

*THE DEPENDENCE OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY
UPON JUDAISM.*

IF we wish to understand and appreciate a historical fact, a single personality, or an entire movement, we must compare it with the conditions preceding it and implied by it. Only then we may perceive what was new, what was unique and significant, what was epoch-making in that particular movement. Sometimes the result obtained is quite different from what people have been wont or are wont even now to suppose ; but still it is right. And at the same time we may ascertain from such a comparison, how intimately new theories were linked with older opinions, how much these men learnt from their ancestors. The discoverers and the pioneers in all realms of science and of art stand up on the shoulders of their predecessors and even their most singular opinions are prepared for by the previous development.

The theory is not novel that even the Christian religion had its antecedents. From the beginning its adherents emphasized the fact that it was anticipated by, nay, contained in the Old Testament. And though in this form their opinion was of course erroneous, still it remains true that in a great many respects Christianity starts from the religion of Israel, that its ethical idea of God, and a great portion of its eschatology, may be traced back to the Old Testament prophets. But this would be a sufficient explanation of the origin of Christianity only on condition that there had been no continuance in the religious and moral development of the Jewish people during the two centuries that inter-

vened between the close of the Old Testament and the appearance of Christ. If the development did *not* cease during this period, then the New Testament may be as little sufficiently explained from the Old Testament as the philosophy of Kant from that of Bacon and Descartes or the poetry of Schiller and Goethe from that of Hans Sachs and Simon Dach. And there was no stagnation in the development of the Jewish people in this period in which the nation freed itself from the yoke of the Syrians and came under the rule of the Romans, or at least of the half-pagan dynasty of the Herodians. We even learn from the New Testament itself that this development continued; for in the New Testament we repeatedly meet with expressed or implied opinions and institutions which are subsequent to the Old Testament because not yet mentioned in it. It is true, until recently we did not know much about this development which we are wont to call Judaism, for the literature attesting it had to a large extent been disavowed or even destroyed by the Jews themselves. Only the apocrypha of the Old Testament, which we have even now in some editions of the Bible, were accepted by the Jews as belonging to their Holy Scripture, and not by all Jews, but only by the Jews in the dispersion; the Jews living in Palestine rejected them and all Jews rejected the pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, i.e., other pseudonymous writings of the same time which I shall discuss at greater length by and by. All these writings were preserved by the Christian Church, which in the beginning at least read them together with the canonical books of the Old Testament; later on they were thus regarded only by the oriental Churches which separated from the Catholic Church in the fourth and fifth centuries, the Armenian, Syriac, Coptic and Abyssinian Church. Thus it is to be explained that many of these writings have been preserved to us only in versions in one of these oriental

languages, and it is only in the last decade or two that some of these versions have been discovered or more closely studied. In the main the Germans, and in addition a few English scholars, undertook this task, and through their co-operation both Judaism and primitive Christianity are now better understood by us than by any former generation.

As in this paper I shall sometimes have to cite at least the most important of the writings referred to a moment ago, I think it best to begin with an enumeration and characterization of them. I distinguish three categories.

Of comparatively the least importance or interest for us are the historical books written in this period, whether they describe events of the ancient or more recent past. To the first group belong the so-called Jubilees, a recasting of Genesis, especially supplementing it on the chronological side, i. e., dating every event mentioned in it. For this purpose jubilees or periods of fifty years are distinguished, and, therefore, the whole book is called Jubilees. It is preserved to us in an Ethiopic and partly in a Latin translation. The first and second books of the Maccabees, on the other hand, relate the story of the struggle of the Jewish people for freedom in the second century B. C., they are preserved to us in a Greek translation; but originally all these books were written in Hebrew.

A second group is formed by the practical writings; exhortations to piety and righteousness, partly in connexion with historical or mythical events, partly without such a reference. The former one holds good with regard to the works of Philo of Alexandria, who brings forward his ideas in an allegorical exposition of the Pentateuch, the latter one with reference to the sayings of Jesus Sirach, or as we ought to say more correctly, of Jesus, the son of Sirach, and with reference to the wisdom and the psalms of Solomon, which, however, have nothing at all to do with the historical

Solomon. The psalms of Solomon and the sayings of Jesus, the son of Sirach, were originally written in Hebrew and a large portion of the original of the latter was rediscovered a decade ago; the rest is extant only in Greek, in which language the other works were originally written. The psalms of Solomon contain also some prophecies on the future and lead us thus to the third and most interesting group, to the apocalypses, the predecessors of the Revelation of John.

The oldest of the apocalypses is the book of Daniel, which we have in our Old Testament in Hebrew and Aramaic, published between 167 and 165 B.C. In the first half of the first century followed the book of Enoch, of which only an Ethiopic and parts of a Greek and a Latin translation have been preserved; it was originally written in Hebrew. A little after 6 A.D. appeared the assumption of Moses, after 70 the apocalypse of Baruch and the second book of Ezra. All of these books were probably written in Greek; we have them only in Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian and Ethiopic versions. Everybody who is acquainted with the history of the Jewish people sees at a glance that these apocalypses were written in times of great distress and tribulation; whenever an external foe oppressed the people, whenever the internal affairs seemed to have become intolerable, the Jews believed that this could not last much longer, that God would presently intervene, and usher in the final catastrophe. Now, in order that their prophecies regarding the future might be believed, these men put also the past into this form and attributed their writings to men of the past, who of course had nothing at all to do with them. Still, the material which these men employed was older, and in part even very old; we may therefore make use of their writings to depict the background of Christianity.

Nay, we can go even a little farther and consult occasion-

ally the Talmud, which, it is true, was compiled only later, but the contents of which date in part from the period under discussion. Of course before citing a passage we must always demonstrate that it came from an older tradition and oftentimes we are not yet able to thus discriminate between different strata. But for our purpose rather the before-mentioned writings must be primarily taken into consideration. What then do they teach us concerning the dependence of primitive Christianity on the Jewish religion ?

The centre of gravity of every religion, and therefore also of Christianity, is its idea of God. But with regard to it, primitive Christianity was but slightly influenced by Judaism. The belief in the unity and spirituality of God—to mention here only this—was already held by the prophets and by them transmitted to later generations. But even in Judaism the doctrine of God had gone on developing, and by this development at least the *terminology* of the New Testament was influenced. Not perceiving any more God's action upon the course of things in such a way as former generations had believed to be able to perceive it, these Jews avoided even to speak of Him, and spoke, therefore, of heaven instead of God—as for similar reasons other nations used to do too, and as even we do sometimes now. In this way it is to be explained why in the New Testament sometimes instead of kingdom of God the kingdom of heaven is spoken of—the sense of both terms is in general the same—and why in the well-known parable the prodigal son says: “Father, I have sinned against heaven (i.e., against God), and in thy sight.”

There is another more important point closely related to the preceding one. Notwithstanding His transcendence God must be able to act upon the world—for what is religion if God is absentee ? If, therefore, according to Jewish belief, God could not operate immediately upon the world,

and if we remember that men had not yet learnt to think in terms of natural law, it is plain that they must insert other beings between God and the world. Now already in the Old Testament angels are mentioned ; they were originally the gods of the nations living round Israel, of which at first men did not venture to think as non-existent, and which, therefore, they reduced to the rank of servants of the national God, who was considered to be the mightiest one. But it was only in Judaism, where such intermediary beings were needed, that angels began to play a more important rôle. Nay, to a certain extent, they took God's place and entered into the very scheme of religion. When also the New Testament introduces angels so often, it is so far dependent upon Judaism and its transcendental idea of God. This view Christ had as a matter of fact left behind, when He taught : *God maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust, He feedeth the birds of the heaven and arrays the lilies of the field ; without Him no sparrow falls to the ground.* But nevertheless we hear in the New Testament not only of guardian angels of men, but in the Revelation of John even of angels of the four winds, of the fire and the waters ; nay, wherever in Paul's epistles, or those of other writers, principalities, powers, rules, authorities, thrones, dominions are mentioned, angels must be understood.

Whether these last-mentioned angels are good or bad—that is a question one must not ask at all. They live *jenseits von gut und böse*, beyond the realm of good and bad, they are non-moral beings. But in addition to these there are decidedly good and decidedly bad angels or demons. The last-mentioned were believed in because these Jews could no longer derive evil from God in the same direct way as former generations had done, and because they had not yet learnt to consider evil and sin as unavoidable but

surmountable consequences of a gradual development of the race. Thus it is to be explained, that also in the New Testament, and above all in the Gospels, demons are mentioned again and again, that all sorts of diseases are derived from them, that in many cases sick persons are believed to be possessed with demons. It is true, here primitive Christianity was at the same time influenced by other religions ; but in the first place this belief in demons was an inheritance from Judaism.

The same holds good with regard to the Christian belief in a prince of these demons, in the devil or Satan. He, too, is mentioned already in the Old Testament, but he became only by degrees what he is in Judaism. With the prophet Zechariah, who describes him as accusing the Jewish people before God, he is not yet a bad angel, but *eine Art himmlischer Staatsanwalt*, something like a heavenly prosecutor, who, it is true, delights in his business. Later on in the prologue of the book of Job he is already the enemy of mankind who cannot help injuring them, and who, therefore, is not always in God's company, but only from time to time likes to see the Ancient One, as Goethe puts it in the prologue of his *Faust*. Finally in Judaism Satan became God's adversary, a dualistic conception—partly, it is true, under the influence of a non-Jewish religion, but above all for the same reasons which determined the belief in demons. So also the belief in Satan was an inheritance from Judaism.

Another intermediary being, by which Judaism tried to bridge over the gulf between God and the world caused by the transcendence of God, became a still more important factor for Christianity. Already in the Old Testament, where God in general is represented in a human form, His spirit was occasionally mentioned ; later on it was personified, and finally an intermediary being was thought of, from which all extraordinary phenomena in the spiritual realm

were derived. So in the New Testament the spirit is spoken of as the power by which Christ speaks and acts, by which the Christians preach and teach, by which the author of the Revelation of John prophesies the future. Even the Holy Spirit, into the name of which, as into that of the Father and of the Son, men were baptized, was originally a Jewish conception.

Wisdom is coupled with the spirit in the homonymous apocrypha. It too had been personified already in the Old Testament, later on, by Jesus Sirach and the author of Wisdom, it is represented as an intermediary being. As the latter calls it an emanation of the glory of the Almighty, a copy of the eternal light and a picture of His bounty, and as the same terms are applied to Jesus by Paul and the author of Hebrews, it is clear that to this extent the Christology of the New Testament was influenced by the Judaistic conception of the wisdom. And Christ Himself quotes a saying apparently taken from another apocryphal book: "I will send unto them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall kill and persecute."

More important still for the later development of Christianity became another intermediary being of Judaism which is presupposed in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel, in the first Epistle and in the Revelation of John. We are wont to translate the term by Word—"in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"—but the Greek word *λόγος* signified at the same time the reason or intelligence by which, according to Greek philosophy, the world had been created. The Jewish thinkers in Egypt and elsewhere, whose main representative was Philo, identified this divine reason or intelligence with the word of God, which had sometimes been personified in the Old Testament in the same way as His spirit and wisdom, and which in Greek was designated by the same word *λόγος*,

as reason or intelligence. So a new intermediary being was born; nay, this Logos of God was represented as the creator and preserver of the world, as a second God. Finally the authors of the Fourth Gospel, the first Epistle and the Revelation of John identified this being with Christ, and therefore referred to Him in terms which in their turn influenced the later development of the doctrine of Christ's person. To this extent, then, even this doctrine is derived from Judaism.

In the last place I could mention the Messiah, for in later time He too is an intermediary being that closes the gap between God and the world. But this idea will be more conveniently discussed in connexion with the other expectations for the future which primitive Christianity derived from Judaism.

The prophets expected only a restoration of the former condition of the people, a re-establishment of the kingdom under a descendant of David; to the later generations this did not seem to be sufficient; they postulated a future transformation of all things, a new heaven and a new earth, with a new heavenly Jerusalem. This enormous revolution, with which, of course, the end of this world was to coincide, was to be preceded by signs as they were in olden times expected before every important event. So eclipses of the sun and of the moon and other transformations in heaven and on earth were expected not only in Jewish, but also in Christian literature. Moreover, still other signs were awaited before the end. At first, as we saw a little while ago, the end was announced as often as the inward or outward conditions of the people seemed to have become so intolerable that it was believed: this cannot last any longer, now God must interfere and bring about the end. But later on it was just the other way round; a tremendous increase of sin and evil was expected, *when* and *because* the

end seemed to be near at hand. Of this ghastly apostasy and these terrible calamities before the end, which are described at greatest length in the Jubilees, the Gospels and Paul and the other New Testament writers speak incidentally; they are treated in full by the author of the Revelation of John. Here also a last attack of a hostile power is expected, which in one place is called Gog and Magog in accordance with the prophet Ezekiel, in another is expected from the Euphrates and identified with the Parthians, as in the book of Enoch. In Daniel it is represented by four or two beasts, in the psalms of Solomon by a dragon; both metaphors occur again in the Revelation of John. In the assumption of Moses, the apocalypse of Baruch and the second book of Esra also a leader of this hostile power is expected; in the Second Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians he is described as a counterpart of the Messiah and in the Epistles of John he is called Antichrist indeed. Finally, in Jewish as well as in Christian literature one or two precursors of the Messiah are announced: Elijah and sometimes also Moses are to reappear before the end—apparently because, according to Old Testament and Jewish tradition, these two men had not died but ascended to heaven.

The end itself was originally to be brought about by God's direct interference; and this conception is sometimes found even later on. But in general, after the idea of God having become so transcendent, this no longer appeared appropriate or even possible. So instead of the battle, in which, according to the older view, God was to defeat the enemies of His people, who were at the same time regarded as His own enemies, in later times an assize was expected, at which, it is true, God was to appear even now but without doing anything. A typical description of this assize is given in the book of Daniel. "Thrones were placed and one

that was ancient of days did sit ; his raiment was white as snow and the hair of his head like pure wool. . . . Thousands of thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him ; the judgment was set and the books were opened"—the books in which all deeds of men or the names of those who are destined for eternal life or eternal death are noted down. Ultimately even this assize was no longer conceived of as held by God—He seemed to be too transcendent even for that ; so it was assigned to the Messiah ; but He Himself was more and more represented as a transcendent being. With the prophets and with some even of the later writers He was an earthly king, though endowed with supernatural gifts ; with most of the later apocalyptists He is a heavenly, god-like being, who existed in heaven before appearing on earth. He is called now the Son of Man, and the same term was used by Christ for stating the expectation of His second coming. Nor can it be doubted that Paul and other New Testament writers represented Christ as pre-existing in heaven before His appearance on earth partly at least for this very reason, that Judaism had a similar opinion respecting their Messiah.

Again, this transcendence of the Messiah introduced a new view of His kingdom or reign. In olden times the main stress had been laid upon the outward welfare of the people, and even later on formulas were in use which originally referred to that view. So the expressions used by Christ in the beatitudes—they shall inherit the earth, they shall be filled—had originally no other sense than the literal one ; but in fact, Christ's idea of God's kingdom was just the opposite one. He emphasized the *inward* well-being, the moral regeneration of the people : the kingdom of God is within you ; or, as Paul says : it is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. This new conception of the kingdom of God was prepared for

only by a very few Judaistic writers, especially by the author of the psalms of Solomon.

Sometimes, it is true, the older and this newer conception were combined in Judaism : at first an earthly dominion of the Messiah, limited in duration, was expected, and only afterwards eternal bliss in heaven was to come. According to some Jewish authorities the earthly dominion of the Messiah was to last a thousand years, and in this form the idea was adopted by the author of the Revelation of John. It is well known what an important part this conception of the Millennial reign has played in the history of Christianity, but it was inherited from Judaism.

Where these two acts of the eschatological drama were discriminated in Judaism and Christianity, there also the resurrection from the dead was expected at two different moments : the pious were to be raised before the establishment of the earthly kingdom of the Messiah or Christ, in order that they might be able to take part in it ; the godless were to be resuscitated only before and for the judgment. But why was the resuscitation expected only before the end ? To put it paradoxically : because originally it had not been expected at all. The prophets announced the future salvation for the generation that would live then, not for the former ones ; it was only later that the dead were expected to participate in it ; but because the salvation was to take place at the end, therefore also the dead were to be raised up only then. It is true, in some circles immortal life was expected immediately after death, and beside this the belief in a resurrection at the end had, properly speaking, no sense ; but, nevertheless, it was adhered to. Some expected no real immortality immediately after death, but an intermediate state, lasting until the resurrection, but oftentimes both ideas—the belief in immortality and in resurrection—were found side by side. And in the same way

the Christians until to-day speak of a life immediately after death and still wait for a resurrection at the end. This anomaly and the whole belief in a resurrection at the end of all things come from Judaism, which so far clung to a conception of religion that in general it itself had outgrown. As long as the whole nation and not the individual was the subject of religion, as long as the individual trusted in God only because he belonged to the nation which according to his belief God had elected, so long of course a salvation of the nation, i.e., of the generation then living, and since this did not any longer suffice, a simultaneous resurrection of the dead at the end was expected. But this collectivistic conception of religion had, in fact, been outgrown already by the later prophets, and Christianity was at bottom still more individualistic; so there cannot be the least doubt that only the belief in immortality immediately after death, not in a resurrection at the end of the world, is a true Christian belief. Nay, the whole expectation of a kingdom of God and of a ruler in it, the Messiah, belonged in its original form to that collectivistic conception of religion. It is true Christ Himself preached: the kingdom of God is at hand, He called Himself the Messiah, and seeing that for the present He would not succeed but perish, He expected His coming back on the clouds of heaven to sit in judgment; He could not help clothing His ideas in the conceptions familiar to Himself and to His hearers; but nevertheless all these conceptions were only the outward wrappings of His preaching. He could have dispensed with all these outward forms and sometimes He did dispense with them indeed.

Another idea of Judaism, and a still more fundamental one, by which also the doctrine of the end of all things had been influenced, was explicitly rejected by Christ. The judgment which was expected at the end was to be held

strictly according to works done ; i.e., only those were to be saved who could boast of a sufficient number of good deeds. It is true, in some writings of Judaism, in addition to works, faith is regarded as justifying, and thus it is to be explained that in opposition to Judaism Paul coined the formula : a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law. But in Judaism the main emphasis was laid upon works ; they merited the grace of God. " Much meat," says Hillel, a contemporary of Christ, " many worms ; many treasures—many sorrows ; many women—many superstitions ; but much law—much life." " If thou hast purchased the words of the law, then thou hast purchased the life of the future world." God, from the point of view of Judaism, was primarily a lawgiver and judge, not the heavenly father ; that was, on the contrary, Christ's idea of God. I quoted a little while ago His word : " God maketh His sun rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust " ; but clearer still is perhaps His own attitude towards sinners : before they had improved, nay, before they had confessed their sins He forgave them their debts ; i.e., He assured them of the love of their heavenly father. That contradicted most strongly the Jewish conception of God, as it contradicts the view now held by a great many Christians. Thus at this most central point Christ opposed Judaism, but in other respects even He Himself did start from it.

However tormenting and harrowing the Jewish conception of God as a lawgiver and judge was, it had brought about a moral fervour, a tenderness of conscience, a keenness of self-examination unheard of in olden times. To be sure, the morality was oftentimes an outward morality, people tried to snap their fingers at the law, nay, as Christ said, they made void the word of God because of their tradition ; but in spite of all this it must be confessed that

there was, in many circles at least, a striving after the good which we cannot admire too much. It is true, the morality preached by Christ was different and differently substantiated ; but still it had been prepared for by Judaism.

Where, on the other hand, God's commandments were not kept, and could perhaps not be kept, there was to be found in Judaism a consciousness of guilt more profound than hitherto experienced in all the human race. So it is to be explained that these people propounded to themselves a question which had not yet interested former generations, namely : what is the origin of sin ? Three answers were given to this question, and all these answers are found again in primitive Christianity.

In the first place, sin, as evil, was derived from the demons or the devil. We read in the book of Wisdom : " by the envy of the devil came death into the world "—death, which, as long as immortality was not believed in, had appeared as a rending of all cherished ties, and had, therefore, been considered as a punishment inflicted by God, and was inconsistently so considered even after the belief in immortality had been born. It is well known that also in Christianity death was regarded in the same way, and the devil was considered as tempter ; all this came again from Judaism.

Strange to say, there is in Judaism and primitive Christianity another theory on the origin of sin which, as a matter of fact, traces sin back to God. Sin is rooted in the flesh, i.e., in the physical nature of man, which, of course, comes from God. Thus this theory amounts to the same thing as the explanation of sin which we must give now and which I hinted at a little while ago : sin is an inevitable product of the evolution of man ; it could not be prevented, provided that the bodily development of the individual and the race was quicker than the moral one. There is much reason to thank Judaism for this solution of the problem of

moral evil which, it is true, was perhaps found only by the help of a foreign philosophy.

It is different with reference to the third explanation of sin, which because of Augustine's influence became by far more important in western Christianity than the previously discussed explanations. Sin is held to have originated with the fall of the first man, who in consequence of this fall transmitted to posterity a propensity for evil. This doctrine is considered a genuinely Christian doctrine by many people even now ; but as a matter of fact in its original form it is only an inheritance from Judaism. It is easy to be seen why this explanation is not sufficient ; although sin is partly to be explained by hereditary transmission, the problem of its origin is not yet solved by this theory ; for why did the first man sin ? So this theory on the origin of sin is much less valuable than the second one.

More important still than this borrowing from Judaism was another one which was made by the apostle Paul. The former Pharisee adhered to his Jewish idea of God even after having professed Christianity ; he considered God in the first place as lawgiver and judge, whose love we must merit over and over again. Now for consoling those who had not observed, and perhaps could not observe, the whole law, Judaism had developed a theory which at the same time shows how outwardly righteousness was sometimes conceived there. People thought that moral debts could be compensated for by another man's good deeds just in the same way as pecuniary debts might be paid by another one. Especially undeserved sufferings of the righteous, as the martyrdom of the seven brothers described in the second book of the Maccabees, were believed to be put down by God as merits to others. This theory was applied by Paul to the death of Christ ; Paul could assimilate Christ's message of the love of God to all men only by assuming that God,

who had been angry with men because of their sins, had been reconciled by Christ's sacrifice, and had given the benefit of His innocent death to all men. It is well known how important this theory became for the later history of Christianity, but originally even this theory was an inheritance from Judaism.

There was still another way in Judaism in which people tried to atone for their defects and to uproot their sin : namely, by doing more than they believed themselves obliged to do and by neglecting or suppressing their physical nature, from which, as we saw, sin was oftentimes derived. So on the one hand the abstention from some foods and fasting, on the other the rejection of matrimony is to be explained. We read in the first chapter of the book of Daniel that Daniel and his three friends ate only vegetables and drank only water, and in the same way we hear from later writers of men who did not care for food but mortified their flesh. How widespread fasting was at Christ's time, is evident from the fact that even He Himself did not at all reject fasting on principle ; His disciples are only, when they fast, not to be of a sad countenance, but to anoint their head and wash their face. Of course now, as long as the bridegroom is with them, they cannot fast at all ; but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them and then will they fast. In the rest of the New Testament, it is true, fasting is seldom mentioned and abstaining from certain foods is even opposed ; but later on all this came into use again—partly, at least, under the influence of Judaism.

This is clearer still with regard to the other and last point I intend to mention here—the rejection of matrimony. It is sometimes to be found in Judaism, but not with Christ. He did not wish to reject matrimony when He spoke of those who had renounced it for the kingdom of God's sake ; on

the contrary, He emphasized the Old Testament saying : from the beginning God has made them male and female : for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife. Even Paul never rejects matrimony, he even recommends it—but only for preventing worse things ; for matrimony is for him a lower form of morality. Nobody who has closely studied the seventh chapter of First Corinthians can deny this. When Paul says : “ it is good for a man not to touch a woman ; I would that all men were even as I myself (i.e., unmarried) ; he, that does not give his virgin in marriage, shall do better ; the widow is happier if she abide as she is ”—he does not do this for the reason that married people will suffer more severely from the calamities that, according to Jewish and Christian doctrine, were to precede the end (for in such times the strongest support and the best comfort of a man should be just his wife, and the strongest support and the best comfort of a woman should be just her husband) ; but Paul’s main reason for his judgment is, that he thinks matrimony a lower form of morality. He says : “ the unmarried woman is careful for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit ”—the married woman, according to his idea, cannot do that. So far, then, Paul is doubtless on the path to the monastic ideal ; as, however, his asceticism is not to be explained by other influences, it must be derived from Judaism.

Now this is the point at which even the most conservative and orthodox Christians, at least in the Protestant Churches, confess that we must get rid of this Judaistic influence. It is not to be entirely repudiated ; on the contrary, we have every reason to thank Judaism for its moral fervour, and its natural explanation of sin. But in most cases this Judaistic influence did indeed bring forward ideas which Christ Himself had outgrown, and which the later develop-

ment of Christianity has surpassed and will surpass more and more—just as these wrappings of its origin from lower religious ideas have been shed by modern Judaism. We are, in most cases, unable to adhere to these conceptions ; but we need not for that reason give up other convictions dear to us. Those conceptions, which we have outgrown, did not belong to the essence of Christianity, they came from a religion in which God's relation to the world and to mankind was represented in another way than it was represented by Christ. So by the very rejection of these Judaistic conceptions our belief will become clearer and dearer to us, just as the entire beauty of a picture may be seen only after all veils have been removed.

CARL CLEMEN.

MARY OF BETHANY ; MARY OF MAGDALA ; AND ANONYMA.

RENAN eulogizes Luke's Gospel as "uniting the emotion of the drama with the serenity of the idyll," and declares expressly, "C'est le plus beau livre qu'il y ait." In its idyllic pages three women are successively portrayed. The sketches are only in outline, but they are limned by a master hand (chapters vii., viii., x.).

I. ANONYMA.

We are taken first to Galilee where the young Rabbi from Nazareth is going about doing good. In Capernaum He has healed a centurion's servant who was ready to die. At the gate of Nain He has called back to life a widow's only son and delivered him to his mother. The multitude are beginning to recognise that in Him God has visited His people. Common people and outcasts justify God ; Pharisees and lawyers frustrate the counsel of God "within themselves." One of the latter group, with some hesitation, "desired