yet, when v. 19 is seen in conjunction with the verb διδάσκοντες in v. 20, this translation is not possible. After all it would be strange indeed if both the verbs μαθητεύω and διδάσκω would be treated as meaning "to teach".

These attempts to discover distinctions in the meaning and/or use of the noun and the verb are indeed problematic. The facts are best explained if the noun and verb are viewed as referring to a single concept. Just as in some cases the noun is definitely used to refer to the disciples in a very inclusive sense, so the verb shows that disciples are people in general who have accepted (Mt 13:52, 27:57) or will accept (Mt 28:19) the teaching of Jesus.  

With the understanding that the term disciple refers to those who are properly religious in the Christian sense, let us now specifically see how this term relates to the term δικαίος. As was noted above, Matthew does not suggest that the followers of Jesus are to be known as the righteous. It will now be shown that Matthew indicates that in some contexts the use of this term is indeed inappropriate. This fact is expressed most clearly in Mt 18:13 and 27:57.

---


36 Cf. Luz, "Die Jünger im Matthäusevangelium", p. 158: "Vielmehr dient das Verb μαθητεύω gerade dazu, Jüngerschaft für die Gegenwart des Evangelisten transparent zu machen."
In the parable of "The Lost Sheep", Lk 15:7 states that "there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons (δικαίος) who need no repentance." Mt 18:13, on the other hand, reads, "he rejoices over it more than the ninety-nine that never went astray." Jeremias has pointed out that this parable has an entirely different audience in Luke and in Matthew. In Luke it is addressed to Jesus' opponents while in Matthew it is directed to his disciples. Jeremias states that there can be no doubt that Luke has preserved the original situation.

Why does Luke refer to the righteous while Matthew does not? The answer is obvious. In dialogue with Jesus' opponents the term dikaios is appropriate. In a discussion with the disciples, that is, within the context of those who are properly religious in the Christian sense, the term dikaios, which primarily refers to those who are properly religious in a Jewish sense, has no place.

In the pericope of the burial of Jesus, Lk 23:50 states that "Joseph from the Jewish town of Arimathea was a "righteous man" (δικαίος). Mt 27:57, on the other hand, states that he was a disciple (ἐκαθαρτησόμενος). It is probable that in order to show that Joseph of Arimathea was properly religious in a Christian sense, Matthew could


38 Ibid., p. 40. Jeremias points out that the Johannine Shepherd parable is also addressed to opponents; John 10:6, cf. 9:40, 10:19ff. (Ibid., p. 40, n. 65).

39 Mk 15:43; "a respected member of the council".
not refer to him as being righteous but rather as being a disciple.

There is no doubt that these factors indicate that Matthew's religious self-understanding was not in terms of being righteous but in terms of being a disciple. It now remains to be seen whether the idea that a disciple has righteousness is important for Matthew. In other words, is the saying in Mt 5:20, that the righteousness of the disciples must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, representative of Matthew's view of what it means to be a disciple?

It has been shown that although the Matthaean concept of righteousness does not include the idea that righteousness is the gift of God, this does not mean that Matthew teaches that salvation is a human achievement. On the contrary, the Matthaean teaching that Jesus came to save sinners and that consequently salvation is the gift of God is unequivocably stated.

That the disciples are saved sinners is also clear. Barth has pointed out that Mt 18 shows that disciples are not those who rely upon their works but those who are empty before God and thus cleave to his grace. The parable of "The Lost Sheep" especially shows that "The disciples are thus the weak and lowly, helpless as regards their own salvation."41

Since the concept of righteousness does not deal with salvation, it is clear that it does not express Matthew's entire view of discipleship. The question under discussion must therefore be limited to the

40 G. Barth, "Law", p. 121.

41 Ibid., p. 122.
conduct of the disciples. In other words, is dikaiosyne the key term
designating the conduct expected of disciples?

This question is answered positively by Strecker,42 Bornkamm43
and Ziesler.44 It is undoubtedly true that Matthew places great stress
on the importance of proper conduct. For example, Matthew emphasizes
the bearing of fruit45 and draws attention to the fact that the final
judgment will involve the criterion of works.46 Yet is dikaiosyne
the term Matthew prefers above all others to designate such proper
conduct?

If one simply looks at the Sermon on the Mount, then the above
question could be answered positively. When one looks at the whole
gospel, then one is forced to answer it negatively.

Let us look at Mt 28:19-20. It has been argued that Mt 28:18-20
provides the key to the understanding of the whole gospel.47 Whether
or not this conclusion is entirely true is debatable. On the other
hand, it cannot be denied that the hand of the redactor is clearly

42 Weg, p. 179.
43 "End-Expectation", p. 130.
44 Righteousness, p. 134.
45 See especially Mt 7:15-16, 21:43.
46 Mt 16:27; G. Barth, "Law", p. 95; "Matthew has expanded
Mark 8.38b to the description of the judgment, in which the Son of man
will reward everyone according to his πρὸς τὸν κόσμον μου."
47 Thus O. Michel, "Der Abschluss des Mattheseluaeangeliums",
visible in Mt 28:16-20. 48

In this very important passage at the end of the Gospel of Matthew, the theme of proper conduct is stressed. Mt 28:20 states that the disciples should teach the future disciples of all nations "to observe all" that Jesus has commanded. The righteousness-terminology is not used in this important proclamation.

Neither is the righteousness-terminology used in Mt 12:46-50, a passage which points to the essence of what it means to be a disciple. Barth has interpreted this passage with great clarity.

To be a disciple means for Matthew doing the will of God.

This is shown especially by the alteration he has made to the apothegm about true kinsmen (Mark 3:31-35 = Matt. 12:46-50). In Mark, Jesus looks round about upon the ἤχλος and says: whosoever does the will of God is my brother ... In Matthew Jesus stretched forth his hand towards his disciples: They are my brethren, for whosoever does the will of God ... The differentiation from the multitude is clear: the will of God is actually done in discipleship. 49

Barth is right in his conclusion that in Mt 12:46-50 (Mk 3:31-35) to be a disciple means to do the will of God. It should be noted

48 J. D. Kingsbury, "The Composition and Christology of Matt 28:16-20", JBL 93 (1974), p. 573, and Kilpatrick, Matthew, p. 49, have presented a good case for the view that vv. 16-20 are completely redactional. Others, e.g. G. Barth, "Law", p. 131; Kasting, Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission, pp. 37ff., have argued that although redactional activity is prominent, these verses are based on traditional materials.

49 G. Barth, "Law", p. 102, n. 1.
that Mk 3:35 is the only passage in the Gospel of Mark which refers to the will of God. Also in the Gospel of Luke there is only one reference to the will of God. This reference is found in Lk 22:42 where Jesus in his prayer in Gethsemane is portrayed as saying "not my will, but thine, be done." This saying is reflected in Mt 26:42.

The Gospels of Mark and Luke thus each have only a single reference to the will of God. Matthew, on the other hand, not only parallels the sayings of Mark and Luke but has three additional references in Mt 6:10, 7:21 and 18:14.

In Mt 6:10 Jesus tells the disciples that they should pray to their Father: "Thy will be done". In Mt 18:14, in the parable of "The Lost Sheep", an example of the will of God is given; "So it is not the will of my Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." In Mt 7:21 Jesus is reported as having said that only "he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven" will enter the kingdom of heaven.

These examples indicate that of the Synoptic writers, it is Matthew who puts the greatest emphasis on the doing of God's will. Indeed it must be concluded that for Matthew the essence of discipleship is the doing of the will of God.

50 The noun θέλημα is also found in Lk 12:47 (twice) and 23:25 but not used with direct reference to God.

51 In addition to these five references the noun θέλημα occurs in Mt 21:31, but in this case it is not used with direct reference to God.

What is the relationship between God's will and righteousness? In the discussion of the dikaiosyne-passages it was noted that righteousness referred to the demand of God upon man to live according to the law. In some instances conduct according to the law was essentially seen as conduct according to the will of God. Does this mean that righteousness and doing the will of God are parallel concepts? Is Hare right in stating that "For Matthew ὁ λαος is the abstract noun which corresponds to the phrase ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατέρας"?\(^{53}\)

In one sense Hare is right; in another sense he is wrong. Righteousness and doing the will of the Father, though not identical in meaning, are related in meaning. They are not, however, related in use. Matthew's religious self-understanding as a member of the church\(^{54}\) is that of a disciple doing the will of the Father and not that of a righteous person doing righteousness. As will be shown below, the latter terminology is reserved for contexts in which Jesus deals with non-disciples and/or polemical situations.

It has been pointed out that in the Gospel of Matthew the term dikaiosyne occurs only in actual sayings of Jesus.\(^{55}\) What has not been observed, is that these sayings are not primarily directed to those who are properly religious in a Christian sense, namely the disciples, but to others.

In Mt 3:15 and 21:32 the term dikaiosyne occurs in the context

---

\(^{53}\) Hare, Jewish Persecution of Christians, p. 131, n. 1.

\(^{54}\) Mt 16:18, 18:17; ἐκκλησία.

\(^{55}\) Fiedler, "Der Begriff", I, pp. 96f.
of the discussions with and about John the Baptist. John the Baptist is not treated as a disciple.

The other dikaiosyne-passages, i.e. Mt 5:6, 10, 20; 6:1, 33, all occur in the Sermon on the Mount which is directed not only to the disciples but to the crowds in general. The nature of the audience is clearly described at the end of the Sermon on the Mount. Mt 7:28 states: "And when Jesus finished these sayings, the crowds were astonished at his teaching".

It is thus evident that all seven references to dikaiosyne occur in sayings of Jesus and that these sayings are directed not primarily to disciples but to the hearers of Jesus in general. In addition to these two observations it should be noted that in three instances a particular segment of the audience is brought into focus.

In Mt 5:20 it is said that the righteousness of the disciples must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees. The warning in Mt 6:1 that one should not practice one's righteousness before men is given with reference to the conduct of the hypocrites (Mt 6:2, 5, 16). From Mt 23:13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29 we know that Matthew identifies the hypocrites with the scribes and Pharisees.

Jesus' saying about the way of righteousness in Mt 21:32 is directed to "the chief priests and the Pharisees" (21:45). It is specifically stated that the chief priests and Pharisees perceived that

56 See ch. VI for a discussion of the fact that Mt 5:20, 6:1 and 21:32 do not deal with Christian righteousness per se. In these cases righteousness is a provisional concept employed solely as a vehicle by which the teaching of Jesus could be explained to non-disciples.
Jesus was speaking about them in the parables found in Mt 21:28-43.

As far as Matthew is concerned, dikaiosyne appears to be a crucial term in the polemical dialogues between Jesus and the contemporary religious leaders of the Jews, notably the Pharisees. The expression, the will of God, on the other hand, is used in contexts dealing primarily with those who are religious in a Christian sense.

The saying in Mt 12:50, "For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother, and sister, and mother", is directed specifically to the disciples (12:49). The reference in the Lord's Prayer (6:10) is also directed to the disciples, since this is to be the prayer of the followers of Jesus. The expression "Thy will be done" not only occurs in the Lord's Prayer but also in the prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane (26:42).

Jeremias has pointed out that the parable of "The Lost Sheep" has an entirely different audience in Matthew and in Luke. In Luke it is addressed to Jesus' opponents while in Matthew to his disciples. Consequently, here too the reference to the will of God (18:14) is made within the context of those who are properly religious in a Christian sense.

The reference to the will of God in Mt 7:21 illustrates the distinction between the use of this expression and dikaiosyne even more clearly than the passages just discussed. The distinction is especially evident when Mt 7:21 is contrasted with 5:20. Mt 5:20 deals with a polemical situation. Jesus contrasts the disciples with the scribes.

---

57 J. Jeremias, Parables, p. 39.
and Pharisees. In this polemical context righteousness is seen as the criterion for entrance into the kingdom of heaven. In Mt 7:21, on the other hand, the immediate context does not refer to the religious leaders of the Jews. In this context doing "the will of my Father who is in heaven" is seen as the criterion for entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

It is therefore evident that Matthew applies the expressions, righteousness and doing the will of God to distinctly different contexts. Not only a difference in usage but also in meaning exists between these two expressions. They are only related in meaning, not identical in meaning. The concept of righteousness refers exclusively to the demand of God upon man. It does not deal with the concept of salvation. The expression the will of God, on the other hand, is not only used to refer to the demand of God upon man but also to the gift of God for man. The latter use is evident in Mt 18:14 where it is stated that "it is not the will of my Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish."

Now we are ready to answer the question posed at the beginning of this chapter: What significance is attached to the use of the concept of righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew?

It is clear that the concept of righteousness does not play a major role in the Gospel of Matthew. In contexts which are specifically addressed to those who are properly religious in a Christian sense, that is, to those who are members of the church, this concept is not used. The concept of righteousness does not pervade Matthaean theology. For example, it plays no crucial role in the Matthaean view of the nature
of salvation.

It thus appears that Matthew's religious self-understanding is that of a disciple doing the will of God as distinct from that of a righteous person doing righteousness.
CHAPTER VI

THE PROVISIONAL FUNCTION OF THE MATTHAEAN

CONCEPT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

In the previous chapter it was shown that the concept of righteousness does not play a crucial role in Matthew's self-understanding as a follower of Jesus. While the Gospel of Matthew clearly indicates that salvation is the gift of God, righteousness is seen only as the demand of God-made upon man. Those who are properly religious in a Christian sense are not the righteous. They are disciples. The essence of discipleship is not expressed as righteousness but as doing the will of God.

Having seen the limitations of the use of the concept of righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew, let us now consider the positive side of its use more closely. Why in fact does Matthew make use of the concept of righteousness in his gospel?

It is the conclusion of this study that the concept of righteousness is used in the Gospel of Matthew to provide a point of contact between the religious understanding of first-century Palestinian Jews and the teaching of Jesus as Matthew understood it. In other words, the concept of righteousness is used as a teaching principle leading from the known (contemporary Jewish teaching) to the unknown (the teaching of Jesus).

The concept of righteousness thus is cast into the role of a
provisional concept. As a provisional concept it can only facilitate in bridging a gap of understanding. It is the nature of such a provisional concept that it can never fully express the view to which it points. Consequently, once the way to the new understanding has been shown, the provisional concept is discarded.

Such a process indeed occurs in the Gospel of Matthew. In the previous chapter it was shown that all seven dikaiosynē-passage in that gospel are directed to the hearers of Jesus in general rather than to those who were properly religious in a Christian sense. Also, in three of the passages, i.e. Mt 5:20, 6:1 and 21:32, it is clearly shown that the term dikaiosynē plays a crucial role in the polemical dialogue between Jesus and the contemporary religious leaders of the Jews, notably the Pharisees.

In addition to these observations the appropriateness of the use of the concept of righteousness with respect to John the Baptist should be noted. In Mt 3:15 and 21:32 the term dikaiosynē occurs in the context of discussions with and about John the Baptist respectively. On the basis of Mt 3:3 and 11 it is clear that John the Baptist is cast into the role of a transitional figure. His function is not to proclaim the entire message of Jesus but only to prepare his way. It is only logical that a provisional concept such as the concept of righteousness be used in the description of such a transitional figure as John the Baptist.

The passage which most clearly denotes the provisional nature of the concept of righteousness is Mt 5:20. It should not be surprising that this passage plays such a role, for the redaction-critical
analysis of the seven dikaiosyne-passages indicated that Mt 5:20 is one of two passages in which Matthew appears to have had the greatest amount of freedom in the use of the term dikaiosyne.¹

In Mt 5:20 it is implied that both the scribes/Pharisees and the disciples have righteousness. However, the inadequacy of this concept to denote the essence of Jesus' teaching is obvious, for the use of dikaiosyne is qualified by the stipulation that the righteousness of the disciples must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees.

The inadequacy of the concept of righteousness to designate the criterion for entrance into the kingdom of heaven (Mt 5:20) is also shown in the ensuing discussion. The climax of the train of thought begun in 5:20 is found in 5:48.² In this verse the righteousness-terminology is abandoned in favour of the conception of perfection. "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."

Mt 6:33 was also shown to be an integral part of the structure which included Mt 5:20 and 48. In this passage the term dikaiosyne is again qualified, the tacit assumption being that this term by itself did not carry the meaning that needed to be expressed. The righteousness that was to exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees now becomes the righteousness of God.

It is only in Mt 7:21, a passage which in contrast to Mt 5:20 is not found in a direct polemical setting involving the scribes and Pharisees, that the transition from the provisional to an absolute

¹See ch. IV, sec. 2.

²For the discussion of the structure of Mt 5 see ch. IV, sec. 2.
concept occurs. While in 5:20 the greater righteousness was the criterion for entrance into the kingdom of heaven, in 7:21 doing the will of God is seen as the criterion.

It is clear that the concept of righteousness by itself was inadequate to express the essence of the teaching of Jesus. This concept was employed solely to provide a vehicle by which the teaching of Jesus could be explained.

Since Matthew uses the concept of righteousness to establish a point of contact between the teaching of Jesus and contemporary religious understanding, it is to be taken for granted that he thought that this concept was suitable for such a task. It now remains to be seen whether this claim can be substantiated on the basis of external evidence. Does Matthew, in fact, use the concept of righteousness in a manner that could be understood by his contemporaries?

If this question has to be answered negatively, then the thesis of the present study could be called into question. If, on the other hand, the evidence points to a positive answer, then the proposed thesis will in fact be substantiated.

In the course of this study a number of similarities between the meaning of the righteousness-terminology in the Gospel of Matthew as compared to that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Tannaitic literature were noted. This was done primarily to show that certain interpretations were indeed plausible.

At this point it would not serve a useful purpose to list the numerous parallels to which attention has not been drawn. Although such a study may be interesting for its own sake, and on the basis of
the facts supplied in chapters II and III could readily be undertaken, it would not contribute to a decisive answer to the question at hand: Does Matthew use the concept of righteousness in a manner that could be understood by his contemporaries?

This question cannot be answered by listing specific similarities. Although there indeed are numerous similarities between the use of the righteousness-terminology of the Gospel of Matthew and the Dead Sea Scrolls and Tannaitic literature, it could be the case that the differences are so great as to render the similarities meaningless. The question at hand can only be answered on the basis of a comparison of general trends.

Let us therefore look at the terms eleemosyne, dikaios and dikaiosyne using the methodology outlined above. In the Gospel of Matthew the term eleemosyne consistently refers to almsgiving. Almsgiving in turn is viewed as one aspect of the doing of righteousness (dikaiosyne).

As was shown above, in the Tannaitic literature the primary meaning of ṭseḏaqah is almsgiving. Whereas in Matthew the term eleemosyne only has one distinct meaning, in the Tannaitic literature the term ṭseḏaqah has a number of meanings. This should not be surprising since, compared to the Gospel of Matthew, the Tannaitic literature is a very heterogeneous body of literature. Nevertheless, the primary meaning of ṭseḏaqah was without doubt that of almsgiving. As in the Gospel of Matthew, in the Tannaitic literature almsgiving was also considered to be one among various aspects of the doing of righteousness (ṭseḏeq). Matthaean usage of the term eleemosyne obviously corresponds
directly to the Tannaitic idea of almsgiving.

The fact that there is no definite proof that the term tsedeqah refers to almsgiving in the Dead Sea Scrolls does not cast doubt on the foregoing conclusion. The parallel between the Gospel of Matthew and the Tannaitic literature is so clear that it cannot be discounted by any argument based on omission. The Matthaean usage of the term eleemosyne can readily be understood in terms of the Tannaitic usage.

It was noted above that the most obvious conclusion emerging out of the study of the concept of righteousness in the Tannaitic literature was that the term righteous (tsaddiq) played an essential role in the definition of those who are properly religious. By far the primary term for those who were said to be properly religious was righteous (tsaddiq). It should be noted further that to be righteous, to be properly religious, meant to practise the law.

Of the Dead Sea Scrolls especially the Damascus Document (CD) uses the adjective tsaddiq as the primary designation for those who are properly religious. As in the Tannaitic literature the criterion is also observance of the law. In CD, however, the law is not defined as the Mosaic law but as the law of the New Covenant which was made in the Land of Damascus. Nevertheless, in CD as in the Tannaitic literature, the righteous are the properly religious as seen in terms of proper observance of a norm, namely a specific law.

This usage corresponds directly with the way the adjective

---

3It was suggested above that in 1Q5 5:4 and 8:2, and possibly even in 1:5, the term tsedeqah may refer to almsgiving. But there is no definite proof that this is the case.
dikaios is used in the Gospel of Matthew. As was demonstrated above, Matthew uses this term as the primary designation for those who are considered properly religious in a Jewish sense, namely those who live according to contemporary religious standards which are based on contemporary interpretation of the law. There is no doubt that the meaning which Matthew attaches to the term dikaios could readily be understood in terms of the usage attached to the term tsaddiq in the Tannaitic literature and CD.

It has been claimed that while the plural tsaddiqim is used in the Rabbinic literature to refer to the righteous of the past, present and future, the singular tsaddiq is applied directly only to the people of the remote past. Generally it is assumed that no specific people are called righteous after Simeon the Righteous.

As was shown in the discussion of the Tannaitic literature, this assumption is not valid. In Mek Nezikin 18 on Ex 22:22 (III, p. 142; p. 313) R. Simeon and R. Ishmael are said to be tsaddiq and in Sifra Emor parasha 1.14 on Lev 21:3 the same is said about Joseph b. Paksas. While it is true that in these cases this is done by way of biblical quotation, it is nevertheless done. Consequently, not even the Matthaean usage of calling Joseph (Mt 1:19) and Jesus (27:19) dikaios is in conflict with Tannaitic usage.

Both in the Tannaitic literature and in the Dead Sea Scrolls the term tsadeq primarily refers to man's conduct which is to be in accordance with the demands of the law. This use is in direct agreement with the way the term dikaiosyne is used in the Gospel of Matthew.
Although the primary meaning of *tsedeq* undoubtedly is as defined above, this term does have some secondary meanings. In the Tannaitic literature, for example, *tsedeq* can refer to justice and truth. These meanings in fact bear a close relationship to the primary meaning.

In two cases in the Tannaitic literature and in three cases in the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, the term *tsedeq* refers to God's saving gracious activity, a meaning generally reserved for the term *tedeqah*. In the Gospel of Matthew, on the other hand, the term *dikaiosyne* never refers to God's saving, gracious activity.

Although these exceptions should not be overlooked, neither should their significance be blown out of proportion. As pointed out earlier, the Tannaitic literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls represent a very unhomogeneous type of literature. Consequently, minor variations in usage should be expected.

It is significant that despite the general lack of homogeneity, it is nevertheless possible to isolate a primary meaning of *tsedeq*. *Tsedeq* refers to man's conduct which is to be in accordance with the demands of the law. Also, in *CD*, a writing which places great emphasis on the use of the concept of righteousness, the term *tsedeq* occurs 12 times and in each case refers to the norm for man's conduct, never to God's saving, gracious activity. It is this primary meaning of *tsedeq* which is reflected in the Matthaean use of the term *dikaiosyne*. There

---

4 Sifre Deut 144 on 16:20 (pp. 199f.); Sifra Ḥobah parasha 12:12 on Lev 5:17.

5 1QS 10:11, 1QH 11:18, 1QM 18:8 and possibly also in 1QS 10:26, 11:15 and 1QM 4:6.
is no doubt that this term could not readily be understood in terms of
the use of the term ṭaḏeq in the Tannaitic Literature and the Dead Sea
Scrolls.

As was demonstrated, Matthew uses the concept of righteousness
in a way that could be understood by his contemporaries. Its use as a
provisional concept to facilitate the bridging of a gap of understanding
is justified.

On the other hand, were Matthew’s contemporaries prepared for
the shift from the righteous/rightness-terminology to that of
disciple/will of God? While the Tannaitic literature and the Dead Sea
Scrolls generally reflect the view that the properly religious are to be
referred to as the righteous and that the righteous are characterized
by doing righteousness, there is one important exception to this
general view. In the Manual of Discipline (1QS), the term ṭsaddiq is
not found and the term ṭaḏeq is placed in a subordinate position
relative to the term ṭemēt. In 1QS those who are properly religious
are referred to primarily as the sons of truth or light. They are
distinguished by the fact that their conduct corresponds to the truth
(ṭemēt). Hence, not only the meaning of the Matthaean concept of
rightness but even the shift to another concept is paralleled in
the background literature.

Thus, to view the Matthaean concept of righteousness from the
Pauline perspective is completely to misunderstand Matthew’s intention
in the use of this concept. The Matthaean concept of righteousness, in
contrast to the Pauline one, is not a primary Christian theological
concept. The Matthaean concept of righteousness is essentially a
Jewish concept, used in a provisional way to provide a point of contact between contemporary Jewish religious understanding and the teaching of Jesus as Matthew understood it.
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