

FV3P 12/27/29
Simmons Fd.

ST. PAUL IN JEWISH THOUGHT

Three Lectures

BY

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

•••••

LONDON:

DIOCESAN HOUSE, 33, BEDFORD SQUARE, W.C.1.

1928.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Love and the Messianic Age.

Midrash Sifre on the Book of Numbers.

Die religiöse Denkweise der Chassidim (the Teaching of Jewish Mysticism).

A Hebrew-Christian Liturgy (*in Hebrew and English*).

In Hebrew :

Israel's Religion and Destiny.

The Life of Jesus Christ.

The Life of St. Paul.

The Confessions of St. Augustine.

ROBERTS LIBRARY
Southwestern Baptist Seminary

PREFATORY NOTE

The following lectures were delivered to a mixed audience of Jews and Christians at the Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, in September, 1927. It is thought that they may be of interest to a wider circle. They do not, of course, claim to cover the whole field of Jewish thought on St. Paul, and I would ask my readers to judge this little book by what it contains rather than by what it omits.

It is for the fourth time that the Lord Bishop of London kindly appointed me Boys Lecturer. For this favour I wish to express my sincere thanks. I am also indebted to the Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields for granting me the use of his church, and to the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Editor of *Theology*, for his permission to re-issue the lecture on "St. Paul among the Jews," which first appeared in that magazine.

HOLY TRINITY CHURCH,
OLD NICHOL STREET,
SHOREDITCH.

Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1928.

ST. PAUL IN JEWISH THOUGHT

i.—St. Paul and his Jewish contemporaries

He who is in Christ is, according to St. Paul, a new creature (2 Corinthians v. 17). In all his letters he, as a Christian, and an Apostle called by Jesus Christ, speaks openly and clearly to his brethren, his fellow-believers in Christ, of this new and inner life which is gained *through* Christ and *in* Him. "The old things are passed away; behold, they are become new." He differentiates in himself as well as in other Christians between "once" and "now." The old things that, to the Apostle, had passed away, were not anything external, not, for instance, the Jewish national way of life according to the traditionally interpreted Law of Moses. For, even as a herald of the Gospel he claims to have become "to the Jews a Jew in order to gain them." But to St. Paul his former life as a Jew was a life lived to himself, which life expressed itself sometimes as a life *after* or *in* the flesh (Romans vii. 5, viii. 13, 2 Corinthians i. 17), and sometimes in a more refined fashion, as an attempt to establish his own righteousness, in which St. Paul excelled many of his contemporaries (Galatians i. 4). In this disposition which, before Christ called him to be His servant (1 Timothy i. 6), led him to be a blasphemer, a persecutor, an oppressor of the Church of the Lord, and not in external things, does St. Paul see the "old things" that have passed away. Through the event that took place on the way to Damascus Paul beheld the Crucified One sitting at the right hand of the Father as Judge of the living and the dead (Acts ix. 3, Galatians vi. 15, 1 Corinthians ix. 1), as well as his own guilt (Acts xxii. 7, 26, xiii. 14, Romans vii. 22, 24), but through it also he realised the quickening grace of God through Jesus Christ (Galatians i. 16, Romans vii. 25), which brought him to a new life (Romans vi. 12, Galatians ii. 20). Thus, his "old man" was crucified in order that he might not any longer serve sin (Romans vi. 6), and a "new man" arose in him, created after God's fashion, living to God in Christ. This was not a magic change but a spiritual transformation, of which the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans bears witness.

But in many modern presentations of the life and teaching of the Apostle, when it comes to the delineation of the concrete historical figure of the old and the new Paul, the *Jew* and the *Christian* are so intermingled as to be practically one. The

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ST. PAUL AND HIS JEWISH CONTEMPORARIES-	5
CLAUDE MONTEFIORE'S CRITICISM AND APPRECIATION OF ST. PAUL	14
A JEWISH DRAMATIST'S PRESENTATION OF ST. PAUL . .	27
APPENDIX: A RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHER ON JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY	48

"Septuagint" Jew Saul is potentially already a New Testament saint, and Paul the Christian is merely a Septuagint devotee who turned mystic through his "Christ-contemplation."

But on approaching these figures they unmask themselves, both from the point of view of religious history, as well as of psychology, as impossible fictions. It is quite wrong to speak of a Septuagint Bible, of Septuagint Jews, and of Septuagint piety, as if the Greek Old Testament formed a unity. Even in its origin and language it cannot be considered as such. One has only to compare the language of the Greek Pentateuch with the Greek Minor Prophets and the Wisdom of Solomon in order to recognise at once that, notwithstanding the same basic root, there are great linguistic differences. Although to the Hellenistic Jews of the last century B.C. the Septuagint appeared to be a uniform work, and, although in the colouring of some phrases, especially in the later books like Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, the Third book of the Maccabees, and especially in the Wisdom of Solomon, Hellenic thought is occasionally reflected, we cannot construct from this a religion of the Septuagint, and so consider the Hellenistic Jews, to whom the Septuagint was holy Scripture, as Jews whose religion was different from that of their Palestinian brethren. And even if it could be shown that many of the Diaspora Jews were, from the strict Palestinian point of view, more liberal, the Jew Paul was certainly not that. He himself emphasises again and again in his letters (2 Corinthians xi. 22, Philippians iii. 4, 5), as well as in speeches (Acts xxii. 3, xxvi. 4, 5), that he was a genuine Israelite, from the tribe of Benjamin, a Pharisee of the Pharisees, educated at the feet of Rabbi Gamaliel. Thus, Saul of Tarsus was not a Diaspora Jew and, accordingly, not a Septuagint Jew, if there were any such. In quoting from the Old Testament he does not copy the Septuagint verbatim, but often changes it according to the Hebrew original. But, as Paul in his work in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, could use only the Greek Old Testament, it is no wonder that he took over the religious and ethical general contents of it into his vocabulary, but at the same time it is a fact that the Apostle has imbued this vocabulary with the new spirit of his Gospel. Hence this so-called Septuagint-religion of Paul is, both in its general pre-supposition of a religion of the Septuagint, as well as in relation to the Apostle's upbringing, an historic fiction.

But let us see what his Jewish enemies thought of Him.

The sayings scattered in Rabbinic literature concerning our Lord and Jewish Christians (the Minim) have often been collected (cf. Herford, "Jesus Christ in the Talmud"; Dalman-Laible,

"Jesus Christus im Talmud"; H. Strack, "Jesus, die Heretiker und die Christen"; Levertoff, "Die rel. Denkweise"; Klausner, "The Life of Jesus of Nazareth"). It is not much, yet what there is confirms the Gospel presentation of the motives and methods of the Jewish opponents of our Lord and His disciples. On the other hand, it is strange that there seem to be no references at all to St. Paul and his activity in any of the Jewish contemporary sources. How is it to be explained that Rabbinic Judaism is silent concerning its greatest heretic? Surely his theology must have awakened the opposition not only of the Judaistic Christians, but even more that of the Rabbis. The book of Acts portrays clearly how his arrival in Jerusalem led at once to conflicts; how his presence called forth intensely the hatred of pious Jews, and how passionately they fought against him. It is difficult to believe that all this opposition should have remained unrecorded in Rabbinic and other Jewish sources.

It could be said that the Rabbis consciously endeavoured to blot out his name from the memory of the people. But this was not the usual method of the Rabbis. Rabbi Elisha Ben Abuya, for instance (the contemporary of Rabbi Akiba, and the teacher of Rabbi Meir) assisted the Romans in the Hadrianic persecution of the Jews in the thirties of the second century. This apostate the Rabbis called "Acher" ("another one"), to designate his apostasy. Yet, many anecdotes are related in the Talmud concerning him. On the other hand, the following fact could be taken into consideration. The Rabbinic piety and learning with which the Talmud deals, had their centre in Palestine and in Babylon, and therefore Rabbinic literature is concerned with problems connected with these countries. But St. Paul's activity was centred in countries outside Palestine, and among heathen surroundings; the Jewish communities, with which he came into conflict were communities of the wider Diaspora (the visit to Jerusalem which eventually led to his imprisonment was merely an episode lasting a few days) and it is quite possible that the Palestinian Rabbis had no immediate occasion to refer to him.

But this would only explain the reason why St. Paul does not play any considerable rôle in the Talmud: although a disciple of the Rabbis, he was more remote from the sphere of interests of his old teachers than our Lord and the Jewish Christians were, who lived and worked directly under the eyes of the Rabbis. Yet it does not explain the absolute silence concerning his activity. Acts xxi. seq. is very instructive in this connection. It shows how even a short stay of the Apostle in Jerusalem led to

great excitement; especially "the Jews from Asia, when they saw him in the Temple, stirred up all the multitude" (Acts xxi. 27). The Palestinian Rabbis must have known a great deal about his activity in the Diaspora.

While Christian scholars have not yet even considered whether there be any references to St. Paul in the Talmud, we have a few contributions towards this problem from one or two Jewish scholars. They deal chiefly with a passage in Pirke Aboth (iii. 11). In the year 1849 Rabbi Jellinek published a short note in the Jewish paper "Der Orient" (x. p. 413), under the title "A contribution to the history of Jewish polemics against Christianity;" and in 1898 Dr. J. Guttman wrote in the "Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums" (xlii. p. 403 seq.) an article "concerning two dogmatic passages in the Mishna." The latter attempts to explain the passage as a polemic against later Jewish Christianity, whilst Jellinek finds in it a reference to St. Paul. But neither examined the parallel sources critically. In preparing my translation of Midrash Sifre I had occasion to examine the passages anew, and have come to the conclusion that we have here a direct polemic against St. Paul (Prof. G. Kittel came independently to the same conclusion, cf. Rabbinica: "Paulus im Talmud").

Let us examine the passage as it appears in Sifre: "Rabbi Eleazer of Modiim says: 'He who desecrates the holies (Qodashim); he who despises the festivals; he who dissolves the covenant of our father Abraham; and he who speaks haughtily against the Law: although he has a knowledge of the Torah, and has good works, has no part in the world to come.'"

Rabbi Eleazer of Modiim, in whose name this saying is preserved in all the sources (with one exception) was the uncle of Barkochba. He died about the end of the Hadrianic war. It is certain that in the period between 90 and 110 he played a considerable rôle in Rabbinic circles (cf. Baba B. x.; Chullin 92a). The latter passage is introduced with the following words: "Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai spake to his disciples: 'my sons . . .'" and among the answers we find one from Rabban Gamaliel, who, again, refers to this Eleazer of Modiim. He was thus a contemporary of the Apostle. As Jochanan's chief activity falls in the time immediately after the destruction of the Temple (M. R. Ha-Shana iv. 134), the saying might have been uttered about thirty years after the tumult caused by St. Paul's presence in Jerusalem. Moreover, as is often the case with Rabbinic sayings, an early tradition, when it happens to be quoted by a later Rabbi, is ascribed to him.

Further, we must, with Kittel, keep in mind the following.

The passage refers to persons who, because of certain transgressions, are considered to be outside the pale of Judaism. But why just these transgressions? We would rather expect to find sins such as are usually regarded as very grave, and for which there is no forgiveness: deadly sins, like idolatry, murder, incest (cf. Tos. Pea i. 2). We find instead a few grave transgressions mentioned, together with such as are not exceptionally serious. There can be only one explanation, namely, that it is not intended as a theoretical statement, but refers to a concrete historic case. It contains a polemic against a certain person, obviously a Jew, even a law-observing Jew. We naturally think of that man who testified of himself that he "advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of his own age among his countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of his fathers." (Galatians i. 14).

Let us analyse the passage more in detail. We begin with the last of the category of transgressions: "He who speaks haughtily against the Law." Literally the phrase runs, "He who unveils the countenance against the Torah." To "unveil the countenance" is an idiomatic phrase meaning "being impudent," "shameless" (cf. Sifre on Numbers xv. 30: Manasseh, who was considered to be a heretical king, "uncovered his face against the Torah," which is interpreted to mean that he treated the Torah irreverently). So it refers to a person who, although learned in the Law and an observant Jew himself, interprets the Torah in a way that to a strict Jew must appear irreverent. It cannot refer merely to the allegorical exegesis of the early Christians, for Philo and his school and also most of the Rabbis interpreted the Bible allegorically. There was only one Jew whose utterances concerning the Law must have appeared to pious Jews as being utterly irreverent. That Jew ventured to say: "Now apart from the Law a righteousness of God has been manifested" (Romans iii. 21); his thesis was: "But now we have been discharged from the Law" (*ibid* vii. 6); "For Christ is the end of the Law" (x. 4).

As to the "dissolving of the Covenant," it certainly refers to one who taught that circumcision was not essential to salvation. We know from Josephus of a certain merchant, Ananias, in the court of King Izates of Adiabene (Ant. xxii. 2), who advised the king, desiring to become a Jew and be circumcised, not to undergo that operation. But it is improbable that our passage refers to him, since his advice was not due to any heretical theories concerning circumcision, but to the fear that the King's subjects might revolt against him if he were circumcised. Moreover, the other transgressions in the list could not possibly refer to Ananias. Yet we only have to think of Romans ii. 28 seq.

("for he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh"), or of Galatians v. 6 ("in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth or uncircumcision" cf. 1 Corinthians i. 19), to realise, that none other than St. Paul is meant. We know what a strong impression it made even upon the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem when they saw the Apostle together with the uncircumcised Titus. How much more must he have appeared to the non-Christian Jews as one who "dissolved the Covenant of Abraham."

The same is true of "the despiser of the Festivals," cf. Colossians ii. 16: "Let no man therefore judge you . . . of a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath day."

As to the expression "desecrator of the holies," which here cannot but mean the Temple, it is not necessary to point out that it reflects Acts xxi. 28: "This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the Law, and this place."

* * * * *

Contrast with this the view of St. Paul given by the late Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, the predecessor of Israel Abrahams as Reader in Rabbinics in Cambridge (cf. Expositor 1886). He found it remarkable that the Apostles sent by our Lord to teach primarily the Jew versed in the Law, were, whatever their moral excellence, as regards Jewish learning untutored men; while the Apostle of the Gentiles was one deeply versed in all the wisdom of the Jews. "But," says he, "*this is not the only strange fact in the rise of Christianity. The apparently foolish things conquered the apparently wise things of this world, time after time, in the progress of Christianity.*"

He is convinced that the Christianity which St. Paul spread was a light to lighten the Gentiles, "*redeeming them from deadly sin, pouring out upon them the Spirit of Sanctification, and securing to them everlasting salvation.*" Comparing Saul of Tarsus with Saul, the first king of Israel, he says, the latter went out to seek for the asses of his earthly father, and found a crown, thereby becoming the central figure in the Kingdom of Israel, and Saul of Tarsus "went out to seek the 'asses' (i.e., the Gentiles!) of His heavenly Father" and became thereby the central figure in the Kingdom of the Gentiles for all time. The same Lord who in His justice had swept away the wicked generation of the flood, he continues, and dispersed the rebels who built the Tower of Babel, destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah and their

sister cities by fire and brimstone; now in His mercy devised a means and appointed an agent to sweep away the wickedness itself.

"That means was Christianity, and that agent was Saul of Tarsus," he affirms. If Christ said that He was only sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, "acknowledging thereby that there were in the flock of Israel many sheep that were lost, and many who stood in the need of no physician because they were whole," St. Paul was sent to other sheep not of this fold, of whom there were so very few whole that the Pharisees had to compass sea and land to make one single proselyte every year, pleading thereby the cause of the Gentiles before God, symbolizing, as this single conversion did, the salvability of the heathen world, who were, in a religious sense, well nigh dead." Collectively Israel has hitherto not fulfilled her mission; isolated individuals of this nation, however, certainly have. "Christianity has carried a portion of the light of Judaism to the uttermost ends of the earth; Christianity itself, on the other hand, was carried by thirteen Hebrew men, representative of the thirteen tribes of Israel. (Generally only twelve tribes are spoken of as constituting Israel; in reality, however, the tribe of Levi not only never ceased to be an integral part of the nation, but for 150 years the priestly office was enhanced by princely and even royal dignity. Whatever may be the reason for the omission of Dan in Revelation (vii. 4-8), Levi is not omitted). The most Hebrew of these thirteen Hebrews, who laboured more abundantly than them all, "though not he, but the grace of God that was in him" (1 Corinthians xv. 10), was Saul who also is called Paul (Acts xiii. 9). Schiller-Szinessy sees a Divine purpose even in this second name of the Apostle (Paulus = little). It is remarkable that Saul addressing Samuel (1 Samuel ix. 21) had long before used the following words: "Am I not a Benjamite of the smallest of the tribes of Israel, and is not my family the least of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin?" He thinks that the Apostle was the younger of two children, and the only son of his parents, who, like their parents before them, were strict Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6). They had a threefold reason for calling their son after the first king of Israel. Although Roman citizens (*ibid.* xxii. 25, 27), they belonged to the tribe of Benjamin, Romans xi. 1; Philippians iii. 5 (That the Apostle knew the tribe to which he belonged need surprise no one, as Judah and Benjamin had been separated from the ten tribes, therefore distinct. A fact somewhat surprising is that R. Yochanan ben Napcha (third century) knew that he was of the tribe of Joseph, B. Berakoth 20a), to which the first king of Israel also belonged. They also had a daughter (Acts xxiii. 16). But apart from the

fact that the Jewish religion looks upon "Be fruitful and multiply" as a commandment, and not as a mere blessing, and that this commandment is not fully fulfilled till a man has one son and one daughter at least—the Divine inheritance of male children was, amongst the Jews, from time immemorial—chiefly on account of their religious position—a source of greater gratification to the parents than the gift of daughters. Father and mother, therefore, no doubt prayed fervently for this Divine gift of a son, and when granted to them, gave him the appropriate name of Shaul (the prayed-for one). Also there is evidently a proof that the parents of the Apostle, like the Levite parents of Samuel of old, devoted their son, as an act of gratitude, to the service of God. (Shaul = devoted, cf. 1 Samuel i. 28).

Tarsus was a great commercial emporium, whilst Jerusalem was not. Had they intended their son to be a merchant, they would not have sent him from his native place to the Holy City. Tarsus was also a renowned philosophical centre, whilst Jerusalem was not. Had they meant their son to occupy himself with profane learning, they certainly would not have sent him from the capital of secular lore to the city of exclusive divinity. We know from Acts that Saul spoke Hebrew (xxi. 40), and from the Epistles that he was well acquainted with Rabbinic argumentation, and that he dexterously used the so-called "Seven Rules" (Tosephta vii. 11) which Hillel interpreted before the sons of Bethera. How could it be otherwise? He had sat at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts v. 34) in whom was centred not merely the learning of his grandsire Hillel, but that of all the generations of Israel down to his day.

Saul of Tarsus was a choleric and melancholy temperament, says Schiller-Szinessy. He was either near-sighted by nature, or his sight had been weakened by close study; perhaps both. He must have been altogether insignificant in appearance, of a weakly constitution, and subject to epileptic fits. Add to this the trade (most Jews taught their sons a trade, Mishnah Qiddushin iv. 14)—weaving the unsavoury smelling goat's hair into cloth for tents, a trade both unpleasant and unremunerative—"and few fathers would have been anxious to have him for a son-in-law, and few maidens would have wished to have him for a husband."

But all these disadvantages, which *prima facie* are against Saul of Tarsus ever having been married, would disappear, if it could be proved that he was a member of the Sanhedrin: as such, it would have been necessary for him not only to have been married, but to have been the father of children (Tosephta, Sanhedrin vii. 5). But Szinessy does not believe that he could

have been a member of the Sanhedrin. However great his learning, he lacked several of the qualifications necessary to a member of that body. No one could be elected a member unless he was of noble stature, versed in profane learning, of a certain age, possessing considerable riches (or according to another reading, understanding witchcraft), having an acquaintance with seventy languages, and able to prove (casuistically) the purity of animals, described as unclean in the Pentateuch (Sanhedrin 17a). It is true that the custom, amounting to rule, of marrying at eighteen (Mishnah Aboth v. 20) was almost a general one. A Jew who was without a wife was regarded as being without joy, without a blessing, without goodness, without the Law, without peace, (Yebamoth, 62b). "As soon as a man marries his sins cease" (*lit.* "are stopped up," *ibid* 63). Saul of Tarsus was, however, not the only one who, even if he wholly entertained those views, acted against his convictions, for higher reasons. Others (e.g. Shimeon ben 'Azzai who divorced his betrothed, Kethuboth 63a: Sotah 4b; and Rabbi Saphro, who remained all his lifetime unmarried, Pesachim 113a) in spending their time in study, prayers and pious works, saw that they were fulfilling God's will in a higher sense than if they had married. St. Paul certainly was more tenderly attached to his children in the faith than if they had been his children in the flesh. "This shows that the spirit was everything with St. Paul, and the body nothing."

When Schiller-Szinessy comes to speak of the conversion of St. Paul, he, as a Jew, naturally finds himself in an awkward position. "How Saul of Tarsus, consenting to the protomartyr's death, and entrusted with a commission to prosecute those 'that were of that way' in Damascus, became Paul the Apostle, need not be further touched on here. Is it not written in the Book of Acts? and is it not known to every reader thereof? And the rest of his mighty works, how Gamaliel's disciple, so insignificant as regards his knowledge of Greek philosophy and Roman oratory, outargued the proud and distinguished philosophers and orators of Greece and Rome, is it not written in the Epistles of St. Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles?"

Next to the pride which a religious Jew naturally feels in being a child of the race and religion of Israel, he surely must feel proud, says Schiller-Szinessy, of that man of his race and religion who had the power over nations and kingdoms, not merely to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to overthrow heathenism, but also to build and to plant Christianity—"the Judaism of the Gentiles."

ii.—Claude Montefiore's criticism and appreciation of St. Paul.

Someone has said that he cannot think of St. Paul with his tender remembrance of all the humble women and slaves in his various little churches, his "outward fightings and inward fears," his visions and his humiliations, his signs and mighty deeds, and his fears and tremblings; his fine tact, his fiery temper, the flesh which struggled against the spirit and the spirit which dissolved away the flesh and painted man as, at his best, hardly approaching anything so purely good as a vacuum for God to fill; his rapidly mounting eloquence that rushes with the whole universe into the presence of God, and his sudden cries of shame and sin; without feeling that in him we reach the highest conceivable degree of that virtue which is not merely moral beauty, and that loveableness of spirit which is not merely sweetness or harmony. That the words of Isaiah liii. concerning the servant of the Lord having "no beauty that we should desire him," ought to be applied not to our Lord, who must have been "the fairest among ten thousand," but rather to Saul of Tarsus: "He was despised and we esteemed him not." Yet is not his the sort of despisedness which is better honoured and better loved than anything else that ever entered into our world, except, indeed, the Light which it reflects, and the Love which it reveals?

It is very remarkable indeed that St. Paul, who for almost nineteen centuries had been either ignored by the representatives of Jewish thought or hated and despised by those Jews who happened to hear or read something about his conversion and his attitude towards the Law, Israel and the Gentiles, should, in our days, be considered by some Jews as one of the greatest religious geniuses and heroes of humanity. Of course, even to-day there are not many Jews who are seriously concerned with the teaching of St. Paul. To most of them the New Testament is still a *terra incognita*. Can anything good come from Nazareth? And from Tarsus? There may be *something* good in Christianity—for the Gentiles. But can there be anything of eternal religious value that is not found already in Judaism? Nevertheless, here and there we find Jews who realise the close connexion between Judaism and Christianity and who, directly or indirectly, come into contact with the ideas and teachings of those

Jews who have truly become the teachers of humanity in things spiritual; namely the Apostles and the writers of New Testament literature. And, instead of merely repeating the words of some wildly extreme New Testament critics, who talk, for instance, of St. Paul's semi-pagan conceptions of sacramental religion or of mediatorship, these Jews study the New Testament for themselves and come to quite different conclusions. They do not always add much to our understanding of the psychology of the Apostle and of some of his difficult arguments; even they are, as yet, not quite free from Jewish presuppositions and prejudices; yet of those whom we are going to consider in the remaining lectures it can be said that, on the whole, they earnestly endeavour to understand St. Paul's teaching. We shall take first the impression of St. Paul on a Jewish scholar who lives in our midst and who is respected, and often admired even in Christian circles, for his sincerity and spirituality. I mean Dr. Claude Montefiore. Lately a second edition of his "Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels" has appeared, and, as far as I can judge from the reviews (I have not yet seen the book) he has advanced considerably in his understanding of the central facts of the Gospel. Some years ago, when editor of the well-known magazine "The Jewish Quarterly Review," he published in that paper a lengthy essay on St. Paul; later he also brought out a book on the same subject. I will give here a short résumé of his estimation of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

He says: "The Epistles of Paul fill a newcomer with immense astonishment." They are so unique. They are so wholly unlike anything else he has ever read. When Montefiore reads the Gospels he does not feel this utter unfamiliarity. But St. Paul's conception of the Law, his views about Israel, his doctrine of justification, are not only original, but utterly strange and unexpected. In comparing the teaching of the Apostle with that of our Lord, Montefiore says: "Jesus seems to expand and spiritualise Judaism. Paul in some senses turns it upside down."

To illustrate this he takes up St. Paul's paradoxical saying that "the Law was given in order that the trespass might abound." First of all it magnified the *desire* to sin. For example, the Law says, "Do not covet." But this very knowledge that to covet is a sin, creates and stimulates the passion of covetousness. Secondly, the Law, by its sheer mass of commandments, increases the *opportunity* to sin. For while there is a natural power to know the good, and though this power or inclination may be identified with the better or

true self, still in the natural man this inclination to the good is inherently and *ab initio* weaker than the opposite inclination to succumb to temptation and to the wrong. Now, the Law supplies no additional force with which the good but weaker inclination may be strengthened or helped. All it does is to say, "Do this" or "Don't do that," but it gives no power with which a man may perform or may refrain. It merely creates fresh opportunities in which the evil inclination may triumph and stimulates the desire to a heightened and overwhelming degree. At the best, then, it can but produce that bitter struggle and mournful defeat, that sharp consciousness of sin and that unfilled yearning for deliverance, which is so graphically described in the famous seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. The misery and wretchedness of it all are heightened by the fact that, though the Law bestows on man no special power by which to fulfil its enactments, though it even increases the internal power of evil and weakens the internal power for good, it nevertheless thunders curses against all who do not fulfil its decrees. "Cursed be he who continueth not in all the words of this Law to do them."

Now, Montefiore doubts whether any Jews before St. Paul ever felt that the Law was "the strength of sin," or was driven through the Law to spiritual despair. Many Jews before St. Paul may have felt the conflict between duty and desire, but they will also have felt that God was with them in their struggle to fulfil the Law. He thinks that the Jew did not believe that God had laid upon him a burden which he could not bear. He could not, indeed, fulfil the Law perfectly, but he could become a good man, just as he could become a sinner. Montefiore recognises that St. Paul's portrayal of the battle between the higher and the lower self is magnificently fine. For the poignant consciousness of the sinfulness of sin is a necessary element of religious progress. There is about it something noble, bracing and sincere. It is better to think that you cannot fulfil the Law and to sigh for God's deliverance than to think you have fulfilled it in its entirety. Not to feel acutely "I might be much better than I am," augurs ill for the religious and moral condition of the soul. Spiritual pride is worse than spiritual despair. For these reasons, he thinks, "the words of St. Paul will always retain their value." So far as the letter of the Law quenches the spirit of the Law, so far as men may be able by fulfilling the letter to think that they have earned salvation by their own deserts, so far the Law, just because it fails to cause the consciousness of sin, may yet, by way of paradox, be called the strength of sin.

He also recognises that the Law was capable, as every other good thing is capable, of moral perversion. He illustrates it as follows: "Suppose a man tries to fulfil outwardly all the ordinances of the Law, whether ceremonial or moral. If he is a rich man he can help the poor, he can pay his tithes, he can observe the Sabbath and so on, without any sacrifice or difficulty. His heart may be filled with pride. He can really believe that he is driving a bargain with God. He can be self-deluded and self-deceived. He may be a complete spiritual hypocrite, without any real consciousness of the fact. Such a person does not really love either God or man; he may, however, think that he does so, because he gives such large sacrifices to God and makes such handsome donations to the poor. And at any rate there will be many commandments, which, in their letter at all events, he will fulfil to a nicety. Such a person would be the man whose attempted 'justification by works' St. Paul ridicules and opposes."

Then he turns to St. Paul's conception of the Law as a bondage.

First, the Law is a bondage by reason of its ceremonial entanglements. It makes people bother themselves about meat and drink, frightens them with scruples about clean and unclean, worries them about the correct observance of "days and months and seasons and years," and, in general, imposes on them a yoke of petty and valueless and unspiritual details. Secondly, the Law merely orders you from without, but gives you no power of fulfilment, or of accepting it from within. You can have Christ as the Spirit within you; you cannot have the Law within you. That must remain an external task-master whose orders you are never competent to carry out. "The letter killeth; the spirit giveth life." "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." The liberty meant is liberty from the Law and its bondage; "The letter killeth" signifies that the Law which threatens death for the non-fulfilment of ordinances which man is powerless to fulfil, is task-master and executioner in one.

He then summarises the main points in St. Paul's conception of the Law. While given apparently for eternity, its real purpose was only temporary. Its seeming object was to make men better, and to qualify them for the Kingdom of God; its true object was to create the knowledge and the lust of sin. At its best, its intended result was to stimulate a desire for redemption through the medium of a spiritual despair; at its worst, it led almost inevitably to self-delusion, hypocrisy and

pride. It claims fulfilment, but no man can fulfil it; it demands obedience, but none can obey. It threatens the transgressor with a curse, but it was only given that transgression might abound; it promises the doer of it reward, but the reward is beyond man's power to attain. It assumes that its commands may be obeyed, but the assumption of obedience is more fatal than the consciousness of transgressions. Its only end is death; death for him who tries and knows he has failed, death to him who tries and thinks that he has accomplished. It seems to say, "Through me you can become good," but what it seems to say is a cruel delusion and a captivating snare; for, if, at best, it does produce the consciousness of sin on the one hand, it can only produce boastfulness on the other.

What then is the nature of Christ's work for man, according to Montefiore's interpretation of the teaching of St. Paul? First and foremost, he thinks, it is not the work which Christ Himself essayed to do as set forth in the Gospels. It is not the work of a great Teacher. For St. Paul the significance of Christ's work lies almost exclusively in His Crucifixion and Resurrection. His work is essentially miraculous and supernatural. It is conditioned by His nature. Being what He was, He was able to do what He did; but what He did was, as it were, all arranged beforehand. It was Divinely planned and Divinely controlled, and a supernatural and miraculous efficacy was super-imposed upon the two great stages of the process. Nevertheless, the work of Christ was also ethical—ethical not only in the creation of human faith with all its issues, but also because it was, in itself, an exhibition of goodness and love. It was the proof of God's love to man in thus arranging man's redemption. It was an exhibition of Christ's love for man, and of his incomparable and yet inimitable character, in that from the fulness of His heavenly bliss, He accepted His human mission, lived a sinless life on earth and voluntarily underwent the penalty and the sacrifice of death. To the mind of St. Paul, as Montefiore understands him, the history of Christ clearly demonstrated the goodness of God while it also provided for man the pattern and standard according to which he ought to live. And by the grace of God the power was now given him to follow in the footsteps of the ideal. To the demands of the Law man sought to conform, but failure was constant and inevitable; but now, for an ideal far higher and nobler than the ideal of the Law—an ideal which he could inwardly assimilate as well as outwardly acknowledge, a living ideal of love, no longer a written ideal of bondage—for this ideal, power was given to follow it and to obey. He could imitate Christ, because, if he believed in Christ, Christ's spirit would become his spirit, and his life a

reproduction of the Life of Christ. Though man be man, and Christ be Christ, and the difference between them be vast, yet Paul offers to the believer the possibility of being able to say with him, "I have been crucified with Christ; Christ liveth in me, and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself up for me."

We have to stop here for a moment and ask whether Montefiore is right in saying with some other New Testament scholars that the historic Jesus as we know Him from the Gospels had no significance to St. Paul and that the "nature of Christ's work for man in the teaching of St. Paul is not the work which Christ Himself essayed to do as set forth in the Gospels"? Let us hear St. Paul himself. No figure of antiquity, whether in sacred or secular literature, is so self-revealing as he. Yet, we must remember that all his letters were written to those who were already believers. From them one cannot directly conclude what St. Paul's message was to those who had not yet heard of Christ. All his letters were occasioned by this or that special circumstance, hence not one of them expresses his entire teaching. Moreover, St. Paul himself testifies to the fact that his missionary preaching differed from his instructions to Christians. When he relates how he proclaimed Christ in Galatia, he says: "O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly *portrayed* crucified?" The Greek word which we rendered with "portrayed" is of great significance. It means that he did not merely give a dogmatic judgment of value concerning the Death of Jesus, but that he *described* what took place, *how* Jesus suffered, so that the Galatians could visualise His Death. This was the manner in which St. Paul spoke of the Crucifixion. But his letters contain hints that he also spoke of the *teaching* of Jesus. There is quite a number of passages in which he directly refers to this. 1 Corinthians vii. 10 undoubtedly refers to the Lord's teaching on divorce. To the Thessalonians the Apostle writes that he instructed them "by the word of the Lord," 1 Thessalonians iv. 15. Again, he states in 1 Corinthians ix. 14 "that they which proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel" as ordered by the Lord. Then we have the long quotation 1 Corinthians ix. concerning the institution of the Eucharist. All this leads to the conclusion that St. Paul had a collection of "the words of the Lord," of which he made use in his missionary preaching.

What, then, to St. Paul, was this miraculous and yet ethical work of Christ which could lead to such miraculous and yet ethical transformations in the nature and in the life of man? asks Montefiore.

In the first place, Christ freed men from the curse of the Law, and abolished it. He was the end of the Law. It might be said that the heathen are also free from, or without, the Law. Did Christ, then, as regards the Jews, merely put them into the same category as the Gentiles? Clearly not. The truth is rather that he raised both Gentile and Jew, the one from a state of lawless licence, the other from a state of legal sinfulness, on to a common higher plane of being from which the ethical portion of the Law could be fulfilled. In other words, Christ destroyed sin, and won for man eternal life. Through Him and His work that external power of sin was abolished and the death which followed hard upon the heels of sin was, in principle, abolished too. The theory of St. Paul cannot, according to Montefiore, be properly explained, unless we try to remember that he seems to have supposed that sin is something over and above the particular sins in which it is manifested. It was for him almost a person—a force, at all events, with something of an independent life. It was this force, which man by his own strength was powerless to overcome, that Christ subdued and abolished. And together with this negative and destructive work, the death and resurrection of Christ betokened a positive and creative work as well. Man was now granted a means, which, if he will use it, enables him, whether Gentile or Jew, to be good and to acquire righteousness. This righteousness is given of God but is also possessed by man. Through it salvation and eternal life are within his reach. In one sense God freely gives this new righteousness; a man is conscious it is not his, but God's. In another sense man himself wins this righteousness by the voluntary effort and exercise of faith. The proof of the gift of God's spirit is man's faith, and yet it is also true to say that faith is the conception of the gift. "No man can say Jesus is Lord, except by the Holy Spirit," and, on the other hand, "If thou believe that God raised Jesus from the dead, thou shalt be saved," that is, thou shalt receive the Spirit. Through faith to the Spirit, or through the Spirit to faith—these are but different ways of looking at a two-sided process, which is simultaneous and only separable in thought.

The ethical effect which should ensue upon the belief that Christ died for our sake, and died to sin, and that we, through faith and baptism, are potentially dead to sin likewise, partners in His Death and partners in His Resurrection, appears to Montefiore to be threefold. In the first place it produces a constancy in sorrow—nay a positive delight in suffering and in the heroic endurance of misfortune and pain. Fellowship with the sufferings of Christ is a visible sign that we have received Christ; and, as we are so far likened to Him by suffering on

earth, so shall we also be likened to Him in a spiritual and blissful resurrection. If suffering is unable to quench our faith, the power of Christ is the more triumphantly displayed through, and in spite of, the misery of His disciples. "Wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses and injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake. For when I am weak, then am I strong." The ethical power of this belief, says Montefiore, can scarcely be over-rated. Before his conversion St. Paul may have interpreted suffering, like the wise men before him, as educational; but this conception of it does not fully suffice. It is not always applicable, and does not seem always just. Now, however, by his faith in Christ, suffering for the Apostle was ennobled and transfigured. It became a privilege on the one hand; a means to a great end upon the other. The due endurance of it would not only serve the individual sufferer for highest profit, but it also served the cause of Christ and proclaimed His truth. Montefiore does not hesitate to state that "*the transfiguration of suffering is one of the great spiritual benefits which Christianity, as such, has conferred upon the world.*" Moreover, St. Paul was following closely in the footsteps of his Master (Matthew v. 11, 12).

But, secondly, a true faith in Christ implies a constant and watchful zeal to walk by that Spirit of Christ and God through whose agency faith and goodness were alike possible. Potentially, by the very rite of baptism and the confession of faith in Christ, our "old man" was crucified with Christ, but this spiritual crucifixion, *de jure*, ought to be transformed, since it can be transformed, by personal effort and personal zeal, into a spiritual crucifixion *de facto*. Man must die to his lower self, or, in Pauline phraseology, he must die to the world. His belief in Christ's Death must lead to an ethical reproduction of it in his own life. The Spirit, as it were, is close to his hand; no obstacle prevents the use of it; the store of latent goodness must be converted into active reality. For they that are "of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof."

Thirdly, Montefiore sees clearly that a full faith in Christ, according to the Apostle, implies not merely a sacrifice of flesh to spirit, or of lower self to higher, but also the abnegation of all selfishness and pride. "Christ died for all." Since He is man's Head and Representative, this means that all men died with Him. They not only died to the Law and to its obligations, but they died, in a sense, to themselves. Everything separate, individual, egoistic, about them, everything of which they could boast as their own possession and accomplishment, was destroyed by the Death of Christ. The Crucifixion and

Resurrection produced a great human equality; it broke down the wall of separation between Jew and Gentile, as in a religious respect it broke down and made different the distinction between bond and free, female and male. Before Christ none can boast of his wisdom or his powers of goodness, for none may live "unto himself," but all must live "unto Christ." Absolute devotion and absolute surrender to Christ—which of course includes and implies the service and practice of goodness—this, says, Montefiore, is to St. Paul the logical and necessary result of a Christian's faith. In the Christian community, which forms the Body of Christ, "none of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live or die, we are the Lord's." Moreover, Montefiore realizes that the love of Christ for man, which raises St. Paul's spiritual enthusiasm to so lofty a pitch, is closely identified with the love of God. Christ's love is the proof of God's love; the second is evidenced by the first. For the mission and Death and Resurrection of Christ were pre-ordained and pre-arranged by God. It is God who made the Sinless One to be sin on our behalf; it is God who set Him forth to be a propitiation through faith; it is God's love which Christ's Death establishes and "commends."

He then gives a short analysis of St. Paul's ethical teaching. Although it is mainly incidental, it is fairly comprehensive. His moral exhortations at the close of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Galatians, and the Romans, cover a great deal of ground. He has a firm grasp of the essentials of duty. The list of the virtues hardly exceed the limits of Old Testament and Rabbinical morality; "*they have, however, a spirit and a sureness of touch, a vigour and connectedness essentially their own.*" They are deducible from certain principles, "*so that they become something more than isolated and heterogeneous maxims.*" They may fairly be said to flow from the one central principle of love, that "more excellent way" and "abiding" grace, the virtues and fruits of which are so superbly set forth in the thirteenth chapter of the I Corinthians. Even before he wrote that famous chapter St. Paul had subtly connected his sovereign ethical principle of love with his sovereign principle of faith, when he had said that in Christ "neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision," but only faith working through and expressed in love.

The believer is a changed creature. He glories only in the Cross of Christ, through which the world is crucified unto him, and he unto the world. The lower, egoistic self, with its wearing strife and its vain desires; the flesh, with its passions

and the lusts thereof, are now subdued and abolished. Hence the primal virtue of the Christian is what we now call unselfishness. He does not seek his own advantages; a virtue which is also described as the characteristic of love. Negatively, this unselfishness shows itself in an avoidance of all pride, vain glory, jealousy, strife, envy, insolence, boastfulness—sins against which St. Paul continually protests. It shows itself actively in a perfect humility, in honouring others, in modesty, in meekness; this meekness is a virtue of man as it was a virtue of Christ. Again, unselfishness should lead to unity and harmony in Christian congregations. Each man must do his own part and fulfil his own vocation. So we pass to the more active aspects of unselfishness, living for others, which is the law of Christ and the imitation of Christ. Negatively, the sins which are rebuked by St. Paul under this head comprise covetousness, backbiting and whisperings, malignity and deceit. (The Apostle's wealth of ethical language strikes Montefiore as considerable). Positively, we get the virtues of kindness and long suffering, brotherly affection, active helpfulness and sympathy. "Render to no man evil for evil. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." "Bless them that persecute you, bless and curse not; rejoice with them that rejoice, weep with them that weep." And again, "Admonish the disorderly, encourage the faint-hearted, support the weak, be long-suffering toward all." "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the Law of Christ." All these things lead up to that love unfeigned which sums up the ethical commandments of God.

Devotion to Christ, the consciousness of their high calling and of the possession of the Holy Spirit, should, says Montefiore, exercise a definite ethical effect upon the mind of true believers. They will put on "the breast-plate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation." The assurance of their faith, the conviction that "to them that love God all things work together" for ultimate good, and that "the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed," must give them a wonderful power of endurance in the midst of earthly tribulation. Nay more, they supply them with—"the peace of God which passeth all understanding"—with a grand content, and even with an ineffable joy. Several times over does St. Paul speak of his own pleasure in suffering and persecution; and Montefiore notices with what emphasis the Apostle speaks of "joy" as an element in Christian character. It is the second fruit of the Spirit in that long list of which the first is love, and in the moral code in the Epistle to the Romans, "joy in hope."

precedes and implies, "patience in tribulation." And we get it again among the famous paradoxes which describe the spirit in which St. Paul lived through his wonderful missionary life.

Since the body is the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, so that each believer is in himself a visible sanctuary of God, purity in body and purity in mind are the virtues which befit so high a privilege and responsibility. St. Paul gives to his diatribes against all sexual impurity, as well as against drunkenness, debauchery and lasciviousness, this deep spiritual foundation. The character which he seeks to train is one of simplicity, sincerity, and truth. Hence his not infrequent use of such words as "unblameable," "harmless," "sincerity," "pureness" and "simplicity." These virtues are necessary for that ethical sanctification to which the new life of the believer must lead. "For God called us not for uncleanness, but for sanctification," that is, to live holy lives. There must be no taint of selfish motive in the service of Christ. The whole man is required. Hence the remarkable way in which, following the Rabbinic difference between almsgiving and the doing of kindness, St. Paul distinguishes between the higher and the lower charity: "If I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing."

St. Paul's ideal Christian must be, as he says, "wise unto that which is good, simple unto that which is evil," or as he says elsewhere, "in malice a babe, but in mind a man." Montefiore quotes Jowett: "With what the world terms mysticism and enthusiasm, there were united in St. Paul a singular prudence and moderation." Tenderness as well as sagacity, sympathy no less than temperance, may be discerned in his truly remarkable advice on the question of legally-forbidden foods (1 Corinthians viii., x., Romans xiv.), as well as in many scattered indications elsewhere (cf. Galatians vi. 1-4).

Montefiore's impression is that, so far as we may gather from his epistles, "*St. Paul's life and character correspond in fair measure to the ethical and religious ideal which he enjoins.*" A missionary life spent in what was believed to be at once the service of God and the service of man was a new thing in the history of the world. It provided of itself, beside and above all words, a new and striking ideal of character. He asks, "Are any passages in the epistles more morally moving than those in which, with pardonable self-consciousness, St. Paul speaks of his own labours and methods in the service of Christ?" So, for example, in the 1 Corinthians, "Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst and are buffeted

and have no certain dwelling place; and we toil, working with our hands; being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we entreat: we are made as the refuse of the world, the off-scourings of all things, even until now." Or, as he says in the second Epistle: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God and not from ourselves; we are pressed on every side, yet not shortened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued, yet not forsaken; smitten down, yet not destroyed; always bearing about the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body."

He praises the self-sufficiency of religion characterised in the Epistle to the Philippians: "I have learned in whatever state I am to be content; I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound; in everything, and in all things, have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry; both to abound and to be in want. I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me." "In much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distress, in strifes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings, in pureness, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in kindness, in the Holy Spirit, in love unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God; by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by glory and dishonour, by evil report and good report, as deceivers and yet true, as unknown and yet well known, as dying and behold we live, as chastened and not killed, as sorrowful yet always rejoicing, as poor, yet making many rich, as having nothing and yet possessing all."

Then Montefiore thus sums up his estimate of St. Paul: Paul's religion is based on the love of God—the love, that is, which God feels to man—and also, though in a lesser degree, on the love, which man should feel towards God. "If any man love God, the same is known of Him." The Apostle's perennial power over the hearts of men depends greatly upon his religious and moral enthusiasm. In him we feel the force of a great spiritual upheaval—a new and momentous departure. A new act of the religious drama is beginning; things cannot again be quite the same as they were before. As we have seen, St. Paul's attitude towards the Law does not entirely please Montefiore. Nevertheless, he has to acknowledge that "be we Jews or be we Christians, we cannot but recognise that for the world at large the Law could only have been a bondage. We realise now, from a wholly different point of view, that there was a real historic truth (utterly unknown to St. Paul), in comparing its ceremonial enactments to the beggarly elements

of lower religions. By the infraction of a single command which it were within his power to obey, every Jew, however disinclined he may be to acknowledge it, has tacitly put himself above the Law, and claimed for his conscience and for his reason the right of interpretation and freedom from it. He has raised the spirit above the letter, and entered into the world of freedom. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. *And this spiritual emancipation is historically traceable to St. Paul.* The doctrine of that remarkable passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (ii. 10-16), contains a great truth, however useful it may be to disentangle its permanent value from its temporary form and to qualify it with saving provisos. He that is spiritual judges all things. In one sense there can be nothing between the human soul and God."

Although Montefiore considers St. Paul's zeal for righteousness and holy living as being essentially Jewish, yet he thinks that his tremendous enthusiasm for his cause, which is at once religious and ethical, gives this zeal a glow and fervency peculiarly his own. "The Apostle's hatred of sin," says Montefiore, "is very inspiring." Equally striking is his grasp of the essentials of morality. There is a unity in his ethics. "The virtues hang together." On one or two principles, whether religious or ethical, all seem to depend. He quotes with approval a story about a certain Jew which Dean Stanley has picked out of a sermon of John Wesley's:—

"Nothing is more common than to find even those who deny the authority of the Holy Scriptures, yet affirming, 'This is my religion; that which is described in the thirteenth chapter of the Corinthians.' Nay, even a Jew, Dr. Nunes, a Spanish physician, then settled at Savannah, in Georgia, used to say, with great earnestness, 'That Paul of Tarsus was one of the finest writers I have ever read. I wish the thirteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians were wrote in letters of gold; and I wish every Jew were to carry it with him wherever he went.'" (Wesley's Works, Vol. VII., page 46, cf. Stanley's edition of the Epistles to Corinthians, page 242).

iii.—A Jewish Dramatist's presentation of St. Paul.

"St. Paul among the Jews" is the title of a drama by Franz Werfel (*Paulus unter den Juden*). The author is one of the most original of all modern German poets. His drama, which was published last year, gives in what he calls six "pictures" a powerful dramatic presentation of the great historic moment when Christianity liberated itself from the swaddling bands of Judaism. The scene is laid in Jerusalem during the time of Caius Caligula. The Procurator of Judea was then Marullus, the successor of Pontius Pilate, a suave and wily politician, who, while making a pretence of ardent friendship to the representative Jews and a love for the Jewish people, in reality regards them with contempt and uses their internal disturbances to bring about their destruction.

The play opens in the Praetorium in Jerusalem. Herod's palace has been put at the disposal of the Roman Governor during the periods of his residence when he comes from Caesarea to the Holy City to attend to his duties as judge and to be present at the most important Jewish feasts and fasts. It is just a few days before the Day of Atonement, and Marullus is entertaining the most important personages among the Jews in the banquet hall of the palace. The High Priest is the chief guest. He has two sons, the elder of whom, Chanan, has become, through the influence of Saul of Tarsus, the leader of the Zealots. Chanan has by some means or other got a Jew, named Pinchas, into his power. This Pinchas has sold himself to the enemy, as it were, for he wears the uniform of an official of the Roman Empire, and holds a position of trust in the household of Marullus. His bearing continually expresses a desire to remain unnoticed, for his uniform embarrasses him, making him an object of contempt among his fellow-Jews.

Chanan questions him concerning the preparations for an effort at rebellion against Rome which is to take place soon, and which Pinchas is to aid materially by filching the keys of the gates of the city and so allowing three hundred rebels from Galilee to enter Jerusalem unchallenged. For during the feasts the guard at the city gates was reinforced and each person entering was closely examined. Pinchas is full of fears at being questioned in this spot where he may so easily be overheard. Yet he has so great a love for Chanan and is also so over-

powered by the strong fanatical nature of the High Priest's son that he has done what is required of him, and takes a secret pleasure in his cupidity.

He is much frightened, however, when Chanan demands that even a greater task should be performed, namely, that he should procure the key of the arsenal for the period during which the three hundred would be entering the city. Pinchas turns the conversation to Saul of Tarsus, who has disappeared from among the Zealots whom he had joined, on finding them not zealous enough for him.

Chanan expresses perfect faith in his teacher Saul, vowing that he will return and be stronger than ever in his struggle for the purification of Israel. Pinchas, however, professes great admiration for Rabbi Gamaliel, and teases Chanan concerning Saul's disloyalty to his teacher. Their conversation is interrupted by the entrance of Marullus with the High Priest into the garden from the banqueting hall.

Marullus is pictured as being a stout, bland, middle-aged man; the High Priest as old, tired and dignified. Their conversation turns upon the question of the entry of the new regiments into Jerusalem. The High Priest is urgent in his desire to be assured that the ensigns, effigies and eagles of Caesar will not be brought into the city by the troops. These are the symbols of Caesar's claim to divinity, and it is most important that Jerusalem should not be defiled by idols. He insists on the privileges of the Jews in the Empire, especially in Jerusalem. Marullus seeks to turn him to other issues. "What you call Law I shall never grasp." The High Priest refuses to be drawn. Marullus boasts of his love for the Jews and of the forbearance of Rome. "I respect your prohibition concerning strangers entering the Temple, although according to it I, the Procurator, would be accounted guilty of death were I to enter your sanctuary. But I am not offended; on the contrary, I ordered the execution, without mercy, of that legionary who tore up one of your scrolls."

High Priest: And how many Jews are executed every day in the Roman Empire who have not torn your earthly scrolls of the law?

Marullus: My most worthy Theophilus, surely thou canst not seriously consider Romans and Jews equal.

High Priest (with closed eyes): No!

Marullus: Our benevolence has been richly demonstrated.

High Priest: And so the images and ensigns will remain away?

Marullus (ignoring the question): As far as I am concerned, I wish all the high places were full of columns and images. Dreary land and gloomy people! Your animus against images comes from your gloomy nature.

High Priest: We have the Temple and the Word!

Marullus: The Temple is a gold and crystal glory in the sun. Yet I shudder and yearn for our faultless youths and maids in marble.

High Priest: Behold, even idolatry ye do not take seriously!

Marullus: But Art!

High Priest: What is Art? The most hypocritical kind of lasciviousness.

Marullus (very politely): There are things, O most worthy Theophilus, that even a Jew cannot grasp.

High Priest: The people tremble for the Law.

Marullus: Very strange. This people, that strives for the overthrow of the laws of all nations, trembles for the upkeep of their own! There are movements among you . . .

High Priest (breaking in impatiently): Thou meanest the Nazareans?

Marullus: I mean not only those harmless sects.

High Priest: We respect Rome while Rome respects the Torah. A proof of our good-will I bring thee now, Marullus. The community of Jericho presents thee with the villa of Cleopatra as a winter residence.

Marullus (with twitching eyes): They think I am corruptible?

High Priest (with a touch of contempt): Oh, but Marullus!

Marullus (rudely and lightly): Just because I am not corruptible, I will accept this present. . . . (In a more serious tone) I thank thee with a warning, most worthy Theophilus. Caesar is very sensitive about his divinity. It is only due to my influence and to my superhuman endeavour that we usually succeed . . . and we shall succeed this time too, that no other effigy of Caesar shall be found in Jerusalem than the golden eagle on the outer Temple-gate. But listen! When I passed that eagle yesterday a stone was thrown at it which happily touched only the gate. This offence is trite and vulgar, O Theophilus! But it is extremely dangerous.

High Priest: Do not worry! No ensigns! Thou hast given me back my sleep.

Marullus: I am thy warmest friend. And now I invite thee to the hall where they are expecting us.

(The High Priest waves his hand. Two Levites with torches appear, who come to his side. He goes off with them to the right. Marullus goes after him.)

Then enters Mathias, the younger son of the High Priest, a dissipated young man who apes every Gentile mode of life and attire, and rebels against everything Jewish. With him is Aulus Frisius, a handsome Scandinavian giant, wearing the uniform of a Roman commander. Mathias, small and feeble, is lost in admiration of the other's physique. He expresses his admiration for everything Roman and his hatred of things Jewish. Frisius is amazed to hear that he desires all the empty pleasures of the Pagan world, he, a son of the High Priest. Frisius, on the contrary, is deeply impressed by Judaism; "Rome is great, but Sion fills me with awe." The Temple, Gamaliel, the whole atmosphere of Jerusalem, awaken in him a mystic longing.

Chanan interrupts the scene. Mathias cringes in fear. Again Frisius is amazed to find rebellion, in another form, in this son of the High Priest. Chanan mocks the gay apparel of his brother, he himself is wearing the coarse peasant cloak of the Zealots. Shortly afterwards Pinchas enters, in time to prevent a conflict between the two brothers.

As they retire, the High Priest comes into the garden from the banquetting-hall. He immediately expresses disgust at the dress of each. Mathias he asks, "Where sleepest thou at night?" and Chanan, "Who is thine intimate friend since Saul left thee?" Both are silent. The sad old man sees the gulf that lies between himself and his sons, between all he stands for and their rebelliousness, and his heart overflows with pain and weariness. He envies Gamaliel, who, free from the burden of office, can live entirely in the atmosphere of sanctity and peace. He deplores this spirit of unrest and dissension that has crept into Jewry, of which his sons are such vivid examples. "I stretch out my hands to my children, and they do not clasp them." "Rome clasps them," answers Chanan ironically. And Mathias, "We are God's culprits continually, and I want to live, to live!" The High Priest cries despairingly: "Lord of the world! Why are a man's children the distortion of his own self?"

The entrance of Marullus and the Jewish notables from the banquetting-hall interrupts the scene. Marullus is praising the moderation of his Jewish guests in the matter of the wine cup. He has evidently drunk deeply, but carries it well enough. The High Priest introduces his sons, and Marullus avows his delight in constantly serving the House of the High Priest. Frisius enters with the list of the newcomers to the city for the Day of Atonement celebrations, among whom is Saul of Tarsus. "Who knows Rabbi Saul?" enquires Marullus. Amid some whispering, Chanan speaks up: "I." "Thou knowest this person? Here, Frisius, continue to do thy best for the safety (turning to the guests) of our friends." Then (turning to Chanan), "My dear Chanan, why didst thou blush so?"

Chanan (looking fixedly at Marullus): I did blush.

Marullus: Is he a reliable man, this thy . . .

Chanan (in a resolute voice): Saul.

Marullus: Pardon me! What is it that excites thee?

Chanan (after a pause, his eyes all the while on Marullus): The hope of Israel . . .

That ends the first "picture."

The second scene is set in one of those dark tunnels familiar to the East which serve as shelters from the intense heat. Here low stools and tables and small rugs are spread about for the convenience of those who come to chat or intrigue. At the end of the tunnel is seen one of the steep streets reached by numerous steps out of the tunnel. The bright dazzling daylight contrasts sharply with the dim twilight of the tunnel, in which two Roman soldiers discuss Jerusalem and the oddities of the Jewish people. As they talk, Barnabas enters with a Nazarean

woman. They speak about Paul, who is evidently lying sick in some upper room where the woman has been looking after him. She is afraid of Paul's violence. "An evil angel torments him. Hast thou seen how crazy are his eyes and how his fists are clenched, his lips all crooked and his dreadful voice when he cried: 'Flesh, O thou my body of death!' and 'Christ smite him'? I tremble at the thought of going up to him."

Barnabas: The attack is becoming milder already.

Woman: Can this man become mild? He rages even in his impotence; and how he raged, as a zealot, against the Church, and fell upon the brethren and dragged them to prison! And did he not with his own hand lead Stephen, the saint, a relative of mine, to be stoned, against the will of the people? Can I forget?

Barnabas: Woman, I tell thee, a wonderful act of grace and a miracle from our Lord has been wrought. He there, and not the disciples, has received the last and greatest commission from the Christ. Be thou silent in awe. We have been commanded to love our enemies, but still more to treat tenderly those that are repentant. . . . I will now fetch the saints, and keep thou faithful watch over him. Maranatha!

Woman (reascending the steps): Maranatha!

As they pass out, Chanan and Pinchas appear from one of the dark passages opening into the sides of the tunnel. Chanan angrily complains that Pinchas has not found his teacher and friend Saul. Pinchas declares he has searched everywhere except among the Christians: "I believe it is not he who has come, but another." As they speak, a grim black figure is blocked in the doorway. It is the Rabbi Exorcist, of whom Pinchas says: "The terrible man who keeps all the six hundred and thirteen commandments and their children and children's children. Since he observes them all, God cannot do anything to him!"

The two soldiers have been quietly conversing together all this time. As Chanan and Pinchas disappear, the Rabbi Exorcist comes forward. The soldiers gaze upon his tall figure in its white flowing robes, and black beard which sticks out of his hollow cheeks, his black eyebrows meeting over his nose. He walks in a manner that suggests that even his very steps seem to consider what is prohibited and what is not. The soldiers question him concerning Messiah's coming. "What is that to you? King Messiah cometh not *for* but *against* you, when the Antichrist, may he be damned, has put his dissolute image in the Temple." When one of them asks, "Who is this Antichrist?" his answer is, "Thou servest him." As he speaks, a Galilean family, father, mother and little son, enters the tunnel. They seat themselves. The soldiers ask plainly if the Rabbi means Caesar. Immediately the Rabbi Exorcist wraps himself in a cloud of words, and leaves them to join the Galilean

group. One of the soldiers says, "You will never discover what these people mean."

The Galileans prove to be wine-growers who have come to bring their first fruit-offering to the Temple, and also to find a teacher for their son, whom they are eager to place under Rabbi Gamaliel, of whom the Rabbi Exorcist is jealous. He frightens these simple people with his harsh words. He tells them that in Jerusalem their son will learn very easily how to become a Pagan. After some parley they decide to leave their son in the care of the Rabbi Exorcist, who very definitely tells them he will need payment. Rabbi Gamaliel taught for love merely. "I receive payment, but not in order to keep the filthy lucre: I distribute it among the poor. But it is said, 'Acquire to thyself a teacher,' not 'find' but 'acquire.'"

Barnabas, Simon Peter, and James enter, and the Rabbi Exorcist commands the parents of the boy quickly to veil the child's face from these "Galilean rats, disciples of the Crucified One, who gnaw and spoil our Torah. The very sight of them brings defilement." They all retire from the scene. Simon Peter, James and Barnabas have meanwhile seated themselves on some of the benches, and Barnabas places two bags on the table. They contain the joint wealth of Barnabas and Paul, which they desire to bring to the common purse. Simon Peter and James are depicted as upright labourers, whose faces "are transformed by an inner light." Simon Peter in his speech and actions is shown to be a man of tender heart, merciful, but distrustful of his own judgment regarding the sincerity of these two men, especially of Paul. James is harsh and suspicious and very much a pious Jew in spite of the light of the Spirit. "How will ye live? From the churches?" he asks, not being ready to believe in the pure motives of these two aristocratic men of wealth. Peter fears Saul of Tarsus, the persecutor, the director of the stoning of Stephen. Is this not perhaps a new wile to catch Christians? Neither of them can truly believe that to Saul was vouchsafed a sight of the Risen Lord on the way to Damascus. "To no other did the Lord choose to appear but only to the stranger and enemy Saul!" says James. The latter is especially incredulous. It is vain for Barnabas to protest and to quote witnesses. "A scribe. Hm! We have experienced a good deal of cunning already." When Barnabas tells them how broken is not only Paul's spirit now, but even his body—"When it comes over him, it is as though an imprisoned being, which abides in him, wishes to break its prison. He falls down, he moans, and convulsions shake the poor afflicted one"—James answers: "I, who call myself the brother of the Lord, have visions, I speak with tongues, I am in grace,

and not possessed." At this last suggestion Peter is reproachful, he signifies his belief in Barnabas's story, and asks where the sufferer is. At this point the Nazarean woman comes rushing in to say, "The man is dead," meaning Paul. "His last word was not Christ," says she, "but Rabboni, my teacher."

Simon Peter and James rise in consternation, but Barnabas is calm and reassures them, and at that moment Paul appears at the top of the steps lately descended by the affrighted woman. She screams and flees. Paul, all emaciated and unkempt, comes down the steps and falls down at Peter's feet. "I know thee not, but thou art Peter!" (With failing voice) "O ye pillars, ye saints, ye His disciples!"

Peter: Rise, Paul!

Paul: How can I rise?

Peter (full of emotion): I will lift thee up! (*Does it.*)

Paul (looks at him for a long time): Simon, thou art good to me.

James (disturbed): What sayest thou? Seat thyself near us.

Paul: Ye, ye accompanied Him. In your eyes I find His image.

James: Thou findest Him whom thou hast persecuted?

Barnabas (hastily): Deal patiently with him!

Paul (sinking his head): Chastise me!

Peter (compassionately): Be of good cheer, Paul! I also, who was the first to have found Messiah, have denied him thrice.

James (shamed, with a far-away look in his eyes): And I, who saw the King of Israel when He was in His cradle, the silent child with eyes full of prophecy, I did not recognise Him. Pardon me that I reproached thee.

Paul: There—despair! Here—a new creation! *There* was Saul, a man who lived in Death, saw only Death, and since he saw only Death, he could not live; and as he could not live, he wrought the works of death. Ugh! out of all his dreams crept decay. Chastise me for that man's sake! At that time I deserted Gamaliel. Only a dead branch could drop away from such a master. But God wished that I should be dried up in order that I may burn now. I was quite empty and I filled my emptiness with hatred and proud dreams of Israel's victory. For how can an outcast live without an evil dream? There were the enemies of Israel round about. Jesus was an enemy! Look ye! And the enemy Stephen I bound and brought him here myself, so, so! And we dragged him to the gate. . . . (*Rising*) The first stone hit him! He closed his eyes and smiled. The second stone! Dumbly he lifted his arms. Hundreds of stones, all the stones! He looked at me, me, then he fell down in his blood. At me, the murderer, a new death smiled, a death which is eternal life. . . . (*He begins to tremble vehemently.*)

Peter: And before Damascus, Paul?

Paul: That look will never fade away. . . . The road of hell winds before me. . . . No! Not hell! For hell is *something*. . . . To the left and right of me there is an irretrievableness, that which has no word to express it. . . . But . . . (*He sinks down and hides his face.*)

Barnabas: Calm thyself, Paul! See how he trembles! The recollection of that miracle kills him.

Paul (smiling through tears): Kill me? How? I was dead.

James: Thou hast seen Him and heard His voice?

Peter: Speak! (*Paul attempts to speak, but fails. His lips move.*)

Paul: The defiance! The more defiant I became, the more patient was Rabban Gamaliel. I continued to be obstinate, but at home my soul pined more and more in misery, then I would be ill for days. But that's nothing, oh, nothing! This defiance against the Christ has melted away. But the sorrow, the bitter-sweet sorrow of the soul, will never end!

James: What dost thou wish in Jerusalem.

Paul: It is not I who govern myself any more. He who governs me commanded me to come . . . When will He come again as He promised to you?

Peter: Even before this generation has tasted death. First the prophecy of the setting up of the abomination of the desolation in the Temple must be fulfilled. We shall experience it all in the flesh.

Paul: Then I must hasten! There is no time to spare! I must start at once!

Peter: Why? It is all one where the Day will find thee, which will come upon us like a snare.

Paul: The whole world believes itself to be Saul, and knows not that it is Paul. The time is short and this body of death is slothful! (*He glances at Peter.*) Ye were elected from the beginning. I am merely one of the saved. From the abyss come I, where souls perish. Hence I am to cry warning to mankind.

Peter: Where goest thou?

Paul: Who knows all of the great cities of the world?

James (stily): Wilt thou go also to the Gentiles?

Paul: The Kingdom of God comes to all men.

Barnabas: And everywhere is the Kingdom of the poor.

James (excitedly): The Messiah Jesus lived within the Law. He preached to the lost sheep of Israel. He did not wish to cast the children's bread to the dogs.

Paul: Jesus, the Messiah, is above the Law! (*James starts to his feet.*)

Peter (glancing round anxiously): Righteous God! Speak softly, Paul. Thou wilt cause much confusion.

James (angrily): Nothing must thou do that will not be of service to the holy community. Beware, man! Have we suffered and bled, yea, through thy fault, that thou mightest be converted, only in order that thou destroy our work? With blood and wisdom have we created the Church of Messiah. She lives eternally in the Law of Moses. For the Lord Himself said: "Till earth and heaven pass away, not one jot or tittle shall pass away from the Law. . . ."

Paul: Did the Christ Himself perfectly comprehend the mystery of the Christ?

James: Now I have thee, Rabbi! Thou, the most conceited of all conceited ones! Blasphemest thou the Lord?

Paul: From the Torah it can be proven . . .

James: Thy pride can be proven, thine unconvertible pride!

Peter (moving away from Paul): At one time didst thou persecute us on the strength of the Torah!

James: Can a persecutor become a follower? A Saul can only become a Paul.

Paul: I have knelt before you and will kneel again. For ye were the companions of the Redeemer of Creation. But my office I have not received from man, but from the Christ who spake to me in His own voice.

James: We are the firstfruits of the Word. Our truth is truth without additions or changes. Jehoshua is the Messiah of the Law. For this we live, for this are we beaten mercilessly, for this we will suffer death, happy in our faith. Every other belief, every pandering to the uncircumcised world is disobedience. I am the head of the body. Mark ye, man! The disobedient is the enemy of Christ, whether he be converted or unconverted! Come, Simon!

[Exit.]

Peter: Brother! Thou art a scholar. But we were the eye-witnesses. Why argue? By the next Pasch everything may be over. Friend, visit us at our Holy Meal, in order that thou mayest learn to understand the community.

Barnabas: Thou hast never before taught this, Paul—that Messiah is above the Law. [Exit.]

Paul: It is not I who uttered this awful word, but He Himself in me. I wished to be silent, but this word broke out of me. My heart is even now cold with fear.

Barnabas: Before, they were shy of thee, but now they hate thee, for they are Jews.

Paul: They cannot break free from the man in themselves. We alone, Barnabas, are to teach the universal Kingdom of the Christ.

Barnabas: The Kingdom of poverty, of equality, and of the Spirit.

Paul: I am so sad, brother! The Christ could not have sent me to the disciples. But to whom? To whom?

Barnabas: Trust me! . . . I will run after them, and will win them still. [Exit Barnabas.]

Suddenly Chanan stands before him, saying "Saul, I accuse thee." Hitherto Chanan has disguised his real fiery temperament under a cloak of gloomy calm. Now he is full of excitement. Paul murmurs, "God's trial begins." Chanan relates how all his enthusiasm has been aroused and fed by Saul, his friend, and now . . . ? "O ghost of my old self," says Paul, "I look at thee, O my guilt." Chanan tells him how all their plans are ready. Thousands are marching through Jerusalem, men eager for the fray, and furnished with arms. All that was needed was the leader, and now he, meaning Paul, has appeared. Paul is more and more conscience-stricken. Chanan is more and more puzzled. At last Paul bursts out: "Away from me. Depart from me; even if I could save the whole world, thee I cannot save. Thou abidest in evil, for thou art the Saul that I have discarded. Forget me. Only One can save thee from the horrible decay which will be the end of thy soul. I am Christ's of Nazareth." Chanan is filled with horror and amazement. "Saul and the beggar-Messiah! Thou hast hated Him even more than the money-changers and the priests, because He mars the way." Paul no longer hears him. Chanan raves and persuades, Paul does not heed. He hears a voice. . . . At last he rushes away, saying, in accents full of emotion: "Gamaliel's voice . . . my teacher. . . . Now I know the will of Christ for me." Gamaliel's voice is really heard at this juncture chanting a psalm, for he is marching with the Galilean pilgrims.

They are carrying the rolls of the Book, and at this juncture the Rabbi Exorcist has entered with his disciples. They and he bow to the earth, covering their faces before the Torah. The Rabbi, when the procession has passed, gives vent to his jealousy by reviling Gamaliel, but Chanan seems to awaken

from a trance, saying: "Forget thee? No, Saul, I take thee with me."

The curtain falls.

The third picture has as its background the Rabbinic Academy and western Forum of the Temple area. Before the open hall, furnished with seats in tiers with lectern desks before them, runs a paved alley. Marullus and Aulus Frisius are seen coming along this alley. They are deep in conversation over the many spears and short swords that are missing from the arsenal. Frisius is surprised to find that Marullus is not grieved, but rather pleased, at the theft. He adjures Frisius not to let the matter get abroad, and unfolds to the simple soldier the wily plan to let Judea ruin herself with rebellion which is coming and thus rid Rome of the detested Jews. Turning into the hall of the Academy, Marullus seats himself on one of the benches, saying, "I have a longing to desecrate this place."

Frisius expresses admiration of Gamaliel, but Marullus cannot stand him. "For when you speak with him you feel he is always and truly right; he paralyzes the politician in me, and that is awkward for a Procurator and a future Senator." Frisius: "Why despisest thou this people? Is it not wonderful that in this time of murderers and gluttons there should be a people obsessed by an all-absorbing passion for the Deity?" "Frisius, Frisius," Marullus exclaims, "the old ladies of the Palatine allow themselves to be taken in by Judaism . . . but thou, a brave Teutonic heart! No, no; every Teuton is born a Jew-hater."

As they disappear, the pupils of the Academy come into the hall and take their places, spread out the rolls and begin to recite in low sing-song with swaying bodies. Two young men, pupils respectively of Rabbis Gamaliel and Zaddok, begin to argue concerning the merits of these two Rabbis. Meanwhile Paul and Barnabas appear in the alley. The latter is remonstrating with Paul for having shocked the brethren and for now endangering his (Paul's) life in this "world of the Rabbis." But Paul insists that he has received a divine mission to Gamaliel. "How can I live in the new world when in the old I have not paid my debt?" Barnabas leaves him and he seats himself in the shade at some distance. The young pupils in the Academy are still conversing, the one seeks to learn of the other the reason for Rabbi Gamaliel's emotion when he is giving some specially fine interpretation of Scripture. The other attributes it to sorrow at the loss of his best-loved and most brilliant pupil, Saul of Tarsus. But the pupil of Rabbi Zaddok is surprised: "Has he lost but one disciple?" And the other

assures him that it is the case, continuing: "But perhaps he loves this man more than any of us just because he has lost him."

Two Rabbis appear from the back of the hall. The disciples rise to greet them. Rabbi Gamaliel is tall and powerfully built, with no sign of age in him; Rabbi Shimon, his son, shows refinement and timidity. With them are two small boys, whom Gamaliel presents to the class bidding it welcome and love them. Gamaliel turns to Rabbi Shimon: "Shimon my son, when thou didst enter into my chamber to-day with these souls, the sun's rays trembled on the window. I also trembled. For every child bears the name: *God waits*."

The pupils, meanwhile, are about to clothe the new boys in the student's mantle and furnish them with scrolls, but Gamaliel interrupts, bidding them take holiday instead, for such unawakened souls are a gift. In a pause, it is clear that the old Rabbi is suddenly filled with sad thoughts. "Had I only not awakened *that* child too early," he says at last. They speak of Saul together, and his keen and early perception of truth. This gives an opportunity to one of the pupils to open a discussion in the scribal manner of the day.

"In all of us there is at times far too much perception. That is the origin of all heresy." (*Paul suddenly appears.*)

Paul: Rabban! (*He falls on Gamaliel's neck.*)

Gamaliel: Thou! Thou! My Saul! (*Both weep loudly and long.*)

The Disciples: The man who was lost!

Gamaliel: Pardon me, Shimon, my son! But should not a mother weep, whose little one has risen from the dead?

Paul (sobbing): I fell away . . . I fell away. . . .

Gamaliel: But thou hast returned, and that suffices!

At this point three Rabbis enter together, all old men: Rabbi Zaddok—emaciated, with glowing eyes; Rabbi Huna—a careworn legalist; and Rabbi Meir—very mild and benign. Rabbi Gamaliel greets them joyously with the news of the return of his beloved pupil Saul. But the latter begs him not to rejoice, realising that Gamaliel has not grasped the import of his coming. "I have said, 'The Law is fulfilled, and Love *hath* come,'" says Paul, "Love *will* come," replies Gamaliel. But Paul insists: "Love *was* in our midst. The Law is fulfilled—the Promised One *has* appeared to Israel." All press around him excitedly as he continues. . . . "But Israel has *killed* the Messiah." Their horror is complete. Rabbi Zaddok is amazed at the mercy of God who has not destroyed the world at such blasphemy.

The pupils of the Academy at a sign from Rabbi Huna draw near to bind Paul, but are prevented by Gamaliel, who has recovered sufficiently from the shock to realize Paul's danger.

Paul is taken away by the pupils, with strict injunctions from Rabbi Gamaliel as to his care. The Rabbis remain to argue the matter. The majority desire to bring Paul before the Sanhedrin. It is a case of the most flagrant blasphemy and in the hearing of the whole school, and so it cannot be allowed to pass without extreme punishment, even death. Gamaliel cries out: "What service have ye done to the soul of that Jesus by causing him to be crucified?" The others are again shocked. Rabbi Gamaliel was away at sea when the Crucifixion took place. Rabbi Huna says: "Who knows but that thou wouldst have acquitted even him?"

Gamaliel (with a long look at Rabbi Huna): Who knows?

Rabbi Huna goes on to point out that this case is extremely serious, for the offender is a teacher of the people, a learned man, whose influence was unlimited. The majority desire Paul's death even more eagerly, until at last Rabbi Meir, who is more in sympathy with the tender feelings of Gamaliel, asserts that it is clear that Saul of Tarsus has every sign of being possessed by an evil spirit, whom he calls "Messiah," and therefore can only be dealt with by an Exorcist. The others are scornful of the "quibble," but the idea moves the majority, however, and eventually carries the day. Rabbi Gamaliel has begged them all along to let him deal with Saul in his own way, and even now, "Again I say, give me this soul."

Rabbi Huna: There must be no pact between Israel and the Crucified One.
Gamaliel (with a long look): Why not?

Great excitement ensues. "Father! Thy word makes the majority," says Rabbi Shimon imploringly.

Gamaliel: Fetch the Exorcist.

Mount Calvary is the spot upon which the fourth scene opens. Against the night sky the hilltop is faintly outlined, showing mounds and decaying crosses. Chanan, the High Priest's elder son, is there with some Zealots. He is giving them their instructions concerning the rebellion which is afoot. Pinchas arrives breathless, bringing the news that their plans are all discovered by Marullus, and therefore urges them to flight, but he is taken away as a traitor, while Chanan and his Zealots march off.

Simon Peter, James and Barnabas now enter, the latter carrying a lantern. Peter and James are talking of Paul and his teaching "that sin is the fruit of the Law," which has brought such disquiet among the Christians. While they talk thus, Barnabas has been looking round among the mounds and crosses. He now asks them: "Pray tell me which is the Cross?" And to his amazement and sorrow, no less than their own, they cannot tell him; Peter stretching out his arms to

heaven: "Pardon us, Lord! . . . How could we have known that the ignominious wood of the Cross is the Throne of Thy Kingdom!"

Barnabas: By the two beams in which God and man meet, by the Cross which ye understood not, let us stand by Brother Paul.

(He puts out the light and they all three melt into the darkness.)

Now the Rabbis Zaddok, Huna, Meir, and the Rabbi Exorcist appear, with their disciples carrying lighted torches. They have come to exorcise the evil spirit in Paul. He is presently brought in and tied to a stake.

Paul: What is the meaning of this jest?

Rabbi Meir: The fathers are endeavouring to save thee.

Paul (quietly): I am saved.

They turn on him in anger at this. In vain does Paul try to explain to them his new position. "Am I guilty because Truth has taken its abode in me?" Rabbi Meir wishes to give Paul yet another chance. "It is not good," he says, "that Jew should rage against Jew." Paul continues to say he is perfectly well and sane, and that the *Christ* speaks in him.

Suddenly he recognises Calvary. "Men, this wood lives! Here the lightning cleft the world, which yet remains so undisturbed. Men go on in the selfsame way, and no one, no one is amazed!"

At this the Exorcist prepares to work his charms. But suddenly Paul stops him, and, fixing him with his gaze, makes him helpless. The Exorcist falls impotent before this mightier exorcist, Paul. Seeing which, there is great consternation. Paul, in the power of Christ's love, looses him from his thralldom, and the poor wretch staggers away. The Rabbis' disciples are enraged and would fall upon Paul, when something unexpected startles and fills them with fear, for in the distance martial strains are heard. Rabbi Shimon, the son of Gamaliel, comes upon the scene, all pale and disordered, and stammers out the frightful news that the city is in an uproar, the Zealots are fighting the Roman soldiers in the streets, and Caesar's eagle has been pulled down and trampled upon. "The Temple! The Temple!" laments Rabbi Zaddok.

Barnabas now begs Paul to take advantage of the confusion to make his escape. But he will not. Into the midst of it comes Marullus with soldiers. With his usual scornful courtesy, he mocks the Rabbis. In the light of the flickering torches he proceeds to harangue them on their ungratefulness to him, who has ever treated them and all things Jewish with such respect and consideration. He wilfully puts upon them the onus of this Zealot rebellion, and will not listen to their protestations of innocence. "Old men who are innocent usually

are asleep before sunrise," says he. The Rabbis turn on Paul and blame him for all their troubles. Frisius enters to tell Marullus that the rebellion has been quenched, and through the influence of Gamaliel, for the Roman soldiers were practically overcome by the enemy. Marullus is nonplussed, but after a moment's thought whispers :

"This incident . . . must not, of course, be reported to Rome." To the Rabbis he makes out that the soldiers have restored peace, but with the loss of five men, while in truth only one Roman soldier has been hurt. Unfortunately, he states, punishment must be meted out to the instigators of this revolt. He tells the Rabbis to name them. They protest their ignorance, but Marullus vows he knows the leader already.

The Rabbis : Who ?

Marullus : Saul of Tarsus.

The Rabbis' joy knows no bounds at the turn things have taken.

Barnabas (to Paul) : Now, may Christ protect thee !

(Paul is pushed forward, the soldiers hold the torches to his face. Day breaks. While Marullus is questioning Paul, Gamaliel suddenly appears.)

Gamaliel : Who is guilty here ?

Marullus (uncomfortably moved, shaking himself; then politely) : Most honoured patriarch ! Rome is eternally indebted to thee, most worthy one !

Gamaliel : I do nothing for Rome, Roman !

Marullus : What stoic modesty ! Can I serve thee ?

Gamaliel : Who was proclaimed guilty here ?

Marullus : Thou acknowledgedst that Rome cannot let this night pass unpunished !

Gamaliel : Rome will receive her compensation. For this I can pledge myself, Roman ! Who is accused ?

Marullus : He, there ! Thy colleagues also accuse him.

Gamaliel : Hast thou proofs ?

Marullus : This letter !

Gamaliel (takes the letter and slowly tears it to pieces) : Are calumniations proofs for Rome ?

Marullus (annoyed) : Am I now the defendant or the Procurator ?

Gamaliel : Thou art now a man with a man's responsibility !

(The daylight increases.)

Gamaliel (to Paul) : Is it not so, my child, we have something to settle between Israel and Israel ?

Paul : Between Israel and Israel ! Rabboni !

Gamaliel : And it is more important than all the kingdoms of the world !

Paul : Mightier than the kingdom of this world, Rabboni !

Gamaliel : And if in this place guilt is to be expiated, both of us should bring down peace !

Paul (with a stifled joy in his voice) : I have a message of peace for thee, my teacher. And thou wilt hear it !

Gamaliel (to the Rabbis) : Turn aside ! . . . and thou follow me !

(The Rabbis protest at Gamaliel's protection of Paul, but to no purpose. Gamaliel leads him off triumphantly as the red rays of the rising sun light up the hill with its gruesome mounds and crosses.)

Marullus : Honoured fathers, I believe all of us have here suffered defeat.

Rabbi Shimon : The righteous one of Israel leads Israel's apostate by the hand !

Rabbi Zaddok : A sign of the end.

Marullus (to himself) : A special messenger to Caligula is on the way.

CURTAIN.

The next scene takes place in the Palace of the High Priest.

Rabbi Zaddok and the High Priest are together in a large hall of the Palace, through the large round window of which can be seen the noble masses of the Temple over which hangs a heavy black cloud.

The eve of the Day of Atonement is far advanced, and these two old men walk up and down in grief and anxiety over the events of the last few days in Jerusalem. Chanan, the High Priest's elder son, has fled from Roman justice, and no news of him is forthcoming ; while the younger Mathias has fled with a Greek dancer. The High Priest contemplates his heavy Day of Atonement duties with fear and misery, feeling too heart-broken to face them. The scene is most moving. Rabbi Huna enters with further bad news : Marullus has closed all the synagogues, imprisoned the elders, and confiscated the moneys. The dark clouds over the Temple seem to these agitated minds to portend disaster. The High Priest : "I have sent for Gamaliel." "Gamaliel ? He entertains blasphemy in his own house," says Rabbi Huna, who has brought a warrant for the arrest of Paul. He urges the High Priest to put his name to it, and so end all troubles by the execution of the source of them.

Rabbi Shimon enters. The High Priest questions him eagerly for news of Chanan. He brings news of more and more disasters : the Roman troops are occupying fresh places. Rabbi Huna presses the High Priest to sign the warrant. The High Priest enquires why Gamaliel has not come, according to custom, to be present at the vesting.

To the astonishment of all, Shimon tells them that his father is deep in studying the records concerning Jesus of Nazareth. "With Saul ?" they question. But he assures them that the two have not met or communicated in any way. "Father reads, reads, reads, day and night. To-day, at morning prayer, suddenly a thought held him spellbound and he left the benediction unfinished. . . ." Their consternation is great. Their exclamations are interrupted by a sound of sobbing which proceeds from Rabbi Meir, who is discovered behind the door curtains. After a time he manages to stammer out the news that the persecution of the Jews is begun all over the Empire. "Ten thousand have been murdered in Alexandria alone."

"These are the birth-pangs of the Messiah," says Rabbi Zaddok. Rabbi Huna urges all these calamities as a further proof of the wrath of God that a blasphemer like Paul is allowed to live.

The High Priest, after much hesitation, signs the warrant at last. "I feel as though I had condemned my own children," says he. Then a great noise, followed by long-continued murmuring, is heard. Pinchas, all ragged and worn, comes in and falls at the High Priest's feet, and tells the dreadful news: Chanan has hanged himself in the desert. Even now his poor body is below in the courtyard. At first the father cannot grasp the import of these words. "He is not dead. Let us go and see him."

But as he goes the priests enter with the robes. The High Priest is torn between love and duty. At last he allows the robing to proceed without further delay. The Chief of the Priests chants the usual sentences over each garment, to point the symbolism. In his glorious golden vestments the High Priest stands motionless, with tears running down his aged cheeks. Loud music is heard from the Temple. This ends the fifth scene.

The last scene is set in the Temple, in the great chamber of the priests. In a corner is a high throne-like seat, on a table priestly utensils. It is the Day of Atonement, and the sound of the murmur of the people at prayer ebbs and flows in the room.

Paul and Barnabas enter, both wearing shrouds, which was customary for every Jew to do, from the High Priest downwards, on that day of contrition. Barnabas urges Paul to leave Gamaliel's house, and tells him of the warrant issued by the High Priest.

Paul: I know it, but another warrant hangs over me. Without Christ the world has two ways, in Christ one alone.

Barnabas is urgent in his pleading, but Paul says: "Not yet."

Barnabas: I have prepared everything. We will steal away to Bezetha to the house of a friend. Greek garments lie in readiness there. So away with us at once into the darkness! (*Breaking out wildly*) How have I shaken off all this—Temple, sin, the Law—through thy assistance! Free am I, Paul! Free from this place of the rich, the oppressors, and the priests! Our Lord is the Christ of the poor! Let them dare! Let them try to take hold of thee! Him and thee will I protect. (*He goes to where the priestly utensils are and takes up a knife.*) And this sacrificial knife will I take with me!

Paul: Thou sinful man! Lay it down at once!

(*Barnabas backs under the glance of Paul, and obeys.*)

Paul: Woe unto thee—not for sin have we been freed, man. We are Jews of Christ. Pray that Gamaliel's soul may be opened. I shall speak, but for the truth of Christ there is no other proof than grace alone can vouchsafe.

When Gamaliel comes into the room Barnabas leaves Paul alone with him. Gamaliel seats himself on the throne-like chair, and Paul, kissing his hand, sits on the steps at his feet.

He prepares to explain himself to Gamaliel. He begins with the day when, as a care-free child, he was brought to this, his spiritual father. He goes on to describe how the Law soon made him lose his care-free spirit, and how he was, as it were, surrounded with thousands and millions of blazing swords in the world that formerly had seemed an easy, happy place. With rigorous fasting and prayer all the years did he then attempt to conquer self in mind, heart and body, but with no success.

Paul: Daily and hourly my death warrant hung over me. Who is the man who can love his death warrant? The Law redeemed me not, it cursed me only with the knowledge of my sin.

Gamaliel: Speak not of it.

Then Paul speaks of Gamaliel himself, of his greatness, his righteousness.

Paul: One Being only the earth has held whom thou resemblest.

Gamaliel: Speak not of me.

Paul goes on to describe how in his love and despair he tried more and more to be like Gamaliel, who so lavishly dealt out to him spiritual food. "But I was starving and could not digest the King's food." Thus, comparing himself in the depths with Gamaliel, who was able to live on the heights, he came to hate his teacher, was jealous of his purity and power, and so fled to the Zealots.

Paul: Thus it came about that the disciple of Gamaliel led young Stephen to be stoned. For in proportion to the death in us so is the will to murder in us.

Gamaliel: Speak of that which thou shouldst speak!

Paul (*springing to his feet and speaking with great emotion*): How can I speak of Him, Rabbani! How can I speak of the moment when I entered, blind, into a new world? My heart is torn when I only think of it. Can a man speak of the moment of his birth?

Gamaliel: Thou wilt speak. For I have decided that thou shouldst lead back Rabbi Jehoshua of Nazareth to Israel.

Paul is overjoyed; he only fears for Gamaliel the result of such a deed. But Gamaliel is sure that false judgment has been passed upon Jesus, and that He has suffered an undeserved death. More than that, Gamaliel declares that this Jesus illumined the Law, but dangerously, because it was too premature, "for even illumination is guilty when it is too dazzling for weak eyes." Paul insists He did more than illumine the Law. Gamaliel avers that is an impossibility. "No Jew can live, think, or say what is not already sealed in God's word."

Paul: The dispensation of the Word is past.

Gamaliel accounts this blasphemy.

Paul: Rabbenu! A strange Being breathes in our midst. We draw in His breath with every breath we breathe. Grasp this mystery! Everything is now filled with His breath also. When I was the old Saul, between me and Creation there was a dead, black atmosphere—Loneliness! Death was the second name of the world. Death—all smiling, all filling earth scents; jeering, stinking death! And now? Why has Loneliness vanished? What is this strong exulting love in me? Whence cometh this knowledge of eternity in the heart, that consumes all fear and decay? A transformation! I tell thee, no smallest blade grows now untransformed. Even thou also, master, art transformed! For we live now in the midst of the Kingdom of God and know it not. . . .

Gamaliel (rising): Saul! . . . Thou art in the Temple. . . . We wear shrouds. . . . Think of the atonement which I would make on this Day of Atonement! (*Quietly but firmly*) What has the love of thy Jesus changed? It has changed nothing, as His anger changed nothing. He overthrew the moneylenders' tables in the Temple, but on the next day they stood there again. *Not* He, and *not* I, can banish evil, only the Law, that mystery that we serve that we may live, the holy Tie which binds mankind.

Paul: This Tie has become rotten, Rabbenu! Like a discarded wineskin the Word lies upon the road!

Gamaliel (with a deliberate composure): This this man Jesus did not say!

Paul: Rabbenu speaketh of a man! Oh, the world is swallowed up, both Jews and Gentiles, and only thou art here, thou and He. Gladly would I be anathema from Him, if thou, Israel's hero, now, shouldst know Him. A man? Has ever a man conquered death and decay? Has ever a man risen bodily from the dead? The Light which spoke to me before Damascus, was it a man? Was it a man that delivered me from myself? Can a man grant God's renewing grace? No, Rabbenu! He was not merely a man! He wore Manhood as a garment, as thou and I wear these shrouds. He, the Messiah, the incarnate Shekina, God's Son, He was before the world came into being. . . .

Gamaliel (coming towards Paul breathing heavily): Saul, say that He was a man, for thine own sake and mine!

Paul: How can I? From man new birth cometh not.

Gamaliel: From man alone it cometh! For this Temple's sake, say that He was a man!

Paul: Not in the Temple, but on the Cross was the Blood of the Atonement shed. Now is the whole world the Temple of the great Sacrifice.

Gamaliel: Saul! Here I stand before thee. Not yet has the immeasurable calamity taken place! Destroy not my work of peace! The Messiah hath not come, for the ever-coming is He! Thou hast never understood the Torah, bad disciple thou! Only in its star-immersing depth abides the Kingdom of God and our ability to achieve it. Where the Torah ruleth not there is a wilderness and chaos! Do not force a strange spirit between God and Israel's freedom! For Israel's freedom's sake, say that He was a man!

Paul: Rabbenu, by the living God I implore thee: Believe! In this hour, not for anyone's sake can I lie.

Gamaliel: Woe unto thee! Knowest thou who the Messiah is? He is annihilation. For when this arrow flies the bow will break. I will not see Him. . . .

Paul (after an awful pause, in a whisper, jerkily): The bow is broken, O Israel! And for ever!

Gamaliel: Traitor! (*As if unconsciously*): Ten thousand crucified ones against one. . . . (*He produces a cloth*). Here! This bloody cloth, blasphemer! 'Tis not prophets' blood! Child's blood! Children slaughtered in Alexandria! They would not be traitors to the Torah! Thou pratest of the Messiah and of love, thou cold Satan, who lovest nothing, nothing, nothing! (*Overcome, he presses the cloth to his face*.) Children—singing they died. Singing, they died for the Torah. . . .

(*The prayer of the people behind the scene increases in volume mightily. Many voices chant verses of the Psalm with groaning, wailing, or wavering altogether confusedly.*)

Gamaliel (with fixed eyes, muttering the penitentiary Psalm as if he had become the concentrated voice of the people): Hide not thy face from me. . . . For my days are consumed like smoke. . . . My bones are burnt up as with a firebrand. . . . My heart is dried up and withered like grass. . . . For the voice of my groaning bones will scarce cleave to my flesh. . . . I am become like the pelican in the wilderness, and like an owl that is in the desert. . . . Even as if it were a sparrow that sitteth alone upon the house-top. . . . Mine enemies revile me. . . . (*He falters, pulls himself together, and walks towards the priestly utensils.*) I retract my decision concerning Jesus of Nazareth! Perhaps He was a holy prophet, but I call Him enemy! The old contradiction is He, the rebellion in lamb's wool. The Rabbis were wise and not I. There can be no peace! And thee I tear out of my heart, thou destroyer, thou drunken apostate! And that thou mayest know who thou art, I give thee thy name: "Israel's self-hatred!" (*He grasps the sacrificial knife.*) The angel of death between us, Saul!

Paul (bowing low): Here I am, Rabbenu! The death of Stephen has made a seer of me also.

Gamaliel: I shall not deliver thee to justice. Let no more blood be spilt over Israel! For the sake of the people I take upon myself the triple great sin: the desecration of the Sabbath, the defilement of the Temple, and murder! (*He approaches Paul.*)

(*A long and urgent trumpet blast.*)

Gamaliel: Behold, my God, I have done everything to save this soul. His youth I have nourished; he fell away: I wounded him. I have accepted his blasphemies. I have saved him from the judgment of men. For the sake of the peace of Thy Creation I wished to return this soul and its master into Thine house. Oh, I have been mocked! Can I let Thine enemy go, my God? Let him go to a strange land, him, who wishes to destroy Thine inexhaustible Torah and our holy responsibility towards men, in order that he may preach his phantom gospel? Oh, they will listen to him, and the phantom will become their Law, for a shadow lies but lightly, but Thy Law lies heavily! Lord, what shall I do? Should I perpetrate the horrible sin here in Thy Temple, in this breathless hour of the world? In this hour in which Thou numberest souls, should I destroy one?

(*Short trumpet blasts sound from all sides.*)

Gamaliel: The priests' trumpets blow on high to blast the walls of Thy Solitude! Men wait for their lives. The moment of decision has come. Never hast Thou forsaken me in this moment, Lord of the world! I have always come before Thee on the Day of Atonement with my pleading, and, with Thy loving voice, which I know so well, Thou hast shed abroad the answer in my heart. . . . Answer me now! . . . Who is Jesus of Nazareth? . . . Answer! . . . What should I do? . . . Who is Jesus whom they call the Messiah? . . . Has the Messiah come? . . . Have we profaned Thy light? . . .

(*Trumpet blasts, always shorter and wilder. Paul, pale, fixed, with closed eyes, as if in a trance.*)

Gamaliel (stamping imperiously): Answer!

(A long trumpet blast, which dies away slowly. Deep silence, long and breathless.)

Gamaliel: No answer! For the first time, no answer! Empty am I like death!

Paul (softly and fervently): I have received the answer, Rabbanu! Here am I!

Gamaliel (suddenly quite collapsed): I know the Truth no more. . . . Go! (He lets the knife fall.)

Paul (suddenly falling on his knees): Take it from me, Rabbanu! Here is my people, here my house. What should I accomplish in the world, I, a poor weak Jew? (He takes Gamaliel's hand and presses it to his forehead.) Yes, I have seen God's answer! I was wafted into dusty streets. In harbours I saw ships come and go; sailors sang. I stood among the throng in a great city and ever must I go—go—go! For the Christ is a tireless hunter.

Gamaliel (as though out of a far-off dream): "Go—go—go." . . . Was this thine answer?

Paul: Now that I know it, I wish I might sleep and be no more. (Barnabas stands at the entrance.)

Gamaliel (seeming to have just awakened, and in perplexity): Who art thou, Jew? (Letting his hand rest heavily on Paul's head) Whosoever thou art, man, the Lord bless thee, the Lord keep thee, the Lord make His face to shine upon thee. . . .

Barnabas: 'Tis the blessing of the priests.

Paul: Thou givest me the strength for the way. (Rises, and walking backwards, keeping his eyes on Gamaliel the whole time.) "Setting sun of my people. . . ." (Exit with Barnabas.)

Gamaliel (his face becoming slowly distorted, calls out): The Destruction upon us! The Destruction. . . . (He stumbles out with a covered face, his cry dying away in the distance.)

Rabbis Shimon and Huna now come in. They are full of distress, for the scapegoat has returned from the wilderness where it had been led. "God has not accepted the sacrifice, that is clear." Simon Peter, James, and two Nazarenes come forward. They speak together of the rejected sacrifice.

Peter: Seest thou, Paul was right. Every sacrifice of the Law is rejected, for the Son of God was sacrificed.

Shrill military music announces the presence of Roman armies marching in the distance. All present are shaken and pale. Marullus and Frisius enter with a company of soldiers, a surging crowd behind them. The horrified Rabbis demand an explanation of their presence in the holy inner courts of the Temple. "The punishment is death."

The people cry, "Back, death to the Romans!" But Marullus ascends the steps of the raised seat and waves a parchment. The High Priest enters in his robes. He is assisted by the priests, for he is scarcely able to stand. The people fall back, and a space opens between him and Marullus. The High Priest gathers himself together and commands Marullus, in the

name of God, to leave the Holy Temple. Marullus politely informs him that they are all on Roman ground. He is still his courteously mocking self as he tells them of the edict of the divine Caesar Caligula "which annuls all their privileges." There are shouts of "Enemy of God!" But Marullus, waiting calmly for silence, quells the noise and reads the edict to the silent throng.

There is martial music which Marullus explains: "Petronius marches on to Jerusalem, bringing the statue of the lawful god with him."

The deep silence is at last broken by an awful cry from all the Jews. They cast themselves at Marullus's feet and beg for mercy. The High Priest reels and nearly falls. He is upheld by the priests.

A voice is heard: "Gamaliel will help us! Where is Gamaliel?" The cry is taken up on all sides. Marullus turns to Frisius and says in an undertone: "I am curious to see whether thy Gamaliel will to-day also play the rôle of being above all this."

There is an abrupt silence. The body of Gamaliel in his shroud is brought in by Levites. "Here is Rabbanu," announces Rabbi Meir sadly.

Marullus: Frisius, this man is invincible.

The people break into a wailing that is not less dreadful for being subdued, and it continues to the end. Rabbi Shimon comes and kneels beside the body. "Father," he cries, "why art thou so terribly silent?" The noise without rouses them all. Rabbi Zaddok shouts in a frenzy: "Listen, the catapults rumble, the storm-rams bleat. The flame roars. The plough crunches over Zion."

Martial music is very loud and near.

Peter (who has been a silent witness to this scene, turns to the Nazarenes, saying): The last righteous one has passed away. The Anti-Christ has come. Every promise has been fulfilled. (He is trembling with his strong emotion. He waves his hand feebly.) Go home. The Hour of the Christ has come.

CURTAIN.

APPENDIX

A Russian Philosopher on Judaism and Christianity.

Dostoevsky once said in a famous speech at the Poet Poushkin Festival, in 1880, that the chief characteristic of the Russian people, which is so strongly expressed in Poushkin's genius, is the ability to grasp the spirit and ideas of alien nations—a sympathetic understanding of the opinions of others. The intimate friend of Dostoevsky, the philosopher Soloviov, possessed this gift to an extraordinary degree. This great Christian thinker could almost identify himself with the persecuted Jews of Russia. He constantly fought against the anti-Jewish legislation of the Czarist Government. His "Protest against the anti-semitic movement in the Press" ends with the following prophetic words:

"The anti-semitic movement must be condemned, not only because it is immoral and wicked, but because it is extremely dangerous for the future of Russia."

In the mutual relationships between Jews and Christians Soloviov observed the following fact: The Jews have treated the Christians "Jewishly," but the Christians have not treated the Jews "Christianly." If we do not practise Christ's Gospel of Love in relation to the Jews, then they are justified in asserting that the "Gospel of Love" is merely the Gospel of a visionary.

But have not the Jews crucified Christ? And are they not still His greatest enemies? Soloviov's reply was: "It is true that the majority of those who cried 'Crucify Him! Crucify Him!' were Jews, but it is also true that the thousands who listened to the preaching of St. Peter, and who became the first members of the Christian Church, were Jews. Anna and Caiphas were Jews, but so were Joseph and Nicodemus. To the same people belong Judas the traitor, who delivered the Messiah to death on the Cross, as well as Peter and Andrew, who for Christ's sake were themselves crucified. Thomas, who at first did not believe in the Resurrection, was a Jew, and he did not cease to be a Jew after he had seen the Risen One, and had said to Him, 'My Lord and my God.' Saul of Tarsus, the cruel persecutor of the Christians, was a Jew, and Paul the Apostle, who for Christ's sake did suffer all things, remained a typical Jew. And what is more important than all, Our Lord Himself was a perfect Jew after the flesh and after His human Soul."

"Is it not remarkable," asks Soloviov, "that we, facing this tremendous fact, persecute the Jews in the name of Christ? If Christ is not what He claimed to be, then the Jews have no greater responsibility than the Greeks had for killing Socrates; but if we believe that Christ is the incarnate Logos, we must consider the Jewish people as the Divine instrument of the Incarnation. For His Death, the Romans, as well as the Jews, are responsible, but for His Birth, God and the Jews only."

Why was the Church of Christ founded in Judea? In other words, Why did God choose the Jewish people to become the people of the Messiah? There must be some moral foundation for His choice. True freedom does not exclude reason; this choice represents the relationship between God and Israel, and, after all, every choice is conditioned, not only by the character of the chooser, but also by the quality of the chosen.

It cannot be denied that the national character of the Jews shows an inner unity; yet we find in it three fundamental characteristics which appear to contradict each other.

1. The Jews are marked by a deep religious sense which often culminates in self-sacrifice for God's sake. They are the people of the Law and the Prophets, of the martyrs and Apostles, "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions."

2. Extreme self-consciousness is another of their national features. Every Jew is deeply permeated by the consciousness of his individual worth as a Jew.

3. Another characteristic is his extreme materialism, in the wider sense of the word. Soloviov finds a symbol for this in the Hebrew alphabet, which consists only of consonants, the body of words, whilst the spirit (the vowels) is either totally absent, or merely suggested by dots and dashes!

Thus, the character of this peculiar people is composed of a Divine element, which reveals itself in the religion of the Jews; of human energy, which expresses itself in the national, personal, and family life of the Jews; and of an inclination to materialism. But in which way do all these self-contradictory elements unite in one national individuality? One should expect that the perfect attachment to God would, if not paralyze, at least weaken, the human interest in worldly affairs, as for instance is the case in Brahminism. Again, the extreme development of the human element—of humanism in one form or another—should on the one hand, weaken the religious feeling, and, on the other hand, free the human spirit from crude materialism, as we see it, for instance, in the best representatives of ancient Greece and modern Europe.

And yet, in Judaism all these contradictory traits are harmoniously united, without in any way disturbing the unity of the national character. In order to find the key to the solution of this riddle we must not be content to dwell on the abstract conceptions of religion, idealism, and materialism *in general*, but study the peculiarity of *Jewish* religion, *Jewish* humanism, and *Jewish* materialism. It is true that the Jew believes in *one* God, but that does not mean an absorption in the Deity, in a pantheistic sense. The Cabbalistic pantheism and the philosophy of Spinoza are exceptions. Generally speaking, Judaism conceived God not as an endless vacuum of a general substratum, but as an endless fullness of a Person who contains all life in Himself, communicating it to all. Free from all limitations, the true God is not merely immanent in the world, but also transcendent, manifesting Himself as the perfect Personality, the absolute Ego. In harmony with this conception of the Divine Personality, religion cannot mean an absorption of human personality in the Deity; on the contrary, it is the expression of the personal, mutual activity between God and man. It was because of this conception of God and of religion, that Israel could become the chosen people of God. The true God made Israel His people because Israel also made the true God her God. God elected them, revealed Himself to them, made a Covenant with them. The Covenant-relationship between God and Israel is the centre of the Jewish religion. This Covenant was conceived as between two, if not equally powerful, yet ethically co-equal personalities. This high conception of man does not weaken the greatness of God; on the contrary, it gives Him the possibility of revealing Himself in His whole power. In the independent ethical character of man God finds an object worthy of Himself. If man were not a free personality how could God reveal His personal character in the world? In so far as the transcendent personal God is higher than the impersonal phenomena of Nature, the religion of Israel is of an entirely different calibre from the naturalistic and pantheistic religions of the ancient East. Neither God nor man in these religions claims independence; man is a slave of strange and unknown powers, and the Deity is merely a pure plaything of human phantasy, as, for instance, in Greek mythology. Not so in the religion of Israel. Christianity begins with the personal relationship between God and man in the Old Covenant, and it culminates in the close personal union of God and man in the New Covenant through Jesus Christ, in Whom both natures are inseparably one. These two Covenants are not two different religions, but two phases of one and the same religion—of God-manhood—or to use a more abstract expression, two moments of one and the same Divine-human process. This one, true,

Divine-human, Jewish-Christian religion steps in majestically between two extreme perversions of Religion: Brahminism on the one hand, where human personality is absorbed in the Deity; and Greek and Roman mythology on the other hand, where the gods are mere reflections of men. The true God Who chose Israel and was chosen by Israel, is a powerful God, an absolute God, a holy God. The strong God chooses to Himself a strong man who can fight with Him; the perfect Person reveals Himself only to a self-conscious personality; the Holy God unites Himself only with one who seeks holiness, and is capable of an active, moral heroism. Human weakness seeks God's strength, but it is the weakness of a strong man—a man who is by nature weak is not capable of a strong religion. Equally, a non-personal, characterless man, with a poorly developed self-consciousness, cannot comprehend the Truth of the true God. Finally, to a man in whom the freedom of ethical self-determination is paralyzed, who is not able to begin an action consciously, who is not capable of performing an heroic action, to attain holiness—God's Holiness will always remain something external and foreign—he will never become a "friend of God." Thus, the genuine religion of Israel, far from hindering the development of a free human personality, *promotes* self-consciousness and energy in man.

Israel was great in faith. But a great faith demands great spiritual powers. The energy of a free humanity expresses itself first in faith. The popular idea that *faith* suppresses the freedom of the human spirit, and that *knowledge*, on the other hand, widens this freedom, is absolutely wrong. In faith, the human spirit transcends the limitation of the visible reality. It affirms the reality of the *invisible*—a reality which cannot be rationally apprehended. True faith is the heroic act of the spirit, "which searches all things, yea, the deep things of God." The believing spirit does not wait passively for the influence of phenomena on him, but goes out bravely to meet them; he does not follow slavishly the phenomena, but precedes them. It is free and independent. "Blessed are those who do not see, and yet believe." In the empiric knowledge, on the contrary, our spirit, by subjecting itself to external facts, is passive and unfree; here, there is no action, no moral merit. Naturally, the contrast between faith and knowledge is not an absolute one. The believer *knows* the Object of his faith, and, on the other hand, scientific knowledge is often founded on faith, on something that cannot be proven empirically—for instance, the objective reality of the physical world, the continuity of natural laws, the undecipherableness of our mental judgments. Nevertheless, it is without doubt that in religion *activity* and *freedom* predominate, but

in the domain of empirical knowledge—*passivity and dependence*. The acknowledgment of a fact coming to us from without does not require the independence and energy of the human spirit; but the realisation of something, which has not, as yet, become a sensuous, tangible, visible fact, requires the energy of the whole personality. The thing which is before our eyes *forces* us to acknowledge its existence; but the power of the spirit consists in this—that we can by intuition see what is coming, recognise what is hidden and mysterious. Just because of this, the highest energy of the human spirit reveals itself in the prophets of Israel, not *in spite* of their faith, but *because* of it.

This union of a deep faith in God with the highest concentration of human energy has been preserved also in *later* Judaism. How sharply, for instance, is this expressed in the last prayer of the Passover ritual, in which the longing for the coming of the Messiah is voiced:

"Almighty God, create soon Thy Temple, soon—in our days—as soon as possible—build it now—build it to-day, build soon Thy Temple. Good God, great God, mild God, high God, merciful God, sweetest God, immeasurable God, God of Israel, in the nearest time build Thy Temple. Soon—soon—in our days—build it now, build it soon, Thy Temple. Almighty God, living God, strong God, God full of praises, merciful God, eternal God, fearful God, perfect God, omnipotent God, rich God, majestic God, faithful God, now—soon—build Thy Temple. Soon—soon—in our days—soon—now—build—build now, now—soon—build Thy Temple."

In this remarkable prayer we note, apart from the sincere faith in the God of Israel and the stubbornness of the human will, a characteristic peculiarity. The worshippers do not desire that their God should remain in the transcendent sphere. Seeing in Him the ideal of every perfection, they demand the embodiment of this ideal on *earth*. They pray that God should reveal Himself visibly, that He should create a Temple to Himself, the material dwelling-place of His power and His glory—and that this Temple should be built now—"as soon as possible." In this impatient longing to see the Divine realised on earth we can find the explanation of the Jewish this-worldliness, their materialistic outlook. There are three different types of materialism: the practical, the philosophical, and the religious. The first means the predominance of the lower human nature over the higher, of the animal instincts over reason, of the sensuous interests over the spiritual. In order to justify the power of the animal nature in his life, the practical materialist seeks to deride the existence of everything which cannot be grasped by this lower nature. He denies everything that cannot be seen or heard, touched, weighed, or measured. In making this denial a general principle this practical materialism becomes

a theoretical or a philosophic system. These two kinds of materialism are not characteristic of the Jews. Jewish materialism is *religious* materialism, or, rather, realism. For every idea and every ideal the Jew demands a visible and touchable materialisation. He cannot acknowledge an ideal which has no power to subdue under it every activity of life. He is capable and prepared to acknowledge the highest spiritual truth, but only on condition that he should at the same time see and feel its real working. He believes in the invisible (for every belief is a belief in the invisible), but he desires that this invisible should become visible and reveal its power; that it should permeate everything material, and use the material as a medium and an instrument. Israel saw in material Nature the not-yet-finished dwelling place of the Divine-human spirit, and paid the greatest attention to it, not in order to worship it, but rather to worship *in* it, and *through* it, the Creator. The idea of the materialisation of the spiritual, "The Word becoming Flesh," played, in the religion of Israel, a much more important rôle than in any other religion. One can say that the whole religious history of the Jews was directed towards preparing for the God of Israel not holy souls alone, but also holy bodies. Therefore the Jewish people formed the genuine environment for the Incarnation of the Divine Logos, for which not only a holy, virginal soul was necessary, but also a holy, pure body.

Thus, these three characteristics formed *one* unity in the religion of Israel. The true Israelite did not desire anything other than that the Object of his faith should make use of the whole fulness of reality and permeate it. Then, too, the purely human longing for action could not be satisfied with abstract ideas and ideals, but expected the real incarnation of the ideas, so that the spiritual demands should entirely dominate the material life. The religious materialism of the Jews is not rooted in unbelief—on the contrary, it springs out of a fulness of faith which pants after activity. The religious materialism has its origin not in the *weakness* of the human spirit but in its *strength* and *energy*; which is not afraid to defile itself by coming into contact with matter, which it purifies and uses for its religious aims. In this way these three fundamental characteristics of the Jewish people, in their co-operation, contributed to the realisation of the work of God in Israel. The firm belief in the true God made the manifestation of God, and His revelation in Israel, possible. By believing at the same time in themselves and their mission, Israel was able to enter into a personal relationship with Yahveh, to speak with Him face to face, to enter into a Covenant with Him, to serve Him, not merely as a passive instrument, but as an active ally, and, when the

fulness of time came, Israel was able to prepare, in her midst, a pure and holy place for the Incarnation of the Logos.

Therefore the Jews became the people of the Messiah. However, only when the free faith in the living God takes the first place, does Jewish self-consciousness, as well as Jewish materialism, serve God's cause and promote the establishment of true Theocracy. But, as soon as these two purely human qualities of the Jewish character hold sway over the religious element, and as soon as the latter becomes subordinate to the former, we see before us the traditional, caricatured Jewish type with its deformed features; which explains, if it does not excuse, the general antipathy towards Judaism. The national self-consciousness, torn from its Divine element, becomes mere Chauvinism; the realism of the Jewish spirit is then perverted into mere Mammonism, which hides the features of genuine Judaism from foreign, prejudiced eyes.

Christianity appears to the Jews, in so far as it means the Gospel of universal brotherhood, as something vague, abstract, and unreal. On the other hand, since Christianity connects the work of world-redemption exclusively with the Person of Jesus, it seems to the Jews to be something narrow and impossible. Moreover, the practical and realistic Jew often considers Christianity as something unrealisable and therefore false. That it should be possible to gather all round the One, and through the One unite each with all, is incomprehensible to him. We can convince the Jews of the Truth which is in Christ only by action. The more perfectly the Christian world expresses the idea of a spiritual and universal Theocracy, the more powerfully this idea works in the life of the individual, in the social life of Christian peoples, in the political relationships of Christian nations among themselves, the more will the Jews be convinced of the reality of Christ and of His Gospel, and "Wisdom will be justified by her children."

Hence, the Jewish question is really a Christian question.

Love and the Messianic Age.

A Study in Jewish Mysticism, with special reference to the Fourth Gospel. 3s. 6d. net.

"The twofold attraction of 'Love and the Messianic Age' is that it breaks new ground in research, and that it is by a thoroughly competent investigator. . . . The Rev. Paul P. Levertoff is an acknowledged expert in this field of study."—*Prof. F. Moffat, D.D., D.Litt., in "Expositor."*

"The book is crammed with suggestive and stimulating thought, and is pervaded by real spiritual beauty. It is a mint of good things and solid learning. . . . We warmly commend this volume both for its theological and devotional value."—*Prof. Canon G. H. Box, D.D., in "Civitas Dei."*

"Based on Hebrew and Aramaic writings, whose ideas have never been reproduced by any Jewish or Christian scholar, this little book is worth special attention."—*The Times Literary Supplement.*

Die religiöse Denkweise der Chassidim.

(University of Leipzig Publications. Research Institute for Comparative Religion.) 12s. 6d.

"Levertoff is a very safe and reliable guide to the study of Judaism. . . . Almost every page of this remarkable book contains important illustrations to the New Testament."—*Prof. Paul Fiebig in "Deutsche Literaturzeitung."*

"A most valuable contribution to New Testament scholarship."—*Prof. P. Krüger in "Theol. Literaturblatt."*

"An important contribution to theological scholarship."—*Prof. Gustaf Dalman.*

"Levertoff has steeped himself, as no other scholar known to us has done, in the devotional and religious literature of Hasidism. He is steeped in Jewish learning, and extraordinarily sensitive to the Jewish affinities of early Christianity."—*Prof. Canon G. B. Box in the "Church Quarterly Review."*

Midrash Sifre on the Book of Numbers.

(The first Commentary on the Book of Numbers, with special reference to the New Testament. Introduction by Canon G. H. Box). Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. 7s. 6d. net.

"The volume has been carefully annotated and attention is often called to the light thrown on the New Testament by this literature. . . . It is to be cordially welcomed."—*Prof. A. S. Peake in the "Holborn Review."*

In a long review in *The Tablet*, Aug. 7, 1926, a Roman Catholic scholar points out the importance of this work for all New Testament students.

"The Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge are to be congratulated on adding this important Rabbinic Commentary to their 'Translations of Early Documents,' and Levertoff on the way in which he has carried out the task."—*Journal of Theological Studies.*

The Order of Service of the Meal of the Holy King.

A Hebrew-Christian Liturgy. Mowbray. 1s.

"Mr. Levertoff claims that it is based on early Jewish and Christian liturgical sources; and an examination of it very soon shows that this claim is thoroughly justified. . . . We say emphatically that he has been splendidly successful."—*Prof. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., in "The Guardian."*

"A learned and interesting liturgy."—*Church Times.*

"I have read it through and through again with ever-increasing admiration."—*Prof. Canon A. Nairne, D.D.*

"It combines most skilfully traditional Jewish forms of liturgical worship with Christian motifs."—*Prof. Canon E. A. Cooke, Christ Church, Oxford.*

"It is a beautiful service and anyone can see it on the face of it."—*W. H. Frere, D.D., Bishop of Truro.*

E T
LEV

ILI

RL