

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:



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

PHILO AND THE CATHOLIC JUDAISM OF THE FIRST CENTURY.

THE study of Philo progresses, although the great edition of Cohn and Wendland halts in its stride.¹ Professor Émile Bréhier² has published a comprehensive exposition of the philosophical and religious ideas of Philo, and Professor Leopold Cohn³ has just issued the first instalment of his works in a German translation. From another quarter comes a contribution more limited in scope indeed, but not inferior in learning and thoroughness—a study of *The Influence of Philo upon Primitive Christian Exegesis*, by Dr Paul Heinisch, which bears the *imprimatur* of F. de Hartmann, Vic. Eppi Genlis.⁴

The bibliography, which Professor Bréhier prefixes to his book, is not good reading for English-speaking people. The classic edition, by the pages of which Philo is still quoted, was published in 1742 by Thomas Mangey, Sizar of St John's College, Cambridge,⁵ and Canon of Durham. Mr F. C. Conybeare is the

¹ The fifth volume was published in 1906, the fourth in 1902, the third in 1898, the second in 1897, and the first in 1896.

² *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, par Émile Bréhier, Professeur Agrégé de Philosophie au Lycée de Laval, Paris, 1908.

³ *Die Werke Philos von Alexandria in deutscher Übersetzung*, herausgegeben von Prof. Dr Leopold Cohn, Erster Teil, Breslau, 1909. It contains *Einleitung vom Herausgeber über die Welterschöpfung*, übersetzt von Dr J. Cohn (Eschwege) . . . *Ueber Abraham*, übersetzt von Dr J. Cohn . . . *Ueber Joseph*, übersetzt vom Herausgeber . . . *Ueber das Leben Mosis*, übersetzt von Prof. Dr B. Badt (Breslau) . . . *Ueber den Dekalog*, übersetzt von Dr L. Treitel (Laupheim). The translation is accompanied with footnotes, of which the editor says:—'Sie haben nur den Zweck, hier und da Schwierigkeiten des Textes zu erläutern und für bestimmte Lehren und Aeusserungen Philos auf die Quellen und auf Parallelen hinzuweisen. Besondere Sorgfalt ist auf den Nachweis von Parallelen im Talmud und Midrasch verwendet worden, aber auch darin ist Vollständigkeit nicht beabsichtigt, geschweige denn erreicht' (p. vii).

⁴ *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese (Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria): ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der allegorisch-mystischen Schriftauslegung im christlichen Altertum*, von Dr Paul Heinisch, Priester der Erzdiözese Olmütz, Münster i. W., 1908.

⁵ 'Thomas Mangey, born at Leedes, Yorkshire . . . admitted sizar for Mr Hall . . . 28 June [1704] aet. 16,' *Admissions to the College of St John the Evangelist*, Cambridge, part ii, p. 172.

next English name: his work on the *De Vita Contemplativa*, published at Oxford in 1895, is described as 'unique édition critique'. In 1886 Dr Rendel Harris published the *Fragments of Philo Judaeus* at Cambridge, and this also is reckoned among 'des travaux . . . vraiment importants'. Under the heading 'Études générales' stands Dr Drummond's *Philo Judaeus and the Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in its development and completion*, published in London in 1888—and recently 'remaindered'. Among special studies Ryle's *Philo and Holy Scripture* is the only representative of English scholarship. And the pity of it is that—with the exception of Mr C. G. Montefiore's *Florilegium Philonis*—there is (so far as I know) nothing else in English that Professor Bréhier ought to have read or commemorated. Jewish scholars and Roman Catholics and philosophers think it worth while to study Philo; but he is a voluminous person and—*nos silemus!*

Well, the books of Professor Bréhier and Dr Heinisch have been sent to the JOURNAL for review, and the editor permits me to try to say why they should be read, and why—they would both agree that this is still more important—people interested in Christianity, and therefore in its mother-church, should read Philo himself for themselves.

Since 1895 English scholars have been silent on the subject of Philo; but from time to time in Cambridge the Special Board for Divinity tempts men to study one or other of his tracts as an examination-subject. It is difficult to imagine a man who having tasted Philo could abstain from habitual indulgence, and refrain from tempting others.

For the fact of the matter is that Philo wrote out the faith by which he lived in the equivalent of two volumes folio. Of other Rabbis, Palestinian or Babylonian, we have only sentences and exaggerated appreciations in Talmud and Midrash. The writers of the Nazarene sect have left occasional writings and books concerned either with Jesus of Nazareth or with some of the missionaries who first proclaimed His resurrection from the dead. Josephus, who accepted Vespasian as Messiah, wrote the history, ancient and modern, of his nation at the end of the first century, with the apparent object of reconciling Jewry to the Roman rule. There are Jews who dreamed in cipher and gave out

hidden revelations; and these have survived in languages of which inquisitors had no cognizance. But only Philo sets forth the presuppositions and translates the verbal imagery of the Jewish faith in gross and in detail. Christians have pilfered his stores of learning without forgetting to call him Jew. Jews have neglected him, because he wrote in Greek, and was secretly or openly adopted by the Christians. Philosophers have patronized him as a lowly step in their lofty ladder, and have labelled him according to their fancy or their knowledge of more ancient philosophers. But *ver novum*—all this is over and gone. If one cares to know the faith which has survived the shocks of circumstance from the days of Antiochus Epiphanes until to-day, one must read Philo. Men call him philosopher; but he regarded philosophy as a means and not as an end—a mental gymnastic perhaps, but just an instrument apt for his purpose. And his one purpose was that all men should be led into the way of truth and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life. No better summary of his gospel could be found than this:—‘The chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever.’ And Philo is himself a typical embodiment of the faith which he preached.

Half-way through the first century of the current era Philo was an old man. As an old man he was compelled by force of circumstances to champion his faith against the imperious challenge of the man-god Caligula. The Jews, as he says, had a notion of the deity, which no man living at the time could fulfil. Atheists for this turn, they confronted the omnipotent Shepherd of the civilized world with tremulous equanimity and denied His divinity to His face. Here, if anywhere, we may see Judaism in action and its precepts put into practice. The writings of Philo are concerned in the main with the inner life of the individual; but his picture of this interview stands out sharp and clear to exhibit the genius of Common or Catholic Judaism.

By way of preparation for the proper appreciation of this picture it will be well to look for a little at the previous condition of the civilized world and also at the immediate cause of this embassy—the Jew-baiting at Alexandria.

On the Ides of March in the year 44 B.C. Julius Caesar was struck down at the foot of Pompey's statue—'but for supporting robbers'—by self-appointed ministers of justice. His body was burned in state, and the Roman people remained by the pyre all night long.¹ Foreigners resident in Rome came in crowds to mourn after their several fashions, and chief among them the Jews, who never failed to visit his tomb at night.² Josephus records the benefits which he had conferred upon the Jews, and Philo praises him as the founder of the dynasty under whose rule the whole world had peace, and the Jews had liberty to keep their Law.

Augustus pursued the same policy of toleration, and Philo speaks of him as passing the limitations of human nature. In the eyes of the Jews he was Saviour and Benefactor. His arm was long enough to protect the scattered communities of the Jews from the hatred of their neighbours, and so protected they enjoyed a Messianic Age. Here and there seditious individuals or even innocent communities might suffer persecution; but Roman law checked local lawlessness.

Tiberius withdrew his countenance from some of them for a time, when he fell under the influence of Sejanus. False accusations were laid against the Roman Jews, but even so the provincial governors received a proclamation bidding them conciliate the Jews resident within their jurisdiction, inasmuch as they were naturally peaceable, and their peculiar laws contributed towards the general tranquillity.³

Therefore from the standpoint of general Judaism, whose wide purview was made up of so many separated and yet united interests, the world enjoyed the Golden Age, and had no need to hope or yearn for it, when Caligula came to the throne in the year 37 of the present era. They were free to frequent their synagogues, to send their temple-dues to Jerusalem, and to devote themselves in their several ways to the pursuit of happiness. And this freedom they owed to the family of Augustus, who had made war to cease and saved the world from mutual annihilation.⁴

¹ Appian *Bellum Civ.* ii 148.

² Suetonius *D. Iulius Caesar* 84 fin. 'in summo publico luctu exterarum gentium multitudo suo quaeque more lamentata est praecipueque Iudaei qui etiam noctibus continuis bustum frequentarunt'.

³ Philo, ii 569 M.

⁴ Philo, ii 567 f M.

It is reasonable to suppose that in all this Philo is expressing the general opinion of his nation as a whole. Individuals—the Jews in Rome, perhaps, who had suffered from the machinations of Sejanus, and certainly the titular king of the Jews, Herod Agrippa—may well have looked for a deliverer in the successor of Tiberius.

Of the Jews in Rome who matched their wits against the cunning of Sejanus we know nothing. Agrippa was the friend and boon companion of the new emperor. Six months before the accession of Gaius, son of Germanicus and foster-child of the legionaries, he had been thrown into prison for expressing a wish that this might come to pass. Upon the fulfilment of his wish he was released. To replace his iron fetters he received a golden chain of equal weight. The Senate made him Praetor and declared him king over the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias. At length he set out to put his kingdom in order; and at the emperor's wish he went by way of Alexandria.

Pharos was sighted at twilight after a good voyage; but Agrippa wished to enter the harbour in the dead of night. He had seen the sights of Alexandria, when he stayed there to raise a loan upon his wife's credit; and he was anxious to avoid publicity. In spite of his precautions, the news of his arrival was spread abroad and increased the general excitement.

Flaccus the governor was ill at ease, for he had been appointed by the dead Tiberius. His friends resented the presence of King Agrippa as an insult to the governor. The populace detested the Jews and grudged them their share of the emperor's favour. So Agrippa was lampooned as he waited for a wind; and Flaccus, at best, did nothing to restrain the licence of his subjects. After all, as his friends declared, he needed a friend at court; and, since the son of Tiberius and Macro the prefect were dead, his only advocate was the city of Alexandria, which all the family of Augustus had honoured from the beginning.

At last the mob proceeded from read and written libels to an acted mockery of the Jews and their king. They took a harmless lunatic named Carabas and clothed him with a parody of a king's insignia—a leaf of papyrus for diadem, a door-mat for robe, and for sceptre a stick of papyrus which they found lying in the street. In the Gymnasium they enthroned him for all to see; and then, as

his bodyguard surrounded him and his subjects laid petitions and salutations before him, there arose a great shout of 'Marin'. The shout revealed the purpose of the whole performance: 'Marin' is the Syrian word for Lord; and the people knew that Agrippa was a Syrian by race and had a large section of Syria, over which he was king. That the scene chosen for their symbolic anti-Semitism should be the Gymnasium was both natural and appropriate. Two hundred years earlier Jason the high-priest inaugurated the great apostasy by building a place for gymnastic exercise in Jerusalem according to the customs of the heathen.¹

Emboldened by their impunity, the mob proceeded to a more ordinary and a more effective method of Jew-baiting. In the name of the emperor they demanded of the governor that images should be set up in the synagogues. Four hundred families of Jews were evicted from their homes—and the governor acquiesced.

But, god as he was, the emperor had still a feeling for the king of the Jews, his boon companion. Scattered as they were, the several communities of the Jews retained a consciousness of national unity. Suddenly Flaccus was arrested in the middle of a revel; and the Jews assembled at dawn on the seashore—for want of a synagogue—to praise God for their deliverance. It was the season of the Feast of Tabernacles.

In the nature of the case the respite gave them no permanent security. The mob of Alexandria had tasted blood and the emperor had declared his divinity. Even Romans forgot or abjured their ancient Roman liberty and prostrated themselves before him like so many barbarians. Of all his subjects only the Jews refused to accept his declaration. So the Jews of Alexandria sent an embassy to Rome.

The ambassadors, who waited upon the emperor, discovered that he not only affirmed but actually believed his own divinity. Helicon, his jester, flattered him to the top of his bent and lost no opportunity of inflaming him against the Jews. In spite of this the ambassadors met with a kind reception, when they first entered the presence in a field beside the Tiber. Only Philo felt

¹ 1 Macc. i 11-14; 2 Macc. iv 7-14.

misgivings, being older and wiser than the rest. The emperor promised them a hearing in due time: the delay was unnecessary and ominous.

From Rome the court removed to Puteoli, the great seaport of communication with Egypt and the East; and thither went the Jews to wait for their audience. One day, as they waited, a man accosted them. His face was flushed and troubled. Panting for breath he asked them 'Have you heard the news?' He stopped abruptly and burst into tears. Then he began again, and again broke off. At last he said, 'Our temple is gone. Gaius has ordered that a colossal statue of himself, inscribed with the name of Zeus, be set up within the Sanctuary.' The deputies stood stock-still, aghast at the intelligence. Others appeared to confirm it, and they all retired to mourn over their private and common misfortunes in seclusion. No hope remained and they prepared to die for the observance of the Law. The danger of the winter-voyage and the peril of the Alexandrine community, all this was as nothing compared with the menace offered now to the catholic community of Israel. And yet they encouraged one another to cherish the hope in God their Saviour: He might ordain the chastening of the nation and would bring them safely through, as in the days of old.

Resolute and hopeful in their despair the deputies turned upon the messengers and demanded what had moved Gaius to issue this decree. The bare fact was a spark to set them burning: after their lamentation they were eager to understand the situation. The answer was that Gaius desired the fairest temple upon earth for himself. A collector of tribute in Judaea had suggested the sacrilege by letter, in order to save himself from impeachment by his victims. The mongrel population of Jamnia had furnished the occasion by erecting an altar of common material for the sole purpose of provoking the Jews, who lived with them; and the Jews had destroyed it. So Petronius, the legate of Syria, had orders to place the statue within the Sanctuary; and only his knowledge of the Jews prevented him from compliance.

In the event their hope was justified. At the risk of his life the legate saved the Holy City, the mother-city not of Judaea only, but of most of the countries in the world. As Agrippa said to Gaius, or is made to say:—'The Jews have sent colonies

at different times into Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, and Coele-Syria; into Pamphylia, Cilicia, and most of Asia as far as Bithynia and the recesses of Pontus; likewise into Europe, Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Aetolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, and the most and best parts of the Peloponnese. The most famous of the islands Euboea, Cyprus, and Crete were full of Jewish colonies.'

But this is to anticipate: the Alexandrine deputies have yet to face the emperor, whose divinity neither they nor any serious pagan could recognize.

Gaius gave them audience, while he was inspecting the gardens of Maecenas and Lamias. They greeted him as 'august emperor'. He responded so courteously and so benevolently, that they despaired not only of their petition but also of their lives. 'You,' he said, 'are the atheists who will not acknowledge my divinity like the rest.' The deputies protested that they had sacrificed three times in his honour. 'Enough,' he said, 'you have sacrificed—but not to me!' And so he turned to his inspection of the buildings on the estates. Upstairs and down he went, finding fault and sketching costly alterations. Then he asked the deputies a great and solemn question:—'Why do you abstain from pork?' Their enemies—contrary to etiquette—burst into shouts of laughter: some were pleased and others were merely anxious to shew their appreciation of the imperial wit. 'We answered,' Philo says, "Different peoples have different laws; there are some things our opponents may not use." Some one said, "Yes, most men refuse to have common lamb served up to them." "That's reasonable enough," said the emperor, "lamb is not good eating;" and then, "we would learn what form of government you have." In the middle of our exposition he leapt off at speed into a great house and gave orders for the glazing of the windows. Again he asked, "What do you say?" and ran into another house to superintend the hanging of some old pictures. We were exhausted and in despair. Our souls had gone forth from us for fear to beseech the true God that He would restrain the passion of the pretender. And so the emperor took pity on us and changed his wrath to mercy. In a milder mood he said, "It seems to me that these men are unfortunate rather than wicked: their unbelief in my divine nature is mere stupidity. So he bade us depart."

In these two scenes Philo displays the passions of a Jew, which else are overlaid to some extent by his acquired philosophy. A Greek in speech and in mind, like the Jew who colloqued with Aristotle,¹ he remained at heart a Hebrew as his fathers were. Son of the synagogue and student of the Law, he is fired by the outrage offered to the Temple. By choice and practice he had removed himself from human affairs; but his nation could claim him at its need. He was patriot as well as philosopher; but above all he was Rabbi and, at times, prophet. In his writings he parades his Greek learning; but his gospel is the Law and he is concerned to win men to accept its easy yoke and present help.

Thanks to Josephus, we are able to set beside Philo the figures of his brother and his brother's son, to shew what parts Jews were playing in this ancient world.

His brother Alexander Lysimachus was a great man in Alexandria and in Rome itself: he managed the Egyptian estates of Antonia, mother of Germanicus and of the future Emperor Claudius. He was imprisoned by Caligula and released by Claudius, 'his old friend', after Caligula's death.² King Agrippa, to whom for his wife's sake Alexander had lent five talents in earlier days,³ gave his daughter in marriage to his creditor's son. So favoured, it is possible that Alexander earned his second name Lysimachus ('peace-maker') by putting an end to the civil war which had broken out between the Jewish and the native inhabitants of Alexandria upon the death of Caligula. At any rate it is known that he held the office of Alabarch; and an Alabarch was an official whose favour might be necessary for so great a man as Cicero⁴ in his struggle with Caesar. But for all his greatness Alexander Lysimachus remained true to his native religion; and he covered the nine gates of the Temple with silver and gold.⁵

Tiberius Alexander, son of this financier, was a soldier and—perhaps, therefore—an apostate. As an apostate from the worship of the One God and from the customs of Judaism he was no longer a Jew according to the Jewish canon. But for the historian the

¹ Clearchus, *Jos. c. Ap.* i 22.

² *Jos. Ant.* xix 5 § 1 (§ 276 Niese).

³ *Jos. Ant.* xviii 6 § 3 (§§ 159 f Niese).

⁴ Cicero *ad Atticum* ii 17 (fin.) 'velim ex Theophane expiscere quonam in me animo sit Alabarches'.

⁵ *Jos. B. J.* v 5 § 3 (§ 205 Niese).

phenomenon of such apostasy is of the first importance. Philo's references to the impious ἀποφράδες suggest that in his time and place it was as common as it was easy to desert to the general irreligion or religion of the world outside the ghetto. The mysteries attracted the Jew of the Dispersion no less than the Gentile. Both were to some extent surfeited with cities and civilization and inclined to welcome a ceremonial reproduction of primitive and natural religions. But in the case of Philo's nephew the career which he adopted supplies an adequate motive for his desertion of 'the ancestral customs'. A soldier cannot keep the Sabbath. No doubt some Rabbi might have been found to give dispensation. But Philo himself was of the stricter school, and to take service in the Roman army was not to help directly the establishment of the general theocracy. In the history of the Jews there was a time when the pious Hasidaeans condoned the breach of the Sabbath and countenanced recourse to the arm of flesh. But such a life as Tiberius Alexander led is essentially incompatible with Judaism.

Apostate as he was, he lived gloriously and had still to do with Jews. He even went up to Jerusalem—as Procurator of Judaea in succession to Fadus.¹ During his term of office there was a famine in the Holy Land, and Helena, Queen of Adiabene, proselyte to Judaism like her people, bought corn from Egypt for the starving Jews.

James and Simon, sons of Judas the Galilean, who revolted—apostatized—from the Romans, when Quirinius assessed Judaea, were brought before him for judgement; and he ordered them to be crucified. For all this the apostate kept the nation in peace, because like Fadus he did not interfere with the customs of the country.² Judas and his sons were robbers like Barabbas—would-be deliverers of Israel in the eyes of their misguided followers.

From being Procurator of Judaea, Tiberius Alexander became Prefect of Egypt and there also he kept the *Pax Romana*. Nero appointed him, and King Agrippa came to make friends with him.³ But the Greeks cherished their feud with the Jews of Alexandria and the Jews persisted in provoking the Romans.

¹ Jos. *Ant.* xx 5 § 2 (§§ 100–103 Niese). ² Jos. *B. J.* ii 11 § 6 (§ 220 Niese).

³ Jos. *B. J.* ii 15 § 1 (§ 309 Niese).

Tiberius Alexander tried to quiet the Jews and they replied with blasphemies. So he ordered his two legions to devastate the Jewish quarter in the Delta and only withdrew them when the Jews begged for mercy.¹

There is yet another incident in his career which concerns the historian of Judaism, though less than it concerned him. Nero made Vespasian Governor of Judaea in A. D. 66, and, in the year of the four Emperors, Tiberius Alexander proclaimed him Emperor of Rome in Alexandria, whence Rome derived her corn. There was an ancient prophecy current throughout the East that thence should come a Governor. Hitherto the Emperors had treated even the Greek Orientals—as Aristotle advised Alexander of Macedon to treat barbarians—like dogs or milch cows. But, as Tacitus says, many were persuaded that in the ancient books of the priests it was written, ‘the East shall be healed of her sickness and men shall go forth from Judaea to rule the world’.² Suetonius refers to this belief,³ and with Tacitus and Josephus⁴ regards it as one of the causes of the great Jewish rebellion. All three historians are convinced that the prophecy really referred to Vespasian and Titus. Now Vespasian dated his reign from July 1, A. D. 69, when Tiberius Alexander proclaimed him. The Jews had applied their own prophecy—for it is written in their own scriptures⁵—to themselves and by their rising they prepared the way for its real fulfilment. Vespasian—the man of mean birth, whom Nero need not fear—was the Messiah of Josephus the Pharisee, as he was the apostate’s Emperor. And the Jews generally might have known that they were in the wrong of it, because, Josephus says, there was another oracle, ‘the City and the shrine shall be captured when the Temple becomes four-square’.⁶

¹ *Jos. B. J.* ii 18 §§ 7 f (§§ 487-497 Niese).

² *Hist.* v 13 ‘pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens profectique Iudaea rerum potirentur: quae ambages Vespasianum ac Titum praedixerant’.

³ *Vesp.* 4 ‘precrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis ut eo tempore Iudaea profecti rerum potirentur. Id de imperatore, quantum eventu postea patuit praedictum Iudaei ad se trahentes rebellarunt’.

⁴ *B. J.* vi 5 § 4 (§§ 310-315 Niese).

⁵ Micah v 1.

⁶ *B. J. l.c.* Josephus mentions three signs which pointed to the catastrophe, and describes the advent of Jesus, son of Ananus, at Tabernacles four years before the war began, his prophecy ‘Woe to Jerusalem’, and his scourging by order of Albinus the procurator.

From the soldier of fortune, from the financier, and even from Philo the ambassador, we must turn to Philo the Rabbi to learn what Judaism is. Summarily it is this:—An active faith in the One God, who is in Himself unknowable: it is nourished and sustained by appointed mediators, and it is furnished with outward and visible signs, which are prescribed by the Law. Israel, as the name denotes, is the body of men who ‘see God’. Strictly speaking God is invisible to man, but the sight of God is the goal at which every Jew is bound to aim. To help him in his quest he has assistance which other men lack. He and his nation strive to reach the One God and God is gracious to His suppliants.

What the privileges of the Jew are, let St Paul the disciple of Gamaliel say:—‘The children of Israel to whom belong the adoption to be sons and the visible presence of God and the covenants and the law’s enactment, and the ceremonial observances and the promises; whose are the patriarchs, and from whom, so far as natural descent is concerned, came the Christ; whose is the Supreme God, the Holy One blessed be He for ever.’¹

In the time of Philo different sectaries had found different Messiahs. Men whom Josephus brands as Robbers had delivered—or had failed to deliver—their followers for a time. Whether they were or were not anointed by prophet or rabbi, they served their generation or themselves, as Deliverers will. St Paul held Jesus to be Messiah because he was raised from the dead and thereafter removed from human ken as a visible and tangible force in human affairs. Paul looked for the coming of this Messiah as an event in the future. And so far the Nazarene sect conformed to the faith of Judaism. The Christ when He came must fulfil all righteousness, preach the faith in the One God, and therefore be a Jew: as it is said, ‘Salvation is of the Jews’.

But the Christ, if He come, is part of the Promises which the Fathers in part received. Jacob was made—not born—the son and heir of the God of Israel. The ancient glory and the covenants find a home in the Temple. And the worship of

¹ Rom. ix 4, 5. I quote for the most part the rendering of W. G. Rutherford, altering it at the end. Following the accepted text he writes ‘from whom . . . came the Christ, supreme over all, God blessed for everlasting’. I submit that the transposition adopted in my rendering above—*ὁ ὅς* for *ὁ ὅν*—deserves consideration.

the Temple is contained with all other prerogatives of the Jew in the Law, the yoke of which he took upon his shoulders. The sum and substance of Judaism is the Law which Moses delivered to Israel when as yet God reigned over them by means of His prophet.

In the days of Philo and St Paul the Law contained a motley crowd of precepts. The scribes and the priests and the prophets, who sat in turn in Moses' seat, had defined and applied the primitive religion which they preserved. The Torah covered the whole of a man's life as primitive religions do. The custodians of the Torah had 'gained them the gains of various men—ransacked the ages—spoiled the climes'. And when it was fixed by being written down, an Oral Tradition went with it. The conditions of a Jew's life changed from time to time; and his written code had living voices to interpret it accordingly. Scripture was pitted against Scripture in the interests of common sense. Rabbinic exegesis may be subtle and eccentric when it comes into contact with obsolete precepts; but the precepts were all part of the Sacred Law, which the rabbis must expound and the Jews must obey.

The Law of the Jews did not deal merely with the seventh day and with the higher aspirations of men. The scribes who interpreted it were better called clerks in English. Their concern was that a man should be at peace with his associates, and so with himself. They were clerks of the Great King's peace within the parish to which they were called. To fulfil their function they needed a higher education—higher in degree but not different in kind—than that which any Jewish child received. There were country parsons in Judaea who were only distinguished from their flocks by a wider knowledge of the less inevitable parts of the Bible. It was said by the ancients, 'The reward of a precept is a precept'. St Paul said, 'For the righteous man the law does not exist'. By training and therefore by habit the Jew kept the Law, and his Law contained the essentials of any sane code. It provided for the individual and not only for the community: it was the operative part of a primitive religion which had survived the impact of successive civilizations.

In modern times much has been said of the legalism which effectually prevented the Jews from enjoyment of true religion.

The subtle decisions of the scribes have been quoted from the Talmuds as proof that by their learned trifling they reduced the Torah to a ludicrous and oppressive network of minute observances. But once more it must be remembered that for the righteous man the Law is as though it did not exist. Habit inbred, if not actually innate, produced in the good Jew an instinctive obedience to the main principles and the chief precepts of the Mosaic law. And in the first century there were many Gentiles who accepted its yoke. There were women and even men in the civilized world who became Jews according to the variable standards of Jewish missionaries. The delimitation of their activity to the territory of the Roman Empire perhaps explains the attitude of modern critics. The civilized world was bounded by the Rhine on the west, and the Euphrates on the east; Scythians, Germans, and Britons, along with other intractable savages, were outside the pale.

To set the proselytes aside for a little: all native Jews were themselves proselytes like Abraham himself.

Trained as they were in the essentials of their Law from infancy, the time came when each individual must decide for himself whether he would remain a Jew and live as one in the world but not of it. The faithful remnant had little to gain by fidelity to the faith of their fathers. Apostasy was easy. But those who remained faithful did *not* find in the Law an irksome burden. They were as well disciplined as the Roman legionaries; and the Law, in which they rejoiced, was a fertile cause of the propagation of Judaism. The Law contained the promise of life. The Jew had no need to travel over the perilous ocean to win salvation at a central shrine. He was not compelled to consult the heavens and to guide his conduct by the motions of the stars. The subterranean abyss had no Gospel for him. God's word was in his heart and in his mouth. He could read what Moses wrote to his children as the reader read it in synagogue on the Sabbath. And his heart testified that herein was life: man's reason—the voice of conscience—call it what we will—God's spoken word was in his heart as well as in his mouth.

Again and again Philo protests that 'the good profession' is neither impossible of attainment nor hard to track down. It is

'in thy mouth, thine heart, and thine hands', as Moses says. It is not overseas at Delphi, nor in the heavens, as the astrologers aver, nor yet in the depths, whence Demeter or Osiris rose again and rise yearly in the mysteries. Judaism is independent of place and time. The fruit by which it may be known is consonance of thought, word, and action. Its motive power is the Law. It is Faith in the Invisible Creator and Governor of the universe.¹

This Faith had its external rites and ceremonies, and some of the laity, no doubt, attributed a magical efficacy to its sacraments. Many of the proselytes in the first century were probably attracted by these accessories: Tacitus himself seems to hint that they introduced accretions detrimental to the religion of their adoption. But the essentials of Judaism admit of being stated in the Golden Rule according to Hillel, and the safeguards—are safeguards. The Scriptures contain the laws of etiquette and the laws of health. The interpreters of the Law prescribed right weights and measures, rules for the killing of meat: no part of man and no part of human activity was outside the terms of the function which they had received. If any of them bound intolerable burdens upon the shoulders of their people, there were other scribes who could sympathize with the weaker brethren and release them. Observance of the Sabbath, abstinence from forbidden food, and payment of the Temple dues were apparently the only external duties which were binding upon the ordinary Jew. And it would not be difficult to justify these requirements to a mere physiologist. The only possible exception is the yearly tribute for the priests; but a shrine is necessary to any religion, and the better a law is from the physiologist's point of view the more it needs the sanction of Religion, if it is to be obeyed by the generality of men.

So Catholic Judaism—the religion of the plain Jew—stands midway between the superstitious ritualism of the Hypocrites and the lofty freedom of the Allegorists, so far as the outward expressions of the Faith are concerned. There were Hypocrites and there were Allegorists within Jewry in the first century—men who professed Judaism and practised it to excess, and men

¹ *de Mut. Nom.* 41 p. 614 M (§§ 236 ff. CW).

who discerned the spiritual significance of its practices and proceeded to ignore them.

All readers of the Gospel according to St Matthew are familiar with the idea of the Hypocrites; and the common result of their reading is that they suppose all the scribes and Pharisees—if not all the Jews—to be condemned and denounced.

Such a conclusion is of course mistaken. But that there were hypocrites among the Pharisees was familiar enough to the rabbis. Of these hypocrites it is said, a disproportionate number was to be found in Jerusalem. Both the Talmuds contain an ancient tradition, which speaks of seven classes of Pharisees. All of them served God from different motives or in different ways. As Pharisees and as Jews it was their business to serve God; but their successors questioned the sincerity of them all. Among them is a class or type which Philo also found in the ghetto of Alexandria—the Shechemite Pharisee. There were hypocrites, then, in Egypt, in Babylon, and in Palestine, and they were denominated Shechem after the manner of the Jews who always looked to the Scriptures for a vocabulary. It is usually said that the Judaism of Palestine was distinct from that of Babylon and that of Egypt; and all such traditional statements are of doubtful authorship and uncertain authority. But this fact remains: there were representatives of Shechem—Hypocrites—in all three centres of Judaism.

The appellation is variously explained by the Talmuds and Philo. The explanation of Philo is a typical example of the way in which he finds a scriptural foundation for his teaching. It is written:—‘Shechem humbled Dinah and yet spoke after her mind.’ The name Shechem means *shoulder*, the symbol of labour; and the name Dinah means *justice*. So Shechem is the laborious hypocrite, who is righteous in speech and in externalities but unrighteous at heart and in act. The rabbis who stand behind the Talmuds arrive at the same conclusion, but by different means.

But Shechem is also the name of a place in another text from which Philo preaches to his readers. Joseph learns on occasion that his brethren are tending their flocks there.¹ Now this is to say that the fathers—the living embodiments of the

¹ Gen. xxxvii 13.

Law, whose merits are availing for their true descendants—have the mastery over their irrational passions by dint of persistent labour. It is a great load which the virtuous must carry. They must resist the body and the pleasure of the body: they must set their face against external things, and the delights which are derived from them. Pleasure lovers regard such ascetics as mad; but, in point of fact, they are sane and well, as Scripture says.¹ But asceticism may degenerate into something akin to hypocrisy, if it be practised for its own sake in season and out of season. In this respect the Jewish code is eminently sensible. The Law of the Levites decreed that none should give himself up to the service of God before the age of thirty years. The good Jew, therefore, must first do his part in the world of men: he must see to 'the building of the world', as the rabbis put it. Whether he accepted the regulation as applying to himself or not in respect of its obligation, he was bound by it in respect of its definite prohibition. The Law commanded him to *pursue righteousness righteously*.² 'Therefore,' Philo says, 'if you see any one refusing meat and drink at the proper time, or excusing himself from baths and unguents, or neglecting the protections of his body, or sleeping on the ground and lodging in discomfort, then affecting a counterfeit continence on these grounds—take pity for his error and shew him the true way of continence. These practices of his are fruitless and unending labours which only exhaust body and soul with hunger and other afflictions. On the other hand, count no man pious who is fair without and foul within for all his ceremonial sprinklings and purifications.'³

At the opposite pole to the Hypocrites were the Allegorists, who despised all external rites—even the Sabbath and Circumcision. They knew the significance of the symbol and therefore neglected its outward sign. Philo blames them for their levity and insists upon the necessity of external observances. Man is made up of mind and matter. Sacraments are needed to assist him in his struggle to rule his irrational part: they appeal to both of the elements in him, and the visible signs remind him of his high vocation.

Allegorists and Hypocrites and the sane director of the plain

¹ *Quod det. pot.* p. 193 M (§§ 9-12 CW).

² Deut. xvi 20.

³ *Quod det. pot.* p. 195 M (§§ 19 f. CW).

man's conscience—all these are Scribes of the Jews. The Law contains an infinite variety of precepts. If you push any one of them to its logical conclusion, if you strip it of its husk and make out the principle involved, you must remember—as they remembered—to balance things by taking heed of human weakness, and by treating other precepts in the same way. It is the habit of Jewish teachers to insist upon a duty to the momentary exclusion of other duties. They make their point with all the vigour and rigour which lie within their power. But—*securus iudicat orbis*—Judaism lives unto this day. Sabbath by Sabbath the Scribes taught their flocks 'here a little and there a little' in the scattered synagogues. And—*securus iudicat orbis*—the Jews of the Dispersion reassembled at the feasts in Jerusalem to round off their several provincialisms 'as iron sharpeneth iron'. There were turbulent spirits among them akin to the Galilean zealots, but there were also peaceable men like Philo who sought only that the Nation should have peace and liberty of conscience to serve God as the Law and Prophets prescribed.

The gist of the matter is this:—If we study in a museum of dead antiquities, we say 'barren legalism' and yearn for fresh air; but, if we divest ourselves of prejudices and labels, Philo and Josephus will tell us how these dry bones lived. *Haec hactenus.*

J. H. A. HART.