

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ST. PAUL FROM A JEWISH POINT OF VIEW.

IT is a strange fact that the apostles chosen by Jesus of Nazareth to teach, in the first instance, the Jew, versed in the law, were, whatever their moral excellences may have been, on the whole, as regards Hebrew, untutored men. On the other hand, the Apostle of the Gentiles was one deeply versed in all the wisdom of the Jews, among whom he had only nominally to preach, whilst he was almost wholly untutored¹ in the learning of those whom he was to win to the new religion. But 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 Gentile Judaism, if we may say so.

If Jesus of Nazareth—a place from which people never expected any good to come—*founded* Christianity, Saul of Tarsus—a place where heathenism was practised in its most corrupt form—certainly *spread* Christianity; Christianity which was to usher in that portion of Judaism destined to

¹ It is generally held that St. Paul was well acquainted with the language and literature both of Greece and Rome. For this assertion surely there is not sufficient warrant. His Greek is not better than that of any boy born in such a place as Tarsus, and his quotations from classic literature were not only current in every Greek or Roman, but even in every Jewish city. Menenius Agrippa's fable about the members and the stomach, Caius Mucius Scævola's "Romanus sum civis," possibly, though not necessarily, quoted by St. Paul (Acts xxii. 28, etc.), Aratus' true description of our connection with God (though pantheistically used by its heathen author), were well known to every half-educated child in the Apostle's time. Has anybody ever dreamt of ascribing to R. Yehoshu'a ben Chananyah an acquaintance with classical literature on account of his quoting the fable of the lion (wolf) and the crane (see *Bereshith Rabbah*, cap. lxiv.)?

become the light of the Gentiles, redeeming them thereby from deadly sin, pouring out upon them the Spirit of Sanctification, and securing to them everlasting salvation.

If Saul, the first king of Israel, went out to seek for the asses of his earthly father, and obtained on that occasion the kingdom of Israel (1 Sam. ix. 3-20, x. 1-24), Saul of Tarsus went out to seek for the asses¹ of his Heavenly Father, and obtained thereby the kingdom of the Gentiles. The Lord, who in His *Justice* had swept away the wicked generation of the Flood, dispersed the rebels who built the Tower of Babel, destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah and their criminal sister-cities by fire and brimstone; that same Lord in His *Mercy* devised a means and appointed an agent, not of crushing, destroying, and sweeping away those who were even more wicked, rebellious and criminal than the generations of the Flood, the Dispersion, and the Destruction of the five cities, but of sweeping away that wickedness itself. *That means was Christianity, and that agent was Saul of Tarsus!* If Jesus of Nazareth said of Himself 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 not lost, many who stood in need of no physician because they were whole, Saul of Tarsus 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.² The

¹ It must not be forgotten that the pre-Christian Gentiles, owing to their immoral state, were not better, and *less* innocent, than the asses, as both the prophet Ezekiel (xxiii. 20, concerning Egyptians) and the Babylonian Talmud (*Berakhoth*, leaf 58 a, concerning heathens in general) distinctly state. (Comp. Schiller-Szinessy, *Exposition, etc.*, p. 30, note 3, and p. 31, notes 1-4. For the same reason the Founder of Christianity (Matt. xv. 26, etc.) gives them the scarcely superior title of dogs.

² A certain lecturer's remark (in his paper, *Jewish Proselytes in Olden Times*,

Lord loves all nations, although His saints are in the hands of Israel (Deut. xxxiii. 3); and He destined Israel to be a light to the Gentiles, that thereby he (Israel) might become His salvation to the end of the earth (Isa. xlix. 6). All Israel, therefore—the generations that have passed away,

iv.), that “the celebrated denunciation of Jesus (Matt. xxiii. 15) is scarcely warranted by any evidence now extant,” only shows that he (or rather his teacher in Rabbinic) has not read enough of the Midrashim in the original (for what he says in v. he has only at second hand). Had he done so, he would have found three passages, with slight variations, each fully bearing out the first part of the denunciation of Jews compassing sea and land to make one proselyte. Rab Chanin says: “There has been said concerning (the immorality of) the inhabitants of the sea-coast what had not been done (said) concerning the generation of the Flood (Zeph. ii. 5), ‘Woe unto the inhabitants of the sea-coast, the people of *Kerethim*, a people that deserve excision (*Kareth*); but by what merit do they continue to exist? By the merit of one heathen who becomes a God-fearing man (*i.e.* a proselyte) that they furnish every year.” (See *Bereshith Rabbah*, xxviii.; *Midrash* on Canticles i. 4; and *Yalqut* on Zeph. ii. 5.) (Compare Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 35.) Thus the fact of one proselyte being made every year by the scribes and Pharisees is verified. As regards the motives of those acting in this conversion, it must be remarked that there were excellent Pharisees and wicked Pharisees, and that out of the seven kinds of Pharisees which the Talmud (Yerushalmi, *Berakhoth*, ix. 5; Babli, *Sotah*, 22 b) enumerates, only two kinds were good, and of these only one was perfect: this one being a Pharisee, like Abraham, out of love to God. The second part of the denunciation of Jesus is borne out in the following way. A goodly number of things done by a non-Jew are not sins, but if done after becoming a Jew, are sins. For example, a non-Jew who works on the Sabbath, who does not fast on the Day of Atonement, etc., does not commit a sin. If he becomes a Jew and does not observe these Jewish laws, his sin is even greater than that of the Jew who neglects the same, seeing that whilst one born in the Jewish religion is only by reason of his birth bound to keep these laws, one voluntarily embracing the Jewish religion and disregarding its laws becomes thereby twofold more a son of hell (T. B., *Yebamoth*, 47a; comp. Tur and Shulchan 'Arukh, *Yoreh De'ah*, Siman 268, § 2). It ought to be added, that whatever the opinion of Jews may be concerning the doctrines of the person of Christ, a religious Jew, *i.e.* a person whose religion does not consist in a mere negation of Christianity, cheerfully admits that Jesus of Nazareth was a man of the highest morality, and that he would not have uttered a word which he knew was not true. Moreover it is a well-known fact that by the side of sincere and truly religious Pharisees there were also found hypocrites, who used Pharisaism as a mere cloak, *tout comme chez nous aujourd'hui*. Has there ever been, or is there, a religious body in the midst of which this pest of hypocrites has not been, or is not to be found? Significant is the remark made by king Alexander Jannæus to his wife on his death-bed (Talmud Babli, *Sotah*, leaf 22 b): “Fear neither the Pharisees nor the non-Pharisees (*i.e.* the Sadducees), but fear the hypocrites (lit. “the dyed ones”) who look like Pharisees, whose deeds are those of Zimri and who demand the reward of Phineas” (Num. xxv. 6, 14, 15, *ibid.* 7, 11–13).

those now existing, and those yet to come—had, have, and ever will have, individually and collectively, the high duty of teaching the Gentiles. The Gentiles shall stand and feed the flocks of the Jews, shall be their ploughmen and their vinedressers, whilst the Jews shall be named the priests of the Lord, and shall be called the ministers of God (Isa. lxi. 5, 6). Waiting at the altar, they shall be partakers with the altar. The Jews shall have no riches of their own,¹ but shall live on the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory the Jews shall boast (*Ibidem*). Collectively Israel has hitherto not fulfilled this 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, representing the thirteen tribes of Israel.² The most Hebrew of these thirteen Hebrews, who laboured more abundantly than they all, though not he, but the grace of God that was with him (1 Cor. xv. 10), was Saul who also is called Paul³ (Acts xiii. 9).

¹ However honourably the rich Jews have acquired their riches, and however charitably they spend a large portion of them, both on their co-religionists and on non-Jews, it is, in the interest of the Jews themselves, most undesirable that they should excel their neighbours in wealth. These acquisitions not only arouse the envy of their fellow-citizens, but render such Jews themselves less inclined to fulfil their heaven-taught duties.

² 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 nearly 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.

³ The absurdity of the opinion that Saul was called Paul from his noble Roman convert Sergius Paulus is too patent, and may be dismissed at once. Nor was he called Paul from the phrase used by him in reference to himself, "I am the least of the apostles" (1 Cor. xv. 9). He was no doubt called Saul and Paul simultaneously by his parents, in accordance with the Jewish fashion prevailing long before his time and to this day, of giving a Jewish child two names—one religious and one secular (see *Schiller-Szinessy Catalogue*, i. p. 160, note 1). Nor is "Paulus," signifying "little," a mere accident. It is a remarkable fact that Saul addressing Samuel (1 Sam. ix. 21) had long before used the following words: "Am not I 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?"

The great Apostle of the Gentiles was apparently the younger of two children and the only son of his parents, who, like their parents before them, were strict Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6 R. V., and Lumbly, *Camb. Bib. for Schools*). These 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 Benjamin¹ (Rom. xi. 1; Philipp. iii. 5), to which the first king, who with all his shortcomings was declared by a voice from heaven to have been the chosen of the Lord (*Shaul Bechir Adonai*, Talmud Babli, *Berakhoth*, leaf 12 b), belonged, a circumstance which rendered this name popular in the tribe. They 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 (Mishnah, *Yebamoth*, vi. 6; comp. Tur and Shulchan 'Arukh, *Eben Ha'ezer*, Siman i. § 1), and that this commandment is not wholly fulfilled till a man has one son and one daughter at least (*ib.* 5); the Divine inheritance of male children was, among 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.² Father and mother, therefore, no doubt

¹ That the apostle Paul knew the tribe to which he belonged need surprise no one, as Judah and Benjamin had been separated from the ten tribes. A fact somewhat surprising is that R. Yochanan ben Napcha (of the 3rd century) knew that he was of the tribe of Joseph (T. B., *Berakhoth*, leaf 20 a).

² Here is a suitable occasion for removing a mistaken notion prevailing among the Gentiles concerning the position of women among the Jews. From a prayer recited by the males every day, "Blessed be Thou, Lord our God, King of the Universe, Who hast not made me a woman," the Gentiles arrive at the conclusion that in the eyes of the Jews a woman is looked upon as inferior. That woman is destined to be subordinate to man is admitted by the Old Testament (Gen. iii. 16) and by several passages in the New, as is well known. When a Jew says this blessing it is for two reasons: first, destined to be the mistress, woman has to look well to the ways of the household, and is therefore exempt from fulfilling all commandments depending on certain parts of the day which the male has to fulfil. Secondly, God has decreed and nature has destined woman to be subject to certain infirmities to which man is not subject, and in sorrow to bring forth children, from which man is exempt; therefore

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").¹ But 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").² Tarsus was a great commercial emporium, whilst Jerusalem was not; had they intended their son to be a merchant, they certainly would not have sent him from his native place to the Holy City. Tarsus was also a great philosophical school, 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. They, no doubt, had him taught the Bible at five years of age, the Mishnah at ten, and the Talmud at fifteen.³ We know from the Acts, that Saul spoke Hebrew (xxi. 40), and from Epistles, the genuineness of which has been rarely questioned,⁴ that he was well

his thanksgiving. Woman, on the other hand, gently submitting to God's wise ordinances, meekly pronounces the words: "Blessed be Thou, Lord our God, King of the Universe, Who hast made me according to Thy will." Practically the Jewish wife will be found to stand not only on terms of perfect equality, but even, in some cases, of superiority, and the tenderness and affection of a Jewish husband to his wife are proverbial. "If thy wife be little, bend down and whisper into her ear!" is the Talmudic maxim (Babli, *Bobo Metzi'o*, leaf 59 a).

¹ 1 Samuel i. 20, the name of Shemuel, makes this definition to hinge upon the ם being used as a preposition whilst the ך stands for the Most Holy Tetragrammaton. Comp. Gen. xxix. 32, 33. ² 1 Sam. i. 28.

³ See Mishnah, *Aboth*, v. 20. This is no anachronism, as both Mishnah and Talmud, though not in a concrete form, were several hundreds of years anterior to the rise of Christianity. Hillel brought from Babylon Mishniyyoth; the Sopherim even earlier than he composed Mishniyyoth, of which traces are still left (see *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xvi. p. 504, note 5).

⁴ The arguments brought against Paul's authorship of the thirteen Epistles are so weak as to require no refutation; but the writer of this article is fully convinced from internal evidence that the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the original, belonged to St. Paul, and that only the Greek now in our hands is a somewhat inexact translation of it; *teste* vii. 2, 7, "Daily as those high-priests," which is clearly contradicted by ix. 7 "The high-priest alone once in the year." Now any one familiar with Aramaic knows that "Daily" is a mere mistake for the word "Youmo," which is the equivalent of "The Day," i.e. "the

acquainted with Rabbinic argumentation, and that he dexterously used the "Seven Rules" (*Tosephto*, vii. 11) which Hillel interpreted before the sons of Bethera. How could it be otherwise? He sat at the feet of Gamaliel (*Acts* v. 34) in whom was centred not merely the learning of his grand-sire, but that of all generations of Israel down to his day. On the other hand, his knowledge of languages and the profane sciences was very scanty indeed.¹

Saul of Tarsus was of a choleric and melancholy temperament, as is apparent from his writings. He was either near-sighted by nature, or his sight had been weakened by close study, perhaps both. If we may trust to old tradition, he was bald; his mouth, owing to his having early lost his teeth, was fallen in; and his beard was rough. His head was disproportionately large for his body and bent forward Moltke-like. He was altogether insignificant in appearance, of a weakly constitution and subject to epileptic fits. Add to this his trade [most Jews taught their sons a trade (*Mishnah*, *Qiddushin*, iv. 14)]—plaiting the unsavoury-smelling goats' hair into cloth for making tents, which was 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.²

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

Day of Atonement," when the high-priest alone entered the Holy of Holies. There are also many other evidences which (D.V.) we shall give in our Lectures on St. Paul's Epistles.

¹ See Note 1, p. 321.

² The common belief, that Jewish fathers were in the habit of disposing of their daughters without the consent of the latter, is a mistake, and ought to be corrected. "We will call the damsel and inquire at her mouth," has been a rule among Hebrews, Israelites and Jews, rarely violated, down to the present day (comp. T. B., *Qiddushin*, 41a, 81b).

Saul of Tarsus never was or could have been a member of the Synhedrion. However great his learning he lacked several of the qualifications necessary for a member of that body. No one could be placed among its members unless he was of a fine stature, versed in profane learning, having an imposing appearance, being of a certain age, possessing considerable riches (Kesaphim; according to another reading, understanding witchcraft, Keshaphim), having an acquaintance (though perhaps only a slight one) with seventy languages, and able by argument (though only sophistically) to prove animals, positively described as unclean in the Pentateuch, to be clean (T. B., *Synhedrin*, leaf 17 a).¹ It is quite true that the custom, amounting to rule, of marrying at eighteen (Mishnah, *Aboth*, v. 20; and not at twenty as a would-be Talmudic scholar erroneously asserts) 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 a wall, without peace (T. B., *Yebamoth*, 62 b). A Jew that is without a wife is not a man (*ibid.* 63 a). A Jew that is without a wife is as one that sheddeth blood. A Jew that is without a wife diminishes (the circulation of) God's image (*ibid.* 63 b). A Jew that is without a wife deserves death (*ibid.* 64 a). As soon as a man marries his sins cease (lit. are "stopped up, *מתפקין*," *ibid.* 63 b). Saul of Tarsus was not the only one however who, even if he wholly

¹ All these rules were framed for good purposes. The imposing appearance, learning and venerable age were on the one hand to win the confidence of the persecuted innocent, and to exercise a restraining effect upon the wicked accuser and false witness. The possession of riches was to remove the temptation of taking bribes. The knowledge of witchcraft was to enable the judge to give an honest trial in cases of accusation of practising this black art. The knowledge of seventy languages (perhaps a thorough knowledge of one only on the part of each member) was to enable the Synhedrion to dispense with the services of interpreters from outside. The knowledge of sophistic dialectics was wanted to defeat sophistry by the same means; and, finally, a member of the Synhedrion had to be a father, inasmuch as that apparently would render him more sympathetic and merciful.

entertained the same views, nevertheless acted against his convictions for higher reasons. Others besides him, *e.g.* Shime'on ben 'Azzai, who divorced his betrothed (T. B., *Kethuboth*, leaf 63 *a*; comp. *Tosaphoth*, catchword לְבֵרְתִיָּה, and T. B., *Sotah*, leaf 4 *b*); and Rab Saphro, who remained all his lifetime unmarried (T. B., *Pesachim*, 113 *a*), 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. But St. Paul had not even such a high idea of marriage. He no doubt called it honourable, but he called it more than once undesirable. He certainly was more tenderly attached to his true children in the faith than if they had been his own children in the flesh; but even this fact shows that the spirit with St. Paul was everything and the body nothing.

How Saul of Tarsus, consenting to the protomartyr's death, and entrusted with a commission to persecute 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 the 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, out-argued the proud and distinguished philosophers and orators of Greece and Rome, is it not written in the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles? How the feeble, almost blind and epileptic little Jew dethroned the mighty gods of Olympus, is it not duly set forth in the history of the world in general, and in that of the Christian Church in particular? And can this narrative be read by a Jew without deep emotion? 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 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

throw down heathenism, but also to build and to plant Christianity—the Judaism of the Gentiles.

It will be easily understood from all that has gone before, that, in order fully to appreciate the great Apostle, his work and his writings, one must have some knowledge of Judaism and Rabbinic. This is nothing extraordinary; such knowledge is also needed for the proper understanding of the other books of the Greek Scriptures, from Matthew to Revelation. But it may perhaps surprise the readers of this article to learn that the writings of St. Paul are not merely of great interest to the Jews, but of the greatest importance for the understanding of certain laws and passages contained in the Talmuds and Midrashim, etc., the comprehension of which they deepen and the age of which they fix. We will give a few instances, some of which are of an Halakhic, some of an Agadic, one of a liturgic, and one of a Cabbalistic nature.

1. In the Talmud Yerushalmi, *Yebamoth*, ii. 6, the *Bereshith Rabbah*, vii., and elsewhere, a certain rabbi is blamed for having taught that it was lawful to circumcise the child of a Gentile woman on the Sabbath. The phrase which the disapproving R. Chaggai uses runs thus: "Surely we circumcise only on a Sabbath and the Day of Atonement the son of an Israelitish woman!" From the fact of St. Paul not circumcising Titus, whose mother was a Gentile, whilst he circumcised Timothy (who was the son of a Jewess, his father being a Greek) on account of the Jews, we learn that although it is said in Num. i. 18, "they declared their pedigrees after their families by the house of their *fathers*," the race and religion were only determined according to the *mothers*.¹

2. The law that a Jew ought not to bring a fellow-Jew into a Gentile court dates in Jewish literature, at the earliest

¹ It is true that this teaching had been already developed by R. Shime'on ben Yochai, who flourished in the second century (Yerushalmi, as above, and Babli, *Yebamoth*, 23 a).

from the end of the fifth or the commencement of the sixth century (see *Tanchuma*, Pericope *Mishpatim*; comp. also *Sheeltoth*, the same Pericope). Is this ordinance really of so late an origin? One feels from the nature of things that it must be by hundreds of years older, and from 1 Cor. vi. 1, 6, we have positive evidence that such is actually the case.

3. From T. B., *Mo'ed Quatan*, leaf 17a, we learn that we must not publicly rebuke learned men, etc. This tradition is given apparently as being of the second or third century, but it is mentioned already by St. Paul in 1 Tim. v. 1.

4. From T. B., *Megillah*, leaf 26a, the institution of the "seven good men" (deacons) of the town is spoken of in the fourth century.¹ That this institution, however, was at least three hundred years older is proved from Acts vi. 3.²

5. From the phrase, "widows that are widows indeed" (1 Tim. v. 3), we can see that the Rabbinic translation of Ezek. xlv. 22, "and a widow that shall have been a widow indeed," must have been known in the first century.

6. In *Bereshith Rabbah* (cap. xii.) a certain rabbi of the third century says that the ruin wrought by the curse pronounced on the first Adam will not be repaired till Messiah comes. But of course this idea could not have been of so late an origin. From Romans viii. 22 we see that it was well-known to St. Paul.

7. In T. B., *Youmo*, leaf 4a, and *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, i. it is said that Moses "נתקדש בענין." This may mean he was sanctified inwardly in, or that his body was spiritually

¹ It is to be noted that Josephus (*Antiqq.* IV. viii. 14), speaks of "seven men to judge in every city;" but this cannot refer to the institution of the deacons. The writer is there evidently speaking of the Smaller Court of Justice consisting of twenty-three men (seven judges, fourteen Levites, and two more persons to prevent the possibility of equal parties of three times seven, or twice eleven). For a somewhat similar account see *Synhedrin*, Mishnah (i. 6), T. Y. (i. 4), and *ibid.* Babli (17a). Nor can the Mishnah (*Sheqalim*, v. 2), by "Seven *Amar-kelin*," refer to the institution of deacons, as the preceding expression, "three *Gizbarin*," clearly shows.

² Although the Book of Acts was not written by St. Paul, the writer of it was certainly inspired by him, as is well known.

purified by, the cloud, etc. From 1 Cor. x. 2, we see that *נתקדש בענן* must mean "washed by the cloud." Compare *Kiddush yadayim veraglayim* (Mishnah, *Youmo*, iii. 2), which means purification of hands and feet.

8. In T. B., *Synhedrin*, leaves 90b-91b, in which the Resurrection is treated of, there is among other things a proof given from the grain of wheat. Josephus (*Hades*, 5) also uses this simile. But it is more largely and fully treated of in 1 Cor. xv. 37, etc.

9. That the trumpet will be blown on the Day of the Ingathering of Israel is known from the O. T. (Isa. xxvii. 13; Zech. ix. 14); that the trumpet will be blown at the Resurrection of the Dead is taken for granted by the Jews. The earliest source of this is generally given as Saadia Gaon; but this statement is not correct, for it is already mentioned, not only by the somewhat unreliable Josephus (*Hades* 5), but also by the most reliable Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 52.

10. From Philippians iv. 18 we see that the Rabbinic view, given in T. B., *Youmo*, leaf 71a, directing any one that wants to pour out wine upon the altar to refresh the learned, was actually known at the time when temple and altar yet stood.

11. The liturgical phrase, "*Emeth Veyatzib*," etc., is spoken of in the Mishnah, *Tamid* (second century), as having been recited in the temple. It is impossible that the present prolix form could have been recited in the temple; but from the phrase continually used by St. Paul, "faithful saying" (1 Tim. i. 15, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Titus iii. 8) which is evidently taken from the "*Emeth Veyatzib*" in the morning prayers, we can see that originally the phrase must have run "*Emeth veyatzib VENEEMAN HADDABAR*," with the omission of all the matter between, etc.

12. The *Shi'ur Qomah* was certainly known to Saadia Gaon; the Cabbalists hold the book to be of the first

century, and the ideas contained therein to be pre-Christian. These dates are of course ridiculed by anti-Cabbalists as being at least eight hundred years too early. But what will the latter say when they read Eph. iv. 13, where this very phrase, "Measure of the stature," already occurs?

In conclusion, we must mention one point in connexion with St. Paul's conversion. It is the conversion of Jews to Christianity. Whilst most Christians think it a duty to convert the Jews as a whole, and naturally believe in the sincerity of individual Jewish converts, Jews generally not only deny the general proposition, but call into question the sincerity of such individuals. No doubt some of these converts are sincere, whilst others are not. We can quite understand the idiosyncrasies of isolated Jews, who leave the religion in which they were born and embrace Christianity. There are so many points of contact between the two religions, the parent and the child; so many points of attraction in Christianity, so many points of advantage, both worldly and spiritual, that the pure doctrine of Judaism is easily obscured. Christianity indeed has, as regards the Gentiles, a firm footing in the Hebrew Scriptures themselves (Joel iv. [iii.] 18; Zech. xiv. 8, etc.), as mediate help for the development of the world towards Judaism: by the Bible it spreads, by the Messianic idea it promulgates, by the morality it teaches, and by the idea of right and justice as exhibited in the Mosaic Law for which it paves a way. The truth is, according to the Hebrew Scriptures and the history of the world down to our day, the people of Israel must dwell alone and not be reckoned among the nations (Num. xxiii. 9). Christianity for the Gentiles, Judaism for the Jews. As to the sincerity of the individual Jew who becomes a Christian, the Apostle unconsciously and, of course, unintentionally furnishes us with a perfect and unerring standard of opinion—a standard which the writer of these lines has applied at least a hundred times, finding it

in the end absolutely correct. The worst enemies of St. Paul have charged him with becoming a Christian, and teaching Christianity, on account of madness brought about by much study (Acts xxvi. 24) ; but no one has ever charged or indeed could charge him with insincerity. Now what do we find? St. Paul was a zealous Jew before he became a zealous Christian; a bad Jew will rarely become a good Christian. Moreover St. Paul, in his great anxiety to convert his "kinsmen according to the flesh," whom he loved more than himself on account of their being "Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose are the fathers," he, to whom to be with Christ was gain, said that he wished to be accursed of Christ, *i.e.* that he was actually ready to sacrifice his own salvation if he could thereby secure salvation to them. If a converted Jew is sincere, can he stand on the other side in the day that strangers rob Israel of his moral forces? can he, with St. Paul's example before him, speak evil of his kinsmen in the flesh? and still less can he assist in violence against his brother Jacob? (Shame shall cover him for ever!) Now the writer of this article could actually furnish examples of insincere converts, living in England at the present time, which fully bear out this remark. But though—or let it be said, because—a Jew by birth, education, and conviction, he forbears from doing so; and rather glories in the still more excellent way so graphically described by the Apostle (1 Cor. xiii. 1-8), "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to move mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me

nothing. Love suffereth long and is kind: love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness but rejoiceth with the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth." In a word (Prov. x. 12): "All sins are covered by—*love!*"

S. M. SCHILLER-SZINESSY.

THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

VII. NATIONAL REVIVAL.—CHAPS. XII. XIII.

THE prophecies of this book close with predictions of the political importance and military glory of the Jewish people. This future greatness is somehow to be connected with or even to spring out of a poignant national repentance. The cause of this repentance is obscure, but apparently the nation is to be by some means awakened to its undutifulness and disloyalty to its Divine King. The people are to look upon Him whom they have pierced, and to mourn.

Stress is laid upon the circumstance that the repentance will be national and universal: "The land shall mourn every family apart." Once or twice in each generation there occur calamities, such as the Indian mutiny or the Crimean war, when the mourning is not merely national but domestic, not merely domestic but national. As when the firstborn of Egypt was slain, the death-wail rises from every household. The calamity is general, yet each feels as if it were peculiar to himself.

Natural as it is to look for the fulfilment of this prediction in the days succeeding the crucifixion of Christ, it cannot be said that in those days there was anything which could be called a national repentance. The awe which