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

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

It may be asked, If the Chronicler was so astute as to hide his identity in the other speeches by employing classic Hebrew, how is it that he forgot his cunning in chapter 29 and 2 Chronicles 2?

The answer lies in the fact observable throughout, that the Chronicler has no one consistent method of dealing with his sources, and that therefore inferences drawn from his style and idiom are at best equivocal.

VALPY FRENCH.

ST. PAUL'S LAST VISIT TO JERUSALEM.

THE account of this visit in Acts xxi.–xxiii. presents certain well-known difficulties, which have been used as serious arguments against its authenticity. We read, for instance, (i.) that St. Paul consented to share personally in an elaborate Levitical purification in the temple; (ii.) that he did this in order to show "that there was no truth" in the current report that he taught "all Jews that were among the Gentiles to forsake Moses;[1] (iii.) that before the Sanhedrim he claimed to be himself a Pharisee, who was persecuted for holding the Pharisees' faith "touching the hope and resurrection of the dead." When we recollect that the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans had been written not many months before, such an attitude on the part of their author appears unnatural and inconsistent, not to say disingenuous. And yet there are some neglected elements in the situation, which, I submit, go

33, 8 (*Introd.*, 503, No. 4; 504, No. 18; 505, No. 27). On the grounds of changes like this, it is *impossible* to assert of any late expression in the Chronicles that it has not an historic basis.

[1] Dr. Hatch (in *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th edition, article "Paul") has curiously overstated this point. He describes the report about St. Paul as that "he had told the *Gentiles* not to circumcise their children," and naturally adds that the Apostle's repudiation of *this* "seems hardly credible."

far to explain, if not to justify, the Apostle's bearing, and so far to confirm the narrative.

An English journal has recently discussed the influence exerted by great cities like Athens and Paris over their inhabitants. The Bible is full of proofs of the unique and enduring spell which Jerusalem had power to weave round her children. Through the chequered history of a thousand years the fortunes of the chosen people had centred round this royal fortress, which was also the house and home of God. And as the scattered nation became a Church, its Holy City grew into the one sanctuary of the tribes in their dispersion; it became the symbol of their unity, the Mecca of their pilgrimage, to their imagination the spiritual *omphalos* of the world. Indeed, one may almost say that in St. Paul's day, at least for the stricter Jews, Jerusalem *was* Judaism—in the same sort of way in which through its ages of decline Constantinople was the Eastern Empire. The patriots of Palestine clung to their sacred mother-city with indescribable love and reverence and pride. And the Jew abroad in pagan lands left his heart behind him at home. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning." "He beheld the city, and wept over it." After eighteen centuries of time and ruin and war, a wailing place among the broken walls of Zion still bears witness to the same undying memory and regret.

We may believe that Saul of Tarsus was a boy when he was first brought within these charmed precincts, where he passed all his impressionable youth and early manhood at the feet of the great Gamaliel and under the shadow of the Holy House. He seems to have spent some fifteen years as scholar and student and Rabbi and Pharisee at Jerusalem: this was his school, and college, and university, and cathedral, and metropolis: as we might say, his Eton, and Trinity, and St. Stephen's, and Westminster Abbey,

blended into one. All his beliefs and traditions and hopes clustered round the city and the temple, whose very stones were testimonies to the ancient law of God. And though in after years he outgrew that law as a system, he had no words against the temple as a shrine. His only written reference to the city occurs in a pathetic parenthesis: "Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children" (Gal. iv. 25); for St. Paul felt the galling of the foreign yoke upon Israel. And it is noteworthy how in the next verse, "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all," he was the earliest to transfer that dear and venerable name to the highest Christian ideal. Later writers took up and expanded the usage which soon became a commonplace in the Church; yet the way in which that phrase "the new Jerusalem" attracted and absorbed Christian sentiment bears striking witness to the place held by its original and counterpart in old Jewry. The Apostle was perhaps thirty years old when he rode out of Jerusalem through the Damascus gate to meet that which revolutionized his character and career. He little dreamed that he would never enter the city again except on a few hasty and fugitive visits at long intervals of time. So far as we can tell, it was three years before he returned, and then after a fortnight he had to flee from assassination. Jerusalem was henceforth a place of peril for the heretic Rabbi, the renegade Pharisee. Some seven years later he was back with Barnabas, only to bring alms to the Church (Acts xi. 30, and xii. 23). And after seven years more he returned to the apostolic conference, in which, he tells us, he took part "privately" [Gal. ii. 2—query, on account of his personal insecurity in the city?] And now, "*after many days*," he says, "I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings." Is there no accent of the exiled patriot in those words? Surely the passion of Dante for Florence, the tenderness of Newman for Oxford,

were mingled in St. Paul's love for that Jerusalem which he had quitted for good nearly a quarter of a century before.[1]

It is an error to assume that because St. Paul repudiated Judaism for his Gentile converts he therefore left off keeping the law himself. The logic of his theology might indeed prove that law to be no longer binding on any whom Christ had made free. But personal conduct is always determined by sentiment and habit and association, rather than by mere logic. An eminent modern Rabbi, who has been an earnest and active Christian for forty years, confessed to me recently that he could never yet bring himself to eat food Levitically unclean: the ingrained prejudices of his youth were too strong. Similarly, it is not at all strange to find ceremonial customs persisting in St. Paul long after he was theoretically satisfied that such things were neither vital nor necessary for a Christian. He could still shave his head and register his vow, "as in the manner born." He "hasted" to be in time for the feast at the Holy City with something of the old longing: "Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem." And probably he found it quite easy to submit to the act of ritual proposed to him by the apostles. It was on the face of it an ungracious proposal. But St. Paul had just disburdened himself of the foreign contributions for "the poor saints at Jerusalem"; and it is proverbially difficult to be gracious to benefactors whom you privately dislike and distrust. No one pretends that these "poor saints" had much personal regard for St. Paul. And just on this account his immense charity, which was ready to "be all things," if it might conciliate an opponent or

[1] The following approximate dates of the Apostle's career illustrate the argument, but it does not depend on their accuracy: A.D. 34, conversion; 37, first return to Jerusalem; 44, second visit; 50, apostolic conference; 54, end of second journey (Acts xviii. 22); 59, end of third journey (Acts xxi. 23).

save a brother from stumbling, would move him to comply with their request, if he conscientiously could. To call this "going to Canossa," or "a public penance," or to compare it with Luther in his old age performing a pilgrimage to Einsiedeln with peas in his shoes, is, I think, entirely to misconstrue the situation. St. Paul was never slow to crucify his personal dignity for the gospel's sake, and probably this act of compliance in itself seemed to him a customary harmless piece of ritual. Its precise details are obscure; but it meant that he had to share the ceremony of purification in the temple with four poor devotees, and perhaps defray their expenses as well as his own in the matter. This seems to have involved keeping a kind of "retreat"; the purified lived for seven days secluded in the temple courts, giving their time to meditation and prayer.

Now St. Paul always showed himself sensitive to his environment. Witness his sermon inspired by the legend on a vacant altar at Athens; or his inventory of spiritual armour (Eph. vi.), taken almost certainly from the soldier who was guarding him while he wrote; or his farewell on the beach at Miletus to those friends whom he never expected to see again. And now his heart which had learned so much and yet had forgotten nothing must have been stirred to its depths, when he found himself back at the sacredest place on earth, where he had spent so many early, ardent, mistaken years, and whence had sprung the chief opposition to his later mission and ministry. And yet probably those associations with Jerusalem which are strongest for a modern Christian were far from being the strongest with St. Paul. Dr. Denney has said that "no apostle ever *remembered* Jesus," *i.e.* thought of Him as belonging to the past; and of all the apostles St. Paul was most removed from the historical life of our Lord, and most absorbed in His abiding and eternal presence. It

would never occur to him that the True Cross should be looked for elsewhere than in that spiritual experience which made him "co-transforate with Christ." To explore the Holy Sepulchre would seem to him like seeking the living among the dead: that grave was not worthy to be compared with the Risen Lord of Glory, who had become Resurrection and Life in St. Paul's own soul. To him the great Christian associations of Jerusalem were transcendent inward experiences, and not mere guide-book details. But just on that account its Jewish and personal associations would revive in him and react on him with the greater force. That week of brooding in the temple would bring back all his early dreams. The Hebrew of the Hebrews was worshipping once more at the shrine of his ancestral faith. From that lofty vantage ground he could look out across the beautiful city "spreading her gardens to the moonlight and whispering from her towers" the last message of the ancient covenant, which Christ Himself came not to destroy, but to fulfil.

And when the fanatical mob made a tumult and St. Paul was haled before the Sanhedrim, that scene must have recalled more vividly still the days when he himself had been "the rising hope of the stern and unbending" Pharisees, when he had looked forward to occupy one of the chief seats before which he was now being judged. Dormant feelings and memories woke up and asserted themselves afresh. He could not help catching the tone of the assembly: he knew its tactics, he had felt its pulse so often before. First, his sense of order was outraged by treatment which proved the president of the Sanhedrim to be as lawless as the mob outside. Then when he was rebuked for his indignant protest, he excused himself with a text quoted quite in the style of Rabbinic exegesis. And finally, as he gauged the old familiar situation and saw the balance of rival parties and prejudices, the Rabbi's instinct

prevailed over the Apostle's candour; he could not resist flinging an apple of discord among his enemies. "I am a Pharisee," he cried; and we can understand how for the moment he almost did feel himself a Pharisee again.

I do not say that this construction entirely explains or excuses St. Paul's dealings with the Sanhedrim. Dean Farrar has detected a note of subsequent compunction in Acts xxiv. 21. But I submit that such a reading of the narrative does help to make the whole episode more natural and more coherent, more psychologically *possible*. It illustrates the Apostle's temperament, and it is in no contradiction with his epistles. And thus it serves indirectly to confirm what it seemed apparently to invalidate.

T. H. DARLOW.

THE VEIL OF THE TEMPLE RENT IN TWAIN FROM THE TOP TO THE BOTTOM.

THIS was a thick, gorgeously coloured veil, which divided the interior of the temple into two parts; the outer part being for the daily services of the priests, the inner one, called "the holiest of all," being shut out from view by this veil, which stretched from the one side of the temple to the other. Within this veil no one was allowed to enter on pain of death save the high priest, and he only once a year, on the great day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.); and "not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people" (Heb. ix. 7). For he, being a sinful man like the people themselves, could make no atonement for them till atonement had been made for his own sins. For this purpose, a bullock having been killed for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering, he carried their blood within the veil, and sprinkled it seven times before and upon the mercy seat as an atonement for his own sins