MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 16, Folder 20, Evangelical Theological Society, 22nd Annual Meeting, 28-30 December 1970.

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
(513) 221-1875 phone, (513) 221-7812 fax
americanjewisharchives.org

Section F
Porter Hall
A. J. Klassen, *presiding*

8:45 a.m. 18. The Meaning of Resurrection in Pannenberg's Theology
Fred H. Klooster, Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan

9:30 a.m. 19. The Influence of Drugs Upon Contemporary Religion and Faith
S. Robert Denton, Akron, Ohio

Section G
Library Building Room 104
Charles Feinberg, *presiding*

8:45 a.m. 20. Literary Features Relating to the Identification of the Alleged Aitiological Stories in Joshua 1-5
Andrew Bowling, John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark.

9:30 a.m. 21. Indications Toward a Solution of the Genesis Philistine Problem
Harold G. Stigers, Covenant Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

Section H
Library Building Room 106
Elmer Martens, *presiding*

8:45 a.m. 22. History, Scripture and Fact, and the Problem of Polarization
R. Allen Killen, Bryan College, Dayton, Tennessee

9:30 a.m. 23. Palestinian Artifactual Evidence Supporting the Early Date of the Exodus
Bruce K. Waltke, Dallas Seminary, Dallas, Texas

10:15 a.m. Recess

10:30 a.m. Second Business Session, Robert E. Cooley, *presiding* *Porter Hall*
Reports of Regional Sections
New England
Eastern
Southern
Mid-western
Far-western
Old Business
Committee Reports
Editorial—Samuel J. Schultz
Necrology—Vernon C. Grounds
Nominating
Election of Officers for 1971
New Business
Report of the Resolutions Committee

11:00 a.m. 24. Is There Eschatology "Beyond History"?
Robert D. Culver, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois

11:45 a.m. Closing Devotions: William E. Bell, Jr., Dallas Baptist College, Dallas, Texas

12:15 p.m. Lunch *Dining Commons*

REGISTRATION AND RESERVATIONS

To be assured of accommodations and banquet reservations, registration requests should be mailed immediately to Professor Robert H. Gundry, Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California 93103. A registration fee of $2.00 will be charged at the time of registration.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Accommodations are available at the college. The cost per person will be $26.00 for single occupancy and $23.00 for double occupancy. This includes two nights of lodging and two full days of meals including the annual banquet with its special meal. Room facilities will be in Armington Halls.

TRAVEL DIRECTIONS

Westmont College is located on La Paz Road in Santa Barbara. See map in letter dated October 30.

Air: Westmont will provide ground transportation from the Santa Barbara airport to the college. This will be available regularly (10 A.M. to 5 P.M.) on registration day. If you experience any problems call the college switchboard for information and assistance.

Bus: Those arriving by bus can either take a taxicab to the college or call the switchboard asking for accommodation service by automobile.

THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Founded 1949

Officers for 1970
President: Robert E. Cooley, Evangel College
Vice President: Harold Lindsell, Christianity Today
Secretary-Treasurer: Vernon C. Grounds, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary

Committee on Program and Arrangements
Harold Lindsell, Christianity Today
James E. Smith, Cincinnati Bible Seminary
Robert H. Gundry, Westmont College

Evangelical Theological Society

Twenty-second Meeting

December 28-30, 1970

Monday-Wednesday

Westmont College

955 La Paz Road

Santa Barbara, California 93103

(805-969-5051)

Theme: Faith and History

Program

MONDAY, DECEMBER 28

2:00—6:00 p.m Registration
Armington Halls Commons

1:00 p.m. Meeting of the Near East Archaeological Society
Library Building Room 104

First Session

6:00 p.m. Annual E. T. S. Banquet
Dining Commons

Moderator, Vernon C. Grounds, *Executive Secretary* Evangelical Theological Society

1. Presidential Address: Throw Me a Bone
Robert E. Cooley, Evangel College, Springfield, Missouri

8:30 p.m. 2. Overseas Report

3. Open Discussion

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29

7:00 a.m. Breakfast *Dining Commons*

Second Session: Robert E. Cooley, *presiding*
Porter Hall

7:45 a.m. Call to Order

Opening Devotions: A. J. Klassen, *Chairman,* Far-Western Section

Welcome: Robert H. Gundry, Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California

Adoption of the Docket

First Business Session:
Executive Reports
Auditor's Report
Committee Reports
Election of Nominating Committee

8:15 a.m. 4. Dialog of the Evangelical Theological Society with representatives from the Jewish community. Co-sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, Dr. Marc H. Tanenbaum, National Interreligious Affairs Director

The Messiah and the Messianic Era: Jewish and Christian Perspectives
Rabbi Samson H. Levey, Ph.D., Professor of Rabbinics and Jewish Religious Thought, Director of Graduate Studies, Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles, California

10:15 a.m. Recess

10:45 a.m. Resume Dialog: Open Discussion with Questions from the floor

12 noon Lunch
Table Discussions:
Jewish-Christian Dialog
Dining Commons

Third Session: Robert E. Cooley, *presiding*
Porter Hall

1:15 p.m. 5. Theology No Issue: Appraisal of the Jewish-Christian Barrier
William W. Bass, Biola, La Mirada, California

2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. SECTION MEETINGS

Section A
Library Building Room ~~180~~ 109
Paul McReynolds, *presiding*

2:00 p.m. 6. Faith and History in Saint Augustine
Gordon R. Lewis, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver

2:45 p.m. 7. Existentialism and Eschatology: The Integrity of Biblical Historical Thought
Francis I. Andersen, Berkeley, California

3:30 p.m. 8. The Periodization of Redemptive History
Arnold D. Ehlert, Biola, La Mirada, California

4:15 p.m. 9. Individual's Faith a Fulcrum in History
J. Kenneth Wishart, Sylmar, California

Section B
Library Building Room 106
Robert L. Thomas, *presiding*

2:00 p.m. 10. The Tradition of the Words of Jesus
Everett F. Harrison, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California

2:45 p.m. 11. The Historical View of the Book of Acts: The Approach of British Scholars
W. Ward Gasque, Regent College, Vancouver, Canada

3:30 p.m. 12. On the Cessation of the Charismata
Jon Ruthven, Lincoln, Nebraska

4:15 p.m. 13. The Gnostics and History
Edwin M. Yamauchi, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Section C
Porter Hall
Robert L. Saucy, *presiding*

2:00 p.m. Continuation of the Jewish-Christian Dialog for as long as it lasts at which time members may join other Sections

Section D
Library Building Room 204
Arnold D. Ehlert, *presiding*

2:00 p.m. Society of Bible Collectors for as long as the Society wishes to meet to transact business after which they may attend other section meetings

TUESDAY EVENING

6:~~15~~ p.m. Dinner *Dining Commons*

7:30 p.m. 14. Symposium, Faith and History
John W. Snyder, Moderator
Panelists:
Harold Lindsell
Ronald Nash
Merrill C. Tenney
Discussion: Audience participation
Porter Hall

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30

7:00 a.m. Breakfast *Dining Commons*

Fourth Session: Harold Lindsell, *presiding*
Porter Hall

7:45 a.m. Morning Devotions: J. Barton Payne, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

8:00 a.m. 15. Interpretations of Contemporary Middle East History
George Giacumakis, Jr., California State, Fullerton, California

8:45 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. SECTION MEETINGS

Section E
Library Building Room 204
J. Barton Payne, *presiding*

8:45 a.m. 16. Beyond Paul Tillich's Interpretation of History
William W. Paul, Central College, Pella, Iowa

9:30 a.m. 17. God's Revelation in History
Ismael E. Amaya, Pasadena College, Pasadena, California

NEWS FROM THE COMMITTEE

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE Institute of Human Relations, 165 E. 56 St., New York, N.Y. 10022, PLaza 1-4000

The American Jewish Committee, founded in 1906, is the pioneer human-relations agency in the United States. It protects the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad, and advances the cause of improved human relations for all people.

MORTON YARMON, Director of Public Relations

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

SANTA BARBARA, Calif., Dec. 18...Fifteen Jewish scholars and theologians will attend the twenty-second annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, to be held at Westmont College here December 28-30.

The involvement of Jewish religious leaders in this year's meeting marks a "breakthrough" in Jewish-Evangelical dialogue, according to Dr. Robert Cooley, President of the Evangelical Theological Society, and Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, National Director of Interreligious Affairs of the American Jewish Committee, co-chairmen of the interreligious discussion. Serving as coordinators are Dr. Harold Lindsell, Editor of "Christianity Today" and Vice President of the ETS, and Dr. Gerald Strober, AJC's Consultant on Religious Curricula.

The Jewish-Evangelical dialogue will occupy a major part of the second day of the three-day meeting, whose overall theme is "Faith and History."

Opening the interreligious exchange on Tuesday morning, December 29, will be a presentation on "The Messiah and the Messianic Era: Jewish and Christian" by Rabbi Samson H. Levey, Professor of Rabbinics and Jewish Religious Thought and Director of Graduate Studies at Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles.

The afternoon session will feature a paper titled "Theology No Issue: Appraisal of the Jewish-Christian Barrier" by Dr. William W. Bass, Biola College, La Mirada, Calif.

Both presentations will be followed by discussions involving Evangelical and Jewish participants.

- more -

The AJC's involvement in the Evangelical meeting is in line with its policy of encouraging Jewish-Christian dialogue on theological questions in an effort to develop mutual understanding. Other inter-religious discussions it has sponsored in the past few months include meetings at Seton Hall University, Hebrew University, Wake Forest College and Southern Methodist University.

Among the Jewish scholars who will attend the Evangelical meeting are: Rabbi David Aronson, Professor Emeritus of Talmud, University of Judaism; Dr. Lewis M. Barth, Assistant Professor of Midrash and Related Literature, Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles; Rabbi Paul Dubin, Executive Vice President, Southern California Board of Rabbis; Rabbi Steven Jacobs, Temple Judea, Tarzana; Dr. David Lieber, President, University of Judaism; Rabbi Hillel Silverman, Sinai Temple, Los Angeles, Rabbi Alfred Wolf, Wilshire Boulevard Temple, Los Angeles; and Rabbi Joel Renbaum, Dr. Eliezer Slomovic and Dr. Max Vorspan, of the University of Judaism.

# # # #

12/18/70
70-960-221
A,AA,EJP,REL,PP

TALBOT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

13800 Biola Avenue • La Mirada, California 90638

Dr. Louis T. Talbot
Chancellor

Dr. Samuel H. Sutherland
President

Dr. Charles L. Feinberg
Dean

January 6, 1971

Dr. Marc Tanenbaum
American Jewish Committee
Institute of Human Relations
105 East 56th Street
New York, New York 10022

Dear Dr. Tanenbaum:

It was stimulating and meaningful to meet with you and your collegues in connection with the dialogue at the Evangelical Theological National meeting in Santa Barbara. Since Mr. Shelton indicated to me that you would like to receive a copy of the paper, I am enclosing a revised copy--revised in accordance with the desires of the editor of the Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society.

I am taking the liberty also of enclosing a copy of the foremat of the team-taught course which we taught last year and of which I am the co-ordinator.

Best wishes in your work on "dialogue."

Sincerely and cordially,

William W. Bass

WWB:bb

THEOLOGY NO ISSUE: AN EVANGELICAL APPRAISAL OF ROSMARIN'S JEWISH-CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL BARRIERS

Dr. William W. Bass

This essay from a Christian perspective is directed toward dialogue between Christians and Jews. In a world where traditional cultures have crumbled and religions, new and old, are asserting themselves, the need for basic understanding between all religions is of the essence. But Jewish-Christian understanding is particularly crucial in light of the coming Kingdom of God which will involve a Jewish relationship to Jesus Christ.

The points at issue are the theological barriers which Trude Weiss-Rosmarin portrays in Judaism and Christianity: The Differences. Her book is chosen as a rubric for interaction, not only because of its pertinence, but also because it is so precise and enthusiastic in avowing the absolute contradictoriness of the major points of antagonism between these two religions. It is clear, definite, and thus, very useful.

The minimal purpose will be to show that the issues presented are at two levels of difficulty, with neither class being insurmountably difficult. The conclusion will be that only three issues are really crucial--the law, the person of Jesus Christ, and the atonement--and even these are not so difficult as to prevent discussion, and further discussion is the goal of this presentation.

The basic assumptions are, first, that the breaking point even in the first century was not theological, but rather, following James Parks, a series of unfortunate and to some extent "accidental" events which pushed the early Jewish-Christian community away from both the Synagogue and the emerging Gentile Chruch. A second assumption is that the basic "hang-up" is not between the Jewish people or Israel and Christians--that is, believers in Christ--but largely between the clergy of both religions who are, let us assume, men of good faith, but who are dogmatically conditioned in terms of historical influences which have played upon the two faiths and increasingly separated them. This leads to the third concept, that as theological ideas developed and changed in the two traditions and were influenced by external philosophies, theological differences developed which were not inherent earlier. It is the same changing climate of opinion, however, which can be used to show that there is enough divergency in each camp to make discussion possible. The subject is interesting and most vital, but more crucially it seems that apocalyptic times are upon us, and the beginnings of a measure of rapprochement are necessary. The health of the Christian community is absolutely dependent upon some sort of working relationship with Jewish people, and certainly the Jews, in this hour of trial, need the help and understanding which can come from Christians who have such understanding.

Peter Schneider has correctly portrayed us as mere explorers and beginners in this area, who must press toward the goal. accepting mistakes and set backs while at the same time realizing that dialogue must be "intimate and costly."

I. The Jewish and Christian Idea of God

The first unsurmountable obstacle that Dr. Rosmarin sees between the two faiths has to do with the difference between Judaism's pure and uncompromising monotheism and Christianity's belief in the trinitarian nature of the Divine Being. Trinitarianism, the belief in the worship of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, are contrary to all and everything Judaism holds sacred--the one, unique, indefinable and indivisible God. The indivisible oneness of God has been common to the different Jewish concepts of God that have evolved in different ages and must be stressed if Christian trinitarianism is to be avoided. There is no basis for dividing or adding to God's Being. On the contrary, H.E. Fosdick had Christianity as "the religion of incarnation," and John Mackay asserted that "the Christian faith is that God was in Christ." This is shocking to the Jew who believes that God is one and unique.[1]

Dr. Rosmarin sets Moses Maimonides' formulation of the idea of God against the Christian essential formulation of God as established at Nicea and Chalcedon. It should be remembered that ecumenical councils are not necessarily totally Scriptural and that Maimonides and his philosophy were considered heretical in his own time. To Maimonides, God's unity was "one single homogenous uncompounded essence"--an idea which sounds almost identical to the philosophy of the pre-Socratic Parmenides, and his view that time is an accident of creation because creation cannot have taken place in time, sounds as if it could have come from Augustine.[2] Very few Christian New Testament theologians will grant a philosophical God in the New Testament; Jewish historical scholars present the history of Judaism as largely free of philosophical influence before the time of Maimonides.

Christians are certainly free at this juncture in history, both in terms of current criticism of the concept of God and also in terms of their own basic Biblical presuppositions, to seek for new imagery by which to express their concept of God. There seems to be a defensive lack of curiosity among evangelicals which prohibits them from doing this. However, Chalcedon itself incorporates another basic concept of God than that of essence--that of light and glory--and Abraham Heschel has appealed to this very kind of imagery in describing his God in Search of Man.[3]

---

[1]All material from Dr. Rosmarin's writings are taken from Judaism and Christianity: the Differences (Jonathan David: New York, 1943).

[2]Moses Ben Maimon, The Guide of the Perplexed, abridged edition, Introduction and Commentary by Julius Guttman, translated from the Arabic by Chaim Rabin (East and West Library: London, 1952), pp. 67-68, 94.

[3]Abraham Joshua Heschel, God in Search of Man (Meridian Books and

Another basic direction which rapprochement could take at this point, is in the direction of a more careful and better use of Biblical terminology. Both Jews and Christians have been negligent in appealing to the riches of terminology in both the Old and New Testaments. God, as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, has been palatable to Jewish thinkers as well as Pascal. God as Father is palatable to Jewish readers of Isaiah, even if it is felt that they must fall short of using "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." God as Ancient of Days; God as the Coming One; God as the One Who sits upon His throne, are all Biblical alternatives. Then, appellations which show the "communicable attributes" of God are certainly useful. God is loving, angry, sorrowful, and even pained. But it is difficult to improve upon the God of glory, the God of light. There are many alternatives from both the Jewish and Christian standpoints in terms of identifying and describing God, and were it desired to come closer on this particular doctrine, there are many ways in which discussion could be implimented. There is no necessary polarization at this point, but only an unfortunate misunderstanding which stems from the middle ages. The issue lies not in the nature of God described in the Bible, but in the selecting of issues which are considered important by scholars.

II. Miracles

The Christian emphasis on miracles is also seen as a most difficult juncture between the two religions. In early Rabbinic literature, as in Spinoza and the deist philosophers, Divine interference with the laws of nature seemed illogical and irreconcilable. Rather, God provided for the miracles at creation. The miracles were only of minor importance as preliminary to the giving of the law on Sinai. The best Jewish minds supported the rational interpretation of Judaism. Miracles are rejected as proof of the truth, and especially as attestations of the correctness of the Torah.

In contradistinction, miracles play an inordinately important role in Christianity. The Gospels are one long record of the miracles performed by Jesus. The miracles were cogent proofs, not only of His Divine authorization, but of His Divinity. According to Dr. Rosmarin, Christianity was predicated on numerous doctrines based on miraculous events, such as the incarnation, the Divine character and perfection of Jesus, and the Virgin Birth. Catholic Christianity is virtually a slave to miracles. The saints are chosen on this basis--performance of miracles is the acid test of the truth of religious mission and the sine qua non of canonization. Christian worship revolves around the mysteries of the sacraments, Catholicism's seven and Protestantism's two. The Lord's Supper and the partaking of the Eucharist and sacramental wine establishes direct physical bond between the believer and Jesus. There are no sacraments in Judaism and no vestiges of mythological concepts--nothing like transubstantiation, prayer, sacraments, or symbols through which salvation may be magically obtained.

---

the Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia, 1955), p. 105, identifies the ineffable with glory (see also pp. 108, 112 and footnote 10, p. 113). See also Heschel, Israel (Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York, 1969), pp. 24-26 and Jaroslav Pelikan, The Light of the World: A Basic Image In Early Christian Thought (Harper & Brothers, Publications: New York, 1962), pp. 36, 85, 89.

Just as the concept of God should not be made dependent upon medieval material, so the ancient concept of balance of nature should not be transformed into a deistic concept of violation of laws of nature. The New Testament picture is that of the same Kingdom power working in both creation and Christ's ministry. The mighty acts of the Messiah were powers of the age to come which were implimented prior to the full arrival of the Kingdom; not violations of nature, but implications of what was already inherent in the created world and foretastes of what the future could expect to hold. Adjustment of Rosmarin's Rabbinic citations to conform to this would not require the violence to their ideas that violations of laws of nature would demand.

Another aspect of New Testament miracles is that they really were signs--this coming directly from the major thesis of the fourth Gospel. The works that Christ did were glorious showings, reflections, manifestations of the glory of God, and this not in any sense which would not be thoroughly compatible with the Jewish thoughts of the rays of God's glory. Just as God's glory, and not his essence, was a chief Biblical emphasis in both the Old and New Testament, so the manifestation of his glory in the Old and New Testaments is a major theme and should not have ever been recaste and filtered through the questions raised by deistic philosophers.[4] The signs that Christ did from Canaan of Galilee to Bethany were always to manifest the glory of Messiah. It is interesting that Hebrew Christians attempt spontaneously and studiously to combine the two faiths in terms of this idiom. David Baron's Rays of Messiah's Glory may be cited as typical of the Hebrew-Christian mind at this point. It is adequate for further dialog to recognize that there is sufficient historical flexibility to allow appeal to other rubrics than "laws of nature" in an aplogetic for the validity of the powerful acts of God and the amazing phenomena which have been forthcoming. Even Maimonides left his emphases on "essence" and "causation" long enough to quote from Isaiah 9:2: "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them has the light shined."[5] It is true that to Maimonides, miracles were planned with the creation and so were determined; but to him, God did also retain his privilege of interfering with the course of nature. While he seems to have taken this straight from the Scriptures, he rejected many of the Scriptural miracles, as, for example, the talkative ass of Balaam. The main concern behind his particular viewpoint is to correct Aristotle's concept of the eternity of the world. Again, it would seem that the nature of his interests, coupled with his use of the Scripture, would be sufficient basis to indicate that discussion is possible at this point also.

---

[4]In Deuteronomy 4:8 ff, the first and latter signs have "voices" which the people should "hear." There is a logos of the signs, a far cry from any deistic concept of miracles. Sandmel puts Paul in this tradition when in contrast to Philo's static, unhistorical, timeless logos: "The answer for Paul seems to have been rooted in event, that is, the event of Jesus. Accordingly, for Paul the encounter with the Christian tradition as it was unfolding in his time, coupled with the view that Jesus was in some sense divine, led him to identify the logos he so desperately desired with this Jesus." Samuel Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity (Oxford University Press, p. 132.

[5]Ben Maimon, op. cit, p. 202.

It is not suggested that to Jews alone belong the theological tasks of revision, but that evangelicals, too, might well look to their own conceptural foundations with regard to miracles, and be careful that they are not defending deist categories instead of the Biblical ones which they hopefully espouse.

III. Free Will vs. Original Sin

Rosmarin alleges that there is a great discontinuity between the Jewish emphasis on freedom and the ethical predestination of Christianity. To authoritative Jewish sources, all human beings are endowed with freedom in the ethical sphere and are not constrained. Man is "in the hands of his decision" (Berachoth, 33b) at conception. In Sayings of the Fathers III, 15, "all things are foreseen yet free will is granted." "He who wants to defile himself will find all the gates open. And he who desires to purify himself will be able to do so" (Shabboth, 104a). Free will is the foundation of ethics. Without the temptation and the possibility to sin, piety would not be meritorious.

It is held, on the other hand, that Christianity is predicated on the doctrine of original sin, which implies ethical predestination. Adam's fall transmitted to all generations a burden of guilt which descends on every human being the moment he leaves his mother's womb. Judaism has nothing resembling original sin, which is a negation of religion and a denial of the possibility of ethics. Jews do not deny that sin exists, but they refuse to admit that it must exist. Jewish piety does not have a power of evil independent from and opposed to God as the Christian devil; it does have an evil impulse and sages who subdued their sinful desires with the strong weapon of the good impulse. The Jew is taught to regard himself as stronger than sin and the power that draws him to it, and he glories in that strength. The Christian, on the other hand, places grace above conduct and ethical effort. Christianity does not appreciate the exilarating ethical stimulation of the challenge of the evil impulse or the Jewish victory over it.

It is clear that within the Christian community, as in the broader philosophical world, there is extensive disagreement regarding the kind and degree of freedom taught in the Bible and evident in human experience. While newer studies in both Biblical theology and physiological psychology may promote further clarity, it is evident that the New Testament exhorts man to activity and appeals to freedom. Christ's death, too, is surrounded by a rich framework of connections and is scarcely chained solely to an Augustinian or Reformed doctrine of original sin. His death is tied to Israel on the one hand (Acts 2:39) and to heavenly powers on the other (Colossians 1:20).

The nub of the problem here seems to center in the precise meaning of the doctrine of original sin. The term originated as far back as Tertullian, and has borne several meanings. To Augustine, it meant

participation in a mass of perdition. To John Owen, the puritan divine, it meant conformity to the image of Satan. Later reformed thought emphasizes the implication of the total man in sin so that he is unable to rescue himself. Popular evangelical Calvinistic preaching emphasizes the "sin nature," which may possibly have a historical connection with Telesio. Saint Paul was content to speak of a "law of sin" in our members, an idea which is seldom used by evangelicals publicly.

Man is so complex in nature and function, and subject to so many kinds of evaluation and analysis that it would seem that some fresh thinking would be possible on both sides. Improvement in the conceptualization of man's problem could be facilitated by continued detailed induction from the Bible and the utilization of fuller and more varied terminology. One doubts that the Jewish publican of whom Jesus spoke as beating his breast and acknowledging his sin was thinking in terms of either the Yetzer ha ra or of reatus culpae.

IV. Attitudes toward Asceticism

To Dr. Rosmarin, the world and all that fills it is very good. The soul which is created by God and the flesh with its desires are of equal importance and in total harmony. Since the flesh is not depreciated nor considered to be the seat of the baser instincts or the source of evil, there can be no pessimistic asceticism in Judaism. The flesh is the handiwork of God and sacred; matter and spirit compliment one another. It would be sheer folly to despise and degrade the body through which the spirit must manifest itself; it would be rebellion against God Who created man as an inseparable union of the physical and spiritual, of body and soul. Judaism accepts the body, its needs and its desires with glad affirmation. In the age to come, man would have to account for every legitimate enjoyment which he denied to himself.

Christianity, on the other hand, is said to consider poverty sacred, to condemn riches and to discourage marriage; this not only by the medieval ascetics, but also by Jesus and Paul. Dr. Rosmarin cites Galatians 5:24 to the effect that "they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires." This New Testament contrast between spirit and flesh negates Jewish optimism. Further, the New Testament considers marriage to be a necessary evil for the propogation of the race, while to the Jew, celibacy is not only unnatural, but contrary to the will of God who commanded men and women to be fruitful and multiply.

While Dr. Rosmarin may have overpainted the contrasts, there is a difficulty and it must be seen as a product of the garbled history of Christianity. Christianity did absorb both oriental and Egyptian asceticism in its earliest days, directly through cultic practices, but also indirectly through the influence of philosophy. The neo-Platonic structure influenced Christianity extensively. This barrier could be largely disolved by cleaning the Christian house of illegitimate foreign ascetic attitudes which still persist in degree.

Within the pages of the New Testament, there is every indication that the crucial matter, in this regard, was the coming of the Kingdom of God. The seemingly strange behavior of John the Baptist was not because of another worldly orientation, but because he was in the Jewish prophetic tradition and was preparing for the Kingdom of God. Jesus was worldly to the extent that he was called a glutton and a wine-bibber. He enjoyed the simple pleasures at the home of Lazarus in Bethany. His life thus seemed to have an undergirding of basic Jewish tradition and orientation. But built upon this basic structure were the ethical implications of association with the Kingdom of God and with the coming of the new age. What seems to be an ascetic tendency was a modification of attitude toward this world in light of the fact that many of its customs and manners were to be supplanted in the present and coming Kingdom of God. The point here may be summarized by a two-fold emphasis: Christ's life, ministry and thoughts were based upon the Jewish life-affirming ethic, but it was to be modified in terms of the invasion of the Kingdom of God, which he presented. Since the days of Albert Schwitzer, it is honorable to maintain both that Jesus was eschatologically oriented and to hold that Paul did not inject quantities of Hellenistic or other pagan thought into his viewpoint. It seems rather to be an increasingly acceptable thesis that Paul was eschatological in his viewpoint and that the elements of his theology, including his ethics, can be subordinated to his eschatological thinking. In light of the Kingdom of God, one should ponder the validity of marriage; because the new era has come, one can neglect and possibly avoid some of the hinderances of the new life caused by valid elements of the old era. Thus, the issue is not really asceticism; the issue is that of eschatological kingdom thinking and preparation for the Kingdom of God.

Neither contemporary Christians nor Jewish thinkers are very adept at this kind of orientation with reference to personal ethics. The present suggestion for a direction of rapprochement would be, simply, for Christians to think much more eschatologically than they now do--something which is not too difficult in light of the events of the times--and for Jews to do the same. Asceticism as such is pagan, superstitious, and erroneous, even though it may be found in St. Francis or Spinoza. But the Kingdom of God is integral to both the Old Testament and New Testament faiths and there is every reason to believe both Jews and Christians to be accountable at the bar of this basic criterion. It is suggested then that this is not a barrier to Jewish-Christian relations, at least not between Protestants and Jews, and Catholics are doing extensive re-thinking along these lines; it is to suggest, rather, that both need improvement in their consideration of this area.

V. The Interpretation of Judaism

It is alleged that Christianity cannot afford to admit that the old covenant is still in force, for this would be tantamount to signing its death warrant, just as it would spell the doom and end of Judaism if the Jews were to acknowledge the new dispensation. In this way, Rosmarin sets up a gulf that cannot possibly be bridged except by the kind of

tolerance Jewish teachers manifest when they acknowledge Christianity as a youthful, rebellious and immature daughter of Judaism. Dr. Rosmarin holds that, to Paul, Christianity became the true Israel of God, and the promises given to the Jews would henceforth apply to Christians only. The Jews have been "broken off" (Romans 10:20), and the rights and privileges of the Jew have been transferred to the Gentile Christian. Thus, Judaism has been rejected and Christianity supercedes it. All Jews are responsible for Jesus' death, and they are being punished for their rejection of the Messiah.

Again, there is certain justification for this way of understanding the problem. Christians have, by and large, been at fault for implimenting events which made this kind of understanding somewhat plausible. There are, however, some seriously qualifying factors which may help to correct this way of thinking. In the first place, in the New Testament itself, the old covenant is not totally set aside, but it is "becoming obsolete and growing old" and ready to disappear (Hebrews 8:13). Secondly, it is widely recognized by writers in the area of Jewish-Christian relations that it was an error related to a peculiar kind of hermeneutic which the church Fathers employed which enabled them to aver that the Jewish promises have been totally absorbed into Christianity. Thirdly, along this same line, there are a great number of Evangelicals who would insist that national Israel has a place in God's plan which extends far beyond its being a mere prelude to the establishment of Christianity.

Actually, the problem is not that of a warfare between those who hold to the old covenant and those who hold to the new, but that of a total attitude toward Biblical faith which is a challenge to both the Synagogue and the Church. Was not the Judaism of the first century instructed by more than that of the old covenant <u>per se</u>? Could not the old covenant have been supplanted in degree and many elements of Judaism still be considered very vital and very important by both the Church and the Synagogue? The Church has had as one of its perennial theological puzzles the place it will give to the Jews nationally and religiously in its understanding of the Church and its eschatology, while being quite firm about the significance of the new covenant. In this area, too, then, we are dealing with a very complex picture which will probably never be settled to everyone's satisfaction, and perhaps not the complete satisfaction of any--which is all that really needs to be established to indicate that this is not an impassable barrier for discussion between the two faiths. Any blame must be shared by the grand old men of both traditions--the Church Fathers and the Rabbis of the Talmudic period. The difficulty is one of the second century, in which there were unwise decisions and teachings on the part of the leaders and teachers of both the Church and the Synagogue in a series of tragic blunders which harmed the Jewish-Christians most keenly of all. Both the Church and the Synagogue lost some of their finest people at that time, and sowed the seed of later Jewish persecution and extreme loss to the people of God of both faiths.

VI. Faith vs. Law

Rosmarin presents an "incompatible juxtaposition" between Christianity and Judaism in the area of the laws of the Torah which are "the quintessence of permanent goodness." While Jesus affirmed the eternal validity of the law, He himself laid the foundation for its abrogation in Matthew 17:1-8. He alone was master of the Sabbath. Dr. Rosmarin says that Paul, who was the "wizard of propaganda and organization who built the church," declared the end of the law and the arrival of the aeon of faith. There could be no compromise between law and faith. The law was accursed.

To Judaism, the Torah is both the symbol and medium of divine love and the example and spur to perfection. The Torah is the light and the glory of the sons of men (Megillah 16v, Derekh Eretz Zuta 75). The law is beautiful, refreshing, life-restoring, sweetness, joy, healing and protection against evil. It is not a burden to the Jew. Law and faith are compatable and the law is a blessing and a medium of mercy, kindness and peace. It is synonymous with eternity and can never be abrogated or superceded. To Maimonides, "This Torah will never be changed." There is no proper solution to the conflict between this point of view and the Christian viewpoint that "Christ died for nothing" if man could be saved or perfected by the law (Galatians 2:21, 5:1-2). Judaism would sign its death warrant if it conceded the legitimacy of Christian charges.

It is tempting to let this issue stand as an absolute barrier beyond which no progress can be made--this especially after James Park's splendid analysis of the significance of law in the early breakdown of relations between Jews and Christians. But it is quite easy to demonstrate that there is room for multiple opinions and possible modification of doctrine at this juncture. From the Jewish standpoint, in spite of all the meticulous effort to observe aspects of the law in ancient and modern Judaism, the element of serious sacrifice has been strangely, perennially and hopelessly lacking since the destruction of the second temple. Too, it is very clear that law-keeping, even among orthodox Israelites, is a burden. Extensive effort is made to circumvent the letter of the law to facilitate modern life in Israel, and the same was evidently true to an extent in ancient times. From the Christian standpoint, too, there are surface difficulties in over-simplifying the Christian's relationship to the law of Moses, including the Ten Commandments. Traditional orthodox Protestant theology has insisted for the most part that there was a distinction between the Ten Commandments and the ceremonial aspects of the law, a position taken by most Christians who have not been theologically sophisticated. On the contrary, a large number of contemporary evangelicals reject the whole of the law, including the Ten Commandments. On this basis alone, it would seem that both Jews and Chrsitians have much rearrangement to do in their own houses--thus indicating that the law, if not a stumbling block, is at least a difficult item with which to deal for both faiths.

Writing from the Christian standpoint, W.D. Davies, whose scholarly forte is the pursual of the relationship of the New Testament to the Jewish Rabbinic sources, has held that there is Law in the New Testament. He makes reference to the Pirke Aboth, to the Drekh Eretz Zuta (which, curiously, Rosmarin has cited) and other Rabbinic sources, as basic for an understanding of Paul's self concept as a teacher. Davies insists that Paul thought of himself not only as a preacher of the Gospel, but also as one who filled a role comparable to that of a Jewish teacher who would teach the kind of thing contained in these ethically oriented documents. He believed that the importance of Jesus as teacher was not merely the survival of a kind of primitive legalism, but that within the Church there was a growing emphasis upon the historical Jesus as Teacher. Thus, Davies can say that,

> "the cumulative result of what we have written above is that Paul must have regarded Jesus in the light of a new Moses, and that he recognized in the word of Christ a νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ, which formed for him the basis for a kind of Christian Halakah. When he used the phrase νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, he meant the actual words of Jesus were for him a New Torah.[6]
>
> The upshot of all this is that it is possible to make too much of the contrast between Pauline Christianity as a religion of liberty and Judaism as a religion of obedience. Indeed, it is not improbable that Paul would not find it strange to regard himself as a Christian Rabbi, charged to be a steward not only of a κηρυγμα, but of a διδαχή, a New Torah to be applied, expounded and transmitted.[7]
>
> . . . to be a Christian is to re-live, as it were, in one's own experience the life of Jesus, to die and to rise with Him, and also at the same time, to stand under the moral imperative of His words; and it is possible to infer from this the important consequences that not only did the words of Jesus form a Torah for Paul, but so also did the person of Jesus. In a real sense, conformity to Christ, His teaching and His life, has taken the place for Paul of conformity to the Jewish Torah. Jesus Himself--in word and deed or fact is a New Torah.[8]

Christians can consider this emphasis as Jewish scholars watch with interest, but Jews, too, have problems of deep significance to ponder. Both Glazer and Rubenstein watch American Judaism with apprehension.

---

[6] W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (Harper and Row Publishers: New York, 1948), p. 144.

[7] Ibid, p. 145.

[8] Ibid, p. 148.

In his After Auschwitz, Richard Rubenstein, who is radical to be sure, sets the relationship of the Torah to contemporary Judaism in a qualified position:

> "If the Torah was the perfect revelation of God's will, when properly interpreted, then none of its injunctions, no matter how opaque to the lucidites of common sense, could be ignored. To have ignored them would have been to rebel against the will of the Creator. The modern Jew lacks the security of knowing that his religious acts are meaningfully related to God's will. Whether he fulfills all of the Torah's commandments or none of them, he enters a spiritual wager not unlike that made by the unbelieving Christian when he makes a decision concerning the centrality of Christ in his personal life. As Kierkegaard has suggested, religious life hovers over a sea of doubt seventy thousand fathoms deep.[9]

In this most important and delicate area, also, there are qualifications to be made in both the Jewish and Christian viewpoints; it presents no absolute theological barrier in the way of dialogue.

VII. Jesus, Repentance and the Atonement

It is probable that the problem of the law is a greater psychological hurdle than any of the other areas thus far proposed by Dr. Rosmarin. A top level of difficulty is also presented by two of her other categories: Jesus, and sin and atonement. But just as the law has been shown to be less than an impossible technical hurdle for preliminary dialogue, these other areas will be presented in a way which, in spite of the heightened difficulty and emotional overtone, will moderate them to the realm of concern and consideration.

The acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah or Saviour has, of course, been the great watershed between the two faiths. Rosmarin holds it to be erroneous for Rabbis to assume that their endorsement of Jesus as teacher, prophet or Rabbi will be instrumental in bringing about a better relation between Christians and Jews. Christians resent making Jesus a mere mortal teacher; He is God in the flesh. Judaism rejects the idea that Jesus could be the Son of God and an incarnation of the divine being; Jesus can scarcely qualify as a prophet from the Jewish point of view because he did not, as other Jewish prophets, seek to root his teaching in the Torah. He even claimed the right to abrogate or change ritual law and practices, an attempt which is contrary to the Jewish democratic conviction that all men are equal before God. Jesus constantly drew analogies between himself and God. Even His teachings were not in harmony with Judaism; He admonished poverty, played down the relationship toward marriage

---

[9]Richard L. Rubenstein, After Auschwitz (The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966), pp. 113-114.

and the family, and exhorted revenge, which was against the Jewish law. He disregarded communal prayer and recommended secret prayer instead. He cannot be referred to as Rabbi because he opposed and attacked everything which the contemporary Rabbis stood for, and in all important aspects, he stood in opposition to the faith into which he was born. Room cannot be made for him in the Judaism which he himself rejected in both theory and practice, though he insisted on being considered faithful to the religion of his fathers.

It is interesting that many Jews have violated these canons. In the late nineteenth century, both Joseph Salvador and Abraham Geiger held that Jesus' teaching was in harmony with that of the Judaism of the times. Joseph Jacobs, too, an English Jew, hailed Jesus as thoroughly Jewish. Claude Montefiore went further and considered Jesus to be the most important Jew who ever lived and who exercised a great influence upon mankind and civilization. His teaching could not be paralleled in Rabbinic literature and was a unique synthesis which was greater than the sum of the elements which entered into it. Although Ahad ha-Am ("one of the people") charged him with being half assimilated to Christianity and held that Jews could have nothing to do with this idea without denying the fundamental characteristics of Judaism, the attitude of Jews as far back as the nineteenth century indicated that there is room for discussion about Jesus within the framework of Judaism.

There are also areas for discussion about Jesus within Christianity. "Jesus talk" has largely replaced reference to Christ among young Christians. Then, too, the Death of God movement has created at least some interest in discussing the terminology used to describe God, and this has necessarily had an influence on thinking about Jesus. Also, it must be recognized that Christology is a very complex area within the Church. While evangelicals will not wish to give up their New Testament informed doctrine of the deity of Christ, there are undoubtedly many who will not regard the Chalcedonian Council as officially ending all creative considerations. Some very basic and important terminology and conceptual structuring has been ruled out of Church language since earliest days. The concept of Jesus as the Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man is much more closely related to at least the Old Testament Hebrew mind than is the essential diety of modern Christianity. Jesus as Lamb of God is rich in meaning and crucial to Johannine thinking, as well as to aspects of the Old Testament.[10]

There is, says Dr. Rosmarin, no bridge from the dynamic Jewish interpretation of sin and atonement to the essentially static Christian doctrine of vicarious atonement. In Judaism, all human beings will eventually attain to the knowledge of God through their own efforts. Man's own teshuvah and ethical effort are demanded. Repentance has no bounds; no power on earth or in heaven can frustrate it. It is among the seven things whose creation preceded that of the universe. This is totally irreconcilable with the idea of trusting in Jesus' vicarious atonement for

---

[10]Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament (SCM Press LTD: Bloomsbury Street London, 1963), p. 70, claims it replaced and incorporated the earlier emphasis upon the servant of the Lord.

forgiveness. The difficulty might be partly alleviated by the recognition that Jesus also demanded repentance which is "the total attitude of man involving all his powers," not merely a turning away from sin and the recognition of the atonement, but also "a new orientation for the future."[11] Paul, too, who spoke of belief implied that it was a total turning of the soul which is akin to the Jewish repentance.

But then, the matter of vicarious sacrifice looms large on the horizon. One man cannot die for the sins of another; an innocent Saviour dying for sinners is meaningless, for Judaism rejects any mediation by priests or innocent substitutes. This may be a higher ranking problem than any of the others. The Christian doctrine of the atonement is subject to improvement as Biblical theology advances; better selection from existing theological formulations may be made in light of purposes and times. But the idea of substitution is Biblical, Christian and Jewish (as will be shown) and in its totality, needs no re-evaluation. The Torah is permeated with the concept of the blood of animals shed as an approach to the manifestation of the divine glory. Romans, in acceptable Jewish idiom, portrays blood at God's meetingplace with man as a requisite for the manifestation of the divine righteousness (Romans 3:25). The consciousness of the early Jewish Church was not offended by the doctrine of Christ's atonement, and the Talmud devotes long sections to animal sacrifice. Brands of Christianity which neglect any such concept are usually sterile in many areas, including that of meaningful Jewish-Christian dialogue.

Two tacks may be tried. The function of the Messiah may be subordinated to a discussion of his identity. If the "Servant of the Lord" concept could be accepted, he would have to do something meaningful. Standard Jewish Messianic concepts have included meaningful functioning. Messiah would be a prophet (Deuteronomy 18:18); Messiah Ben David was to be the "instructor of the golden age of the future;"[12] Messiah Ben David was to die.[13] Discussion could center upon possible kinds of Messianic function--a procedure which would not initially rule out a vicarious atonement.

The other direction would be more direct. Certain Jewish leaders have accepted the concept of substitution. Caiaphas said, "One man should die for the people" (John 12:30). Stewart's research led to the conclusion that "the combined merits of the Fathers of the faithful are declared over and over again (by Rabbinic writers) to be effective, and even endless,"[14]

---

[11]Rudolf Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament (Herder and Herder: New York, 1969), p. 26.

[12]George F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. II, p. 326.

[13]Ibid, p. 370-371.

[14]Roy Stewart, Rabbinic Theology (Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1961), p. 130.

and "the more popular view is that she (Israel) stnads by virtue of the Torah."[15] It was variously held that the heathen nations of Rabbinic times or earlier would be cast into Gehinnom to make atonement for the sins of Israel; that Job was selected for temporary suffering so that Israel might be saved in the time of the Exodus; and that children should die young, thereby saving the older generation from eternal punishment. Further, there is evidence that the righteousness of Abraham or of any of his descendants may operate vicariously on behalf of those of the same generation, the death of the righteous man being a necessary condition. The innocent are of course regarded as making a more effective vicarious atonement than the guilty.[16]

Bruce cites the Talmud as follows:

> "The Messiah . . . what is his name? . . . Our rabbis say "the Leper (Aram. lūwerā) of the house of Rabbi (house of learning) is his name," as it is said: "Surely he has borne our sicknesses and carried our pains, yet we esteemed him a leper (Heb. nāgūa', 'stricken'), smitten by God, and afflicted." (TB Sanhedrin 98b).[17]

He also cites these words as found in the additional prayers for the Day of Atonement:

> "Our righteous Messiah has departed from us;
> we are horror-stricken, and there is none to justify us.
> Our iniquities and the yoke of our transgressions
> he carries, and is wounded for our transgressions
> He bears on his shoulder our sins
> to find pardon for our iniquites
> may we be healed by his stripes![18]

Certain Talmudic references sound very Biblical, very Jewish and even Christian: "There is no atonement but by blood,"[19] "The blood whereby life escapes causes atonement, the blood whereby life does not escape does not cause atonement."[20]

In this theological area, as in the others, then, there is no absolute theological barrier which would prohibit further steps toward interface between Christians and Jews, between both and God, and between either and a more accurate and beneficial knowledge of Jesus.

---

[15] Ibid, p. 131.

[16] Stewart, p. 133.

[17] F.F. Bruce, The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1968), p. 94.

[18] Ibid, p. 94.

[19] Yoma 5A, Zeb. 6A

[20] R. Eleazar, Gemara on Kerithoth V, in Soncino edition, The Babylonian Talmud III, p. 166.

The Course is Jewish-Christian Relations and is distinct from the course in Judaism which is part of the World Religions block.

APOLOGETICS 817

Sequence of topics

Introductory comments by each professor
Literature--Ehlert

A. Origins of the Problem (as below plus other ideas by each)
   1. Old Testament and Rabbinic Judaism--the difference (Feinberg)
   2. Romans 9-11 (Feinberg, cf. Ellison)
   3. Early Christian Era, historical--Bass
   4. Jewish perspecitive--Ehlert
   5. The present Jewish Question, what is it? (Ehlert &others)

B. Historical Developments
   1. Jews among the Nations--Bass
   2. Medieval Jewry, Life and Literature--Feinberg
   3. The National states and beyond (1492 ff.)--Ehlert
      (Feinberg, personal observations from experience?)
   4. The American Jewish Experience (Rankin, cf. Glazer)
   5. History of Missions to Jews (Sevener)--March 11
   6. Jewish symbolism (R. Rhodes)--March 18
   7. Contributions of leading Hebrew-Christians to the Gospel (Saphir, Baron, Neander, Lowenthal, Edersheim, etc.)--Ehlert and others
   8. A word on Jewish philosophers--Philo, Maimonides, Mendelsohn, Wittgenstein, Husserl, Bergson, Spinoza, Einstein. (brief and if time permits).

C. Dynamics
   1. Spiritual aspects of anti-semitism--ehlert
   2. Psychology and sociology of anti-semitism--Bass
   3. Spiritual and cultural aspects of Jewish conversion--Feinberg
   4. The Contemporary Middle East--Carmona
   5. Jewish-Christian relations in Israel--Ehlert
   6. A word on Jewish-Arab relations

D. Major recent theses on the proper relationship (as J.Parkes, R. Niebuhr, D. Cooper, R. Eckhart, J. Jocz)--student involvement)

   Student reports at this point especially encouraged.

   Evaluatory comments and additions--Feinberg

E. Eschatological considerations
   1. Biblical eschatology (Ehlert and/or Feinberg)
   2. Apocalyptic, Rabbinic and Later Jewish thought through Zionism (Feinberg and/or Ehlert)
   3. Current Jewish ideas and Literature (Ehlert, Feinberg, and Bass)

F. Student reports on notable books.
   (When feasible, to be included with the relevant course divisions).

THE MESSIAH AND THE MESSIANIC ERA: JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVES

Samson H. Levey
HUC-JIR, LA

I deem it a privilege to have been selected to deliver a paper on the Messiah and the Messianic Era at this meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, as the starting point for dialogue between our respective groups. This subject is one of the central issues in the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. My treatment of it will be historical and analytical, the approach of the scholar who views the dynamics of religion against the background of history and who perceives the power of a religious idea in the broad sweep of human events. This approach has special relevance to the doctrine of the Messiah, which was born in the context of Jewish history and has spanned Jewish experience throughout the centuries, and remains a viable religious philosophy linked to the destiny of the Jewish people to this very day. I shall attempt to demonstrate how the Christian concept of the Messiah emerges from this historical-religious context, and how the Jewish and Christian perspectives on the Messianic theme are related.

The origins of the doctrine of the Messiah is a matter of dispute among scholars, but I shall proceed on the basic assumption which is beyond dispute, that is, that the doctrine of the Messiah in its historical development and the detailed depiction of the conditions which will prevail during the Messianic era are indigenous to Israel and are the creation of the Hebrew people.

Joseph Klausner (The Messianic Idea in Israel, pp. 15 ff.) traces the source of the Messianic idea to the personality of the first deliverer of Israel, Moses, who combined within him the two necessary characteristics of the Messiah figure, the political and the spiritual, the power to save the nation from its adversaries on the one hand, and on the other, to elevate it to religious and ethical heights. Moses becomes the symbol of the true redeemer, and the redemptive dualism which the Hebrew people saw in him becomes the essential element in all their projections of the Messiah to come. One must possess both characteristics to qualify for the Messianic role; either one of these characteristics alone is insufficient.

Klausner sees in King David the true prototype of the Messiah, who combined the redemptive dualism of Moses, political and ethical. He attributes to the prophets two positive elements, the Messianic expectation, that is that the ideal state of affairs lies in the future; and that the Messianic era will be humanitarian-universal, extended not alone to Israel and its land, but to all peoples and all lans. The era of the King-Messiah will be the Golden Age of the future, referred to in Scripture as "the end of days," which will see the realization of perfect conditions, not only for the nation, and the individual within the nation, but for humanity as a whole (op. cit. pp. 21-25).

While I concur in Klausner's analysis of the Messianic components, and agree with his statement: "Truly the Messianic idea is the most glistening jewel in the glorious crown of Judaism," I take issue with him on the origins of the Messianic idea and its manifestations in the history of Israel. My own view is

that the Messiah idea as we know it is a product of the Assyrian crisis of 722-701 BCE. The events of that crisis are detailed in 2K chs. 17-19, and 2Chr chs. 29-32. The miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem and its people from Sennacherib was attributed to King Hezekiah, who sat on the throne of David at the time of this event. Hezekiah becomes the archetype of the Messiah, the Messianic promise is read back into history to the time of David, and projected into the future as the guarantee of national security and deliverance from the threat of annihilation whenever a crisis confronts the Jewish people. Subsequent crises re-enforced the idea that God would never forsake them, but would deliver them miraculously through a Davidic King, just as He did in the days of Hezekiah. The superb architect of the Messianic idea is the prophet Isaiah, who was an eye-witness to the historical events and interpreted them, and his school of disciples. The locus classicus of the portrait of the Messiah and the Messianic age is Is. ch. 11.

The nature of Jewish Messianism, then, is that of crisis theology rooted in crisis psychology. When Jewish life became one continuous historical crisis, when the Jew no longer had an independent national existence and there was a constant threat to his survival as an ethnic and religious group, the Messianic hope became an impelling concomitant of Jewish life and thought. Theologically, it was related to the problem of theodicy. National crisis called either for the renunciation of God as the just Power who sustains his righteous people, or for the postponement of the vindication of their loyalty and faithfulness to God to some future time, through an instrumentality of God's choice. Of these

alternatives, the first was untenable: the Jewish people could not desert God, with Whom they a covenantal relationship, and Who indicated through the historical event that He would not desert them, the prototype of that event being the salutary resolution of the Assyrian crisis. That same crisis also pointed to the agent which God had chosen as the symbol of the vindication and the deliverance, a ruler of Davidic descent. Thus, for the Jewish people, Messianism became a theological as well as a political necessity. It has remained so throughout the crises of Jewish history down to the present generation.

The crises that beset the Jewish people subsequently, the Babylonian Exile, the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, the internecine struggles during the reign of the Hasmoneans, all produced a theological response to the events, sometimes distinctively Messianic, sometimes only by implication. The apocalypse of Daniel, in response to the threat of Antiochus, introduces the concept of the Son of Man and the resurrection of the dead. Both of these themes recur in the Book of Enoch, which is a response to Alexander Janneus' slaughter of the Pharisees, and which contributes the idea that the Messiah was fashioned before creation (48:6), and will serve as the judge on the Day of Judgement, sitting on his throne. He will support the righteous, punish the wicked, heal the broken-hearted, and be a light to the Gentiles, and reveal the secrets and the mysteries. After some terrible wars with the Persians and Medes, who will be slain at the gates of Jerusalem, there will set in the Messianic era of complete rest and peace.

Pharisaic and anti-Hasmonean, dating from about 50 BCE are the Psalms of Solomon, which brings us to the most insidious crisis in the history of the period, Roman occupation and rule over Judea, initiated by Pompey when he marched into Jerusalem and sacked the Temple in 63 BCE. While the Davidic element of Messianism was suppressed under Hasmonean rule, and may have been conceqled in another guise, such as the Messiah of Israel and the Messiah son of Aaron, under Pharisaic influence the Davidic Messiah comes to full blossom again. Psalm 17 provides a vivid picture of the Messianic figure and what he will achieve:

> Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David,....that he may reign over Israel Thy servant. Gird him with strength to shatter unrighteous rulers, and to purge Jerusalem from the nations which trample upon her to destroy her. In wisdom and righteousness he will cast out sinners from the inheritance...with an iron rod he will break in pieces all their substance, he shall destroy the godless nations by the word of his mouth...He shall gather together a holy people whom he shall lead in righteousness, and he shall judge the tribes of the people that has been sanctified by the Lord his God...The peoples of the nations shall serve him under his yoke, he shall glorify the Lord openly in all the earth. He shall purge Jerusalem, making it holy as of old, so that nations shall come from the ends of the earth to see his glory....He shall not put his trust in horse and rider and bow, nor shall he multiply for himself gold and silver for war, nor shall he rely on archers in the day of battle...Throughout his days he will not stumble, for God will make him mighty by means of His holy spirit...Blessed be they that shall live during those days, to see the good fortune of Israel, which God shall bring to pass in the ingathering of the tribes.

This lays the groundwork for the portrait of the Messiah and the depiction of the Messianic era that prevailed immediately before, during, and subsequent to the rise of Christianity. It must be borne in mind that Jewish opinions varied on this vital theme, during this period as in previous generations, and these differences were rather freely expressed. The right to espouse a given point of view was never questioned, except where it contravened the accepted position of ethical monotheism and

its implications. But all the individual Messianic opinions notwithstanding, there was a general concensus concerning the subject. Paramount is the liberation of the Jewish nation and its land from the oppressive yoke of the foreign conqueror, which is the political aspect of the Messianic hope, and with it the re-establishment of Jewish autonomy, resulting in the purification of the land and the people and their spiritual rehabilitation. These features of the Messiah and the Messianic era stand out in bold relief:

The Messiah will be the symbol and/or the active agent of the deliverance of Israel. He will be of Davidic lineage, if possible. Elijah will herald his coming. Rome will be annihilated and the enemies of Israel will be shattered. The exiles will be gathered in to their own land from all places of their dispersion. The Northern Kingdom will be reunited with Judah. There will be a resurrection of the dead. The Messiah will rebuild the Temple and restore Jerusalem to its pristine splendor. He will have sovereignty over all the world and make the Torah the universal Law of mankind. He will punish the unrepenting wicked of his people, as well as of the Gentiles, and will have the power to consign them to Gehenna. There will be a moral regeneration of Israel and all of mankind. The Messiah will be a righteous judge, dispensing justice and equity, the champion of the poor and the oppressed, the personification of social justice./ He will establish the kingdom of heaven, abundant material blessing, and unendg peace. the righteous, who will surround him, enjoying the divine effulgence. The essence of the Messiah will be faith in God, and he will vindicate that faith and the faithfulness of Israel in the eyes of all the world. (Based primarily on the tenth chapter of Sanhedrin in the Babylonian Talmud, a.e.)

From the Gospels it is evident that Jesus and his circle of disciples were to begin with a Messianic movement among others that arose during those turbulent years. While Mark and John do not contain any genealogies tracing the ancestry of the family of Jesus to David, Matthew does provide such a genealogy at the very beginning of his account, and Luke makes reference to his Davidic descent (2:4) and his legacy of the throne of David (1:32). The designation of Jesus as "King of the Jews" at the crucifixion, and the discussion with Pilate concerning the kingship indicates that the Romans looked upon his activities as Messianic. The title which he bore, Christos, identifies him as Mashiah, the anointed one, and the prophecies in Hebrew Scriptures which are adduced as proof-texts, are Messianic in tone, or so interpreted by the Evangelists. This is testimony to the political aspect of Jesus' mission. This constituted treason in the eyes of Rome, and called for the appropriate punishment for treason, crucifixion. When it became evident that Messianic aspirations and activity could lead to the direst consequences to those who were in the movement, the political phase is completely disavowed, and only the spiritual aspect is emphasized, so that Jesus could say, "My kingdom is not of this world." (Jn 18:36)

There is an intriguing parallel to this development in early Christian Messianism, in the suspension of the Messianic immediately following the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, which has been completely overlooked by other scholars. Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, who moved the center of Jewish life to Jamnia when Jerusalem was destroyed, clamped the lid on all overt Messianic expression, at least during his lifetime. Klausner is not quite accurate when he says: "...while we have no Messianic say-

ings from the time before the Destruction, from the first years after the Destruction we have a whole series of such sayings" (p. 396). The fact is that R. Johanan b. Zakkai discouraged political activism against Rome as long as he could, by shifting his emphasis not only to the propogation of Torah as the redemptive force in Jewish life, but what is equally significant, by encouraging his disciples to indulge in Merkabah Mysticism. This was a form of mental and spiritual discipline which placed the Throne of God in the highest heaven, a sanctuary beyond the reach of the Romans, a heavenly Jerusalem which was inviolate, and which was accesible to the qualified sages by means of mystic ascent. R. Johanan b. Zakkai gloried in this (Hag. 14b), probably because this spared the Sages from execution for treason by the Romans, and yet gave them a substitute and subterfuge to keep their national aspirations alive. It is only in this light that we can understand his statement in Abot d'R. Nathan (ch. 31): "If you are about to plant something, and they say to you, Behold, here comes the Messiah, go and plant it first and then go out to meet him." What he is saying in effect is, "Go about your business and don't discuss the coming of the Messiah publicly." (Klausner's comment on this passage: "In our whole literature there is hardly a saying as fine as this in praise of the tilling of the soil. (!) (p. 396, n.9)

This does not mean that the old sage of Jamnia harbored no Messianic hope, but he tried to conceal it from the Roman authorities. This may account, too, for his death-bed statement "Prepare a seat for Hezekiah, king of Judah, who is coming." (Ber. 28a. Ab. R. N, ch. 25, omits "who is coming.") This is an

admonition to his disciples not to despair of a Messianic deliverance, but it is couched in language which the Romans could neither understand nor take exception to. When he died (c. 110), the Messianic impulses which he had suppressed, boiled over, and led eventually to the rebellion of Bar Kokeba.

From the beginning of Christianity the only difference between Christians and Jews was that the Jews believed that the Messiah was still to come and the Christians believed that he already came. The term "Christian" was used to describe them, probably for the first time, by the people of Antioch, with reference to Paul and Barnabus and their followers (Acts 11:26).

In time the Christian concept of the Messiah came to stress certain features which followed from its identity as spiritual Messianism only. These are vicarious atonement, Jesus accepting crucifixion and death to redeem all humanity from the sin of Adam which is inherited by all men (I Cor 15:22); his resurrection on the third day (v.20), which is an interpretation of the Jewish idea that the resurrection will follow close upon the coming of the Messiah, Jesus demonstrating the truth of the resurrection by rising from the dead himself; ascending to heaven, where he sits at the right hand of God; he becomes Son of God in a special way, and God Himself (Jn 17:20-22); the Parousia and the Second Coming of Christ (I Cor 16:22). This is the direction which Christian Messianism took, and these remain the cornerstones and the foundation of its fundamental doctrines.

Jewish faith in the coming of the Messiah became even more pronounced with the oppressive measures taken by Rome. The Destruction demanded an eventual show-down with Rome. R. Akiba

sponsored Bar Kokba as the heralded Messiah (p. Taanit 68d), and saw in him the political redeemer who would bring an end to Roman rule, even though he may not have been of Davidic descent. I am of the opinion that the Tannaitic Sages of this period scrutinized the emerging Christianity very carefully in an effort to determine if it was an effective means of solving the problems with which the Jewish people were confronted at the time. Foremost among those Sages was R. Akiba. My own hypothesis is that this study of Christianity is the focal point of the Baraita in Hag. 14b concerning the four who entered the "Pardes." When R. Akiba decided that Christianity was not the solution for the Jewish people, he directed his energies towards the revolt of 132-135 against Hadrian. This, too, was crushed by the Romans, as the other Messianic movements that preceded it had been crushed, and R. Akiba and many of his colleagues met the same fate at the hands of the Romans that Jesus and countless others had met who had valiantly opposed the tyranny of the Roman Empire. This happened after Hadrian had proscribed the Jewish religion and the study of the Torah, recognizing in the spiritual element the impetus that spurred the political and military rebellion.

But Roman oppression could not suppress the Messianic hope nor obliterate the Jewish yearning for deliverance and redemption. It now took the form of speculation, very elaborate and vivid, as to the pre-conditions of the Messianic advent, and extravagant details of the Messianic era and the person of the Messiah, and of his miraculous powers which he will possess. The picture of the Messianic Banquet consisting of Behemoth and Leviathan, first mentioned in the Ethiopic Enoch (60:7-10), now is magnified even more (IV Ezra, a product of this period, 6:49-53) (B.B. 74b-75a), and added to it is the tantallizing wine preserved in grapes since the

first days of creation (San 99a, Ber 34b). Overpowering was the desire to know the exact time of the Messiah's arrival, in view of the failure of those on whom the people had pinned their Messianic hopes previously. This gave rise to calculations of the "ketz," the Messianic end of time, based variously on Persian eschatology (3 periods of 2000 years, Tohu, Torah, Yemot Hamashiah (San 97a); disclosures of Elijah (Ibid.); and the mysterious numbers in the Book of Daniel (7:25-time, times and a half-time; 8:13-14-2300 evening and mornings or 1150 days, equivalent of c. 3½ lunar years; 12:11-12-1290 days & 1335 days). Invariably the calculations proved erroneous, and led to great disappointment and despair. Hence the statement that "Seven things are hidden from man. These are the day of death and theeday of resurrection (nuhama-Syr.)...when the kingdom of the house of David will be restored or when the sinful kingdom will fall." (Pes 54b) There is also an anathema pronounced upon those who speculate as to the date of the Messianic advent, because if their calculations prove to be false, the people would despair of his coming at all (San 97b). Also, "He who calculates the ketz has no share in the World to Come." (Der. Eretz Rab. 11)

Yet, the speculation and the calculation persisted. The Jews virtually rejected the offer of Emperor Julian ("the Apostate") to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem in 362 CE, because they wanted nothing from Rome and expected a Messianic miracle to effect their restoration. (Mentioned in Christian chronicles, but not in the Jewish sources, Gratz, Geschichte, IV, p. 345). Marg & M, p. 230 There is an amazing Baraita which reads: "After 4231 years A.M., if a man were to say to you, Take this field worth a thousand dinar for one dinar, do not take it." Rashi explains that the Messiah is due that year, and he will distribute land free of charge. (A.Z. 9b) The year

4231 A.M. is the equivalent of 471 CE (Creation- 3760 BCE), only five years away from the actual downfall of Rome (Western) in 476.

Public knowledge of the calculated dates of the Messianic advent usually led to great emotional upheavals and accompanying social and economic dislocation. It sometimes brought forth men who claimed to be the Messiah with promises of the miraculous deliverance. Such was the case on the island of Crete, which was heavily populated with Jews, where a certain Moses proclaimed himself to be the Messiah. He attracted most of the people who belonged to the synagogues of the island; they abandoned their normal pursuits, gave him all their possessions, and followed him to the sea. He announced a second Mosaic miracle of the splitting of the waters, and promisedtto lead them through it to the Holy Land, ordering them to cast themselves into the sea. The result was an immediate catastrophe of major proportions (Socrates, Historia Ecclesiastica, ed. Bohn, vii, p. 36) (Hast. ERE viii,580)

The rise and spread of Islam rekindled the Messianic zeal in some Jewish circles and the remarkable Arab victories stirred the Jews to renewed hope that the advent of the Messiah would soon follow (Silver, Messianic Speculation, p.37). I have found evidence of this in the Targumic rendering of 2Sam 22:32, which reads:"Then, in consequence of the miracle and the deliverance which Thou shalt perform for Thy Messiah and for the remnant pf Thy people who remain,, all peoples, nations, and tongues shall confess and say,'There is no God but the Lord,' for there is none besides Thee. And Thy people shall say, 'There is none mighty save our God.'" All this is an interpretation of the Hebrew text which simply asks, "For who is God but the Lord, and who

is a Rock other than our God?" The Targum's phrase, "there is no God but the Lord" is a literal translation of the Arabic, La Ilaha illa 'Llahu, into Aramaic, with Adonai substituted for Allah. Israel's response is also relevant, "there is none mighty save our God," which is undoubtedly a rejoinder to the Moslem "Allahu Akbar."

There were several Messiah figures who appeared rather early in the vicissitudes of the Jews living under Moslem rule. One such was Serene who lived in Syria, identified himself as the Messiah who would drive the Arabs out of Palestine and would reclaim it for his Jewish brothers. He abolished Talmudic ordinances and thereby gained quite a following among Jews in Moslem countries, but he was captured by Moslem authorities and handed over to the Gaon Natronai, who simply administered the punishment of stripes to him and his followers. (c.720 CE) (ERE viii, 582)

Another was Abu Isa b. Ishak who thought of himself as the Messiah son of Joseph, the precursor of the Davidic Messiah. He lived in Persia, and threw his military might on the wrong side of an internecine battle against the Omayyad dynasty and died in battle (c. 755 CE). His followers formed a sect called the Isaites, who practiced asceticism, and entertained some Messianic expectations, perhaps a return of Abu-Isa himself. The sect existed for approximately 300 years. (Ibid.)

Several of the Midrashe Geulah come into being at this time. One of these, Nistaroth d'Rabbi Shimon b. Yohai, has the angel Metatron reveal to the Sage that there will be great animosity between Edom and Ishmael. He reviews the history of the Caliphate to the last of the Omayyads, during whose day the Mes-

siah son of Joseph will appear, will return Palestine to the Jewish people, and will rebuild the Temple, but will be slain by the son of Satan, Armilus (Romulus), who will drive the Jews out the land to which they had been restored. Then the true Messiah son of David will reveal himself and slay Armilus, and bring back the Jews to their land.

The impact of Arab culture also provided the climate for the very productive period of Jewish religious philosophy and theology. All the philosopher-theologians, from Saadia Gaon (892-942) in Babylon to Don Isaac Abrabanel (1437-1508) who was among the victims of the edict of expulsion issued against all the Jews of Spain by King Ferdinand in 1492, accept the doctrine of the Messiah as a fundamental tenet of the Jewish faith, although the relative importance of the concept varies with different theologians. Crescas (Spain, 1340-1410) lists the dogmas of Judaism, in the order of their importance, as the existence of God, omniscience, providence, omnipotence, prophecy, free-will, purposefulness, creatio ex nihilo, immortality, reward and punishment, resurrection, eternity of the Torah, the supremacy of Moses as a prophet, the Urim and Thummim, and the coming of the Messiah. His disciple Albo (1380-1440) reduces the mass of Jewish beliefs into three basic principles, the existence of God, providence, and revelation, and under the latter, belief in the Messiah and divine retribution here and hereafter are at the very bottom.

But the greatest Jewish philosopher of them all, Moses Maimonides, (1135-1204) lists thirteen cardinal dogmas, all of equal stature, all imperatives of faith for the believing Jew, a disavowal of any of them being tantamount to faithlessness and marking one as

being theologically out of the Jewish fold. The twelfth of these articles of faith is the belief in the coming of the Messiah. All of the thirteen eventually were accepted as worthwhile guides to Jewish religious belief, and were included in the traditional prayerbook following the morning service for weekdays, prefaced by the phrase "Ani ma'amin be'emunah shlemah," "I believe with perfect faith (or faithfulness)."

The Maimonidean concept of the Messiah is set forth in several of his writings, the Siraj to San. Ch. 10, the Yad, the Moreh, and the Iggeret Teman. The picture is a rational one. The Messiah will be human, Davidic, will excel in wisdom and learning, will be wiser and mightier than Solomon, and almost the equal of Moses in prophetic insight (Yad, Teshuvah 11:2; Ig. Tem.). He will deliver Israel from foreign domination, enlarge its territory, and implant the love of God in the human heart. The Messiah will be the personification of wisdom, unlike the Messianic pretender who appeared in Arabia and proceeded to dispossess people of their private property and scatter their wealth, which to him was folly because it merely impoverished everybody (Iggeret; Deot 5:12). There will be no change in the natural order. The Messiah himself will die and be succeeded by his son. There will be no difference between the Messianic era and present time, except the restoration of Jewish sovereignty in its own land. Peace will prevail among all nations, who will do homage to the Messiah and will come and learn the word of God from him. Maimonides, like the other philosophers, supported the Talmudic prohibition against trying to determine the exact date of the Messianic advent; and like them, he also calculates the "ketz." On the basis a tradition handed down in his family, he claims the date of the advent of the precursor of the Messiah will be 1216.

There is evidence in Jewish religious development during the Middle Ages of the mystic role of the Messiah-figure as a redemptive force of a limited scope. Kabbalistic lore, esoteric by its very nature, enabled the initiated to perceive the secrets of Creation and Redemption by means of a personal Revelation associated with Sinai and Torah. The Kabbalist, possessing the knowledge of both the beginning and the end of time, need not wait for the temporal "ketz" to find the Messianic deliverance. In the Kabbalah he found the wherewithal to incorporate within himself all the attributes of the Messiah. Thus the Jewish mystic became a Messianic being, rising above time and history, and fulfilling in his own generation and amidst his own limited circle of followers, all the eschatological expectations of the Messiah. By his Messianic-type of leadership he could bring the ecstatic beauty and delight of Paradise to his followers, so that no matter how dismal the external world might be, the inner light of Jewish experience and faith reflected an effulgence of the Divine Presence. And the Messianic bud could blossom in any Jew, for just as the Jewish people are pre-disposed to Prophecy, so are they pre-conditioned to Messianism.

To be sure, this Kabbalistic potential carried within it the seeds of misery and destruction. When this Messianic redemptive urge seized an individual who was not content with serving a relatively small group of Jews, but whose ambition and delusion of omnipotence drove him to attempt mastery of the entire world, the results were tragic, almost to cosmic proportions. Such was the case Sabbatian and Frankist movements, led by Sabbatai Zevi (1621-1676) and Yankiev Leibowitz Frank, (1726-1791) who, under the influence of mysticism, proclaimed themselves Messiahs, and brought death to their followers.

The modern era led to Jewish religious reform, to the Nazi Holocaust, and to the establishment of the State of Israel, all of which involve elements shaped by the concept of the Messiah. Orthodox Jews, theologically, still believe in the coming of a personal Messiah, along the lines drawn in the Talmud and in Medieval Jewish literature. But even the Reform Movement, which is extreme in its departure from Orthodoxy, retains some features of classical Jewish Messianism. I cite as an example the thinking of Isaac Mayer Wise, the founder of most of the institutions of Reform Judaism in America.

Isaac M. Wise was a product of 19th century rationalism which engendered the hope that reason would control the habitations of men for all time to come, and he believed that at long last the Messianic age was about to be ushered in, dominated by democracy, liberty, political equality, social and economic security, human brotherhood and peace. The American dream would redeem the entire world, under the protection of a benign God first conceived by the Jew and now vindicated by universal acceptance. "The spirit of the age" of which Isaac M. Wise spoke so frequently and with such optimistic enthusiasm, was the very Messianic dream that had been painted with such vivid imagery in the sacred Messianic lore of Judaism.

Isaac Mayer Wise was ambivalent concerning the Messiah. It seems that at times he renounced the personal Messiah of tradition. At times he veered towards the position that in consequence of its great religious mission to mankind, the Jewish people itself was the Messiah. At other times he implied that the Messiah might be a man of any nation who would bring into the world an era of perfect peace and justice (J. Heller, IMW, p.170). "The Messianic aim of Israel...is the union of all men as children of God in the confession of the unity of God, so as to realize

the unity of all rational creatures and their call to moral sanctification" (JH, pp. 535-6). Or, as stated elsewhere, "The hour of redemption for mankind must come, the Messiah must be sent to redeem them. Here in America the dalvation of mankind must originate." (D. Wilansky, Sinai to Cincinnati, p. 29)

Grim testimony to the power of the Messianic dream is to be found in the eye-witness accounts of what happened inside of Hitler's concentration camps. The victim's were sustained by the prayer-book version of Maimonides' twelfth article of faith, for which they provided their own melody: "I believe with perfect faith in the coming of the Messiah, and even though he be delayed, I will nevertheless wait for him to arrive, every day." This was chanted over and over again until it became their anthem of life and enabled some of them to survive. (Kiddush Hashem, Anthology of Jewish Martyrology, ed. Sh. Niger, N.Y. 1948, p. 13; Lieder fun di Ghettoes und Lagern, ed. Sh. Katcherginski, Introd. by H. Leivick, p. xxxiv). The crisis theology born in Israel in 701 BCE, was still operative in the Jewish crisis in Europe, 1945.

Zionism and the State of Israel, likwise, are Messianic in character, and partake of the same Messianic hope which dominated Jewish life and faith through the ages. This is attested to by none other than the leading architect of the Jewish State and its first Prime Minister: "...Our vision of redemption is both Jewish and universal...This is possible only in the Messianic vision" (Forum IV, 152 ff.)

I have attempted to present to you some Jewish and Christian perspectives on the Messiah and the Messianic Era. There are

of course some elements of difference in our respective points of view, but our Messianic ideas share a common background and point to similar objectives. As long as there is evil in the world, we must strive to eradicate it. As long as there is room for improvement in the human situation, it is our duty to work towards that end. As long as justice and righteousness and peace have not been realized in the affairs of men and nations, we must spare no effort to make these ideals live in the human heart. As long as man remains unredeemed from sin and his sub-human impulses, we must bring to bear the redemptive power of faith to save him from himself. The Christian with his view of the Messiah and the Jew with his.

Family quarrels are often more impassioned than disputes among strangers. The expectation of family unity exacerbates every difference, turning on occasion the very feelings of affinity into unreasoning perverse passions of hostility. The division between Judaism and Christianity was originally a family quarrel, with the apostles and the Pharisaic teachers appealing to the same sacred texts and the same living tradition. Furthermore, the peculiar bitterness of inverted family affection accompanied the Jewish-Christian debate throughout the centuries, since both sets of disputants regarded the documents of the first centuries as the basic texts of their respective faiths. Both too suffered from the same proclivity to exhibit and illustrate the radiance of their essential teaching by using the other as the dark background.

Happily, the Age of Disputation is now yielding to the Age of Dialogue. New insights that are shared by the elite of our generation as well as the challenge of common enemies have combined to reawaken the old family feeling.' Many studies have shown that the New Testament can hardly be understood outside the context of rabbinic literature. The critical study of Talmud and Midrash in the light of our knowledge of the apocalyptic circles, the early Gnostics, the Qumran sectarians and the early Christian communities has taught us to recognize the rich diversity of Jewish thought in the first centuries of our era. In the all-important area of ethics, the essential unity of the Jewish-Christian tradition is now recognized, in spite of the differences in emphasis that are quite obvious.

In this address, I propose to project some outlines for ~~the~~ continued exploration that will hopefully result in deepening the trends toward mutual appreciation. ~~My task is to examine~~ I wish to call attention to the parallels in the theologies of the two faiths, uncovering their broad equivalencies of thought and sentiment, even in the fields where they are most unlike.

I begin with the opposite axion from that of the traditional Jewish and Christian disputants. While they assumed that there was only one right way in which the biblical heritage could be interpreted and advanced, we begin with the fact of diversity. Their disputations were simply acts of war carried on"by other means," to invest a phrase made famous by Clausewitz. As the polemics of belligerents, their arguments were intemperate, self-righteous, incredibly one-sided and ferocious. Necessarily so, for the piety of one was anathema to the other. If one was right, entitled to the dignity and destiny of Israel, the other was dead wrong, doomed, self-condemned unto perdition, rejected by God, albeit used by Him for some mysterious intent in His grand design for salvation.

I begin with the axiom of bifurcation; as a fact of history, presumably willed by the Lord of history. Here are two faiths that have grown in different ways for well-nigh two millenia. They have become as diverse as two biological organisms, with their respective doctrines and rites ceasing to be mutually interchangeable, even when their unity of origin is clearly manifest. In the realm of spiritual life, there is a phenomenon comparable to that of the rejection of organs transplanted from another body - every rite and doctrine is informed by the spirit of the whole and incommensurate with the corresponding portions of another faith.

Yet, Judaism and Christianity belong to the same family; they deal with the same basic polarities in the relation of man to God. While they stake out their respective positions at opposite ends of the same polarities, they seek at their best to do justice to the values affirmed by the other. Both assert their respective positions, in faith, both are governed by love, inspired by hope and kept vibrantly alive by the constant recurrence of doubt. Both acknowledge the quest of truth and goodness to be an infinite road, which man must pursue in his own slow and fumbling ways. Both acknowledge that they belong together in God's design, fulfilling His Purpose of rescuing mankind from the grip of sin and establishing His Kindgom on earth.

The correspondences that we look for may well serve as illustrations of Paul's teaching in the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians - to wit, many gifts derive from the one Holy Spirit; yet, in all their diversity, these gifts possess a family resemblance, since they are all stamped by the Divine seal of love. Similarly, the Talmud states that the Torah may be interpreted in seventy different ways; yet, the words of the Psalmist remain true, "Her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace."

Martin Buber uncovered an ancient insight when he interpreted the famous verse of Leviticus XIX, 18, to mean - "it is through the love of neighbor that one discovers the reality of God." While we differ from one another in an infinity of ways, we can discover the image of God in one another and thereby rise to the point of feeling the healing presence of our Creator.

In our quest of correspondences and parallels in the two theologies, we must allow for the broad spectrums of thought and sentiment in both traditions. (1a.) For we deal with faiths, not sects. In a sect, the lines of demarcation are doctrinal, not historical. The boundaries are thin, like a razor's edge. The vagaries of life are swallowed up in the rigidities of dogma. In contrast, a faith is a historical community, pulsating with the rich rhythms of life itself. Its doctrines are softened and stretched by the heaving tides of a restless society; its institutions reveal the tensions and contradictions of successive historic forces; its schools of thought are varied enough to reflect the diversities of human nature.

In brief we aim neither to discover identities nor to harp upon differenc but to call attention to some interesting parallels, whereby similar truths were articulated in diverse dogmas and institutions.

No one questions that the Christian concept of God is borrowed from Judaism. It is to the God of Israel, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob whose redemptive deeds were recorded in the Hebrew Bible, that Christians prayed. (1)

And they considered it their mission to eradicate the worship of other gods from the face of the earth. The early Christians were occasionally martyred for their refusal to throw a fistful of incense on a pagan altar or to eat meat sacrificed to other gods.(2) Paul could identify "the unknown god" of Athens with the One God of Israel, but he would not have asserted that either Zeus, or Serapis, or Mithra were essentially one with the God of Israel.(3)

Still, the exponents of both Judaism and Christianity generally regard the doctrine of God as one of the deepest ~~lines of demarcation~~ canyons extending between the two faiths. To the average Jew, his daily recitation of the "Shema" - Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one - is a ringing assertion of monotheism as against Christian trinitarianism. Maimonides, for all his positive appreciation of the historic, nay the providential, role of Christianity in preparing mankind for the triumph of "the true faith" in the future, was convinced nevertheless that the Christians of his day were presumably idolators.(4)

Living in a Moslem country at the time of the Crusades, he based his presumption on a crude interpretation of the Trinity, which he attributed to the majority of Christians. However, he was wise enough to allow that idolatry is a matter of inner orientation of mind and heart, not of verbal formulations. The mystic and Qabbalist, Nahmonides, taught that God Himself was present in the "pillar of fire" that preceded the Israelites in their travels through the wilderness; yet, in the famous disputation on Barcelona, he pinpointed the Incarnation as that absurd doctrine which "the mind of man or Jew" could not but repudiate.(6) Indeed, since the days of Paul, the Trinity was "folly to the Greeks and a stumbling block to the Jews."(7) In modern times Jewish philosophers continued to reaffirm the doctrine of Divine unity on rational, as well as traditional grounds.(8) A'had Ha'am, the great exponent of an ethical philosophy of life, asserted that the unity of God and the consequent condemnation of all images were the core-convictions of Judaism.

Said he, if today a Gentile were to ask me to teach him all of the Torah while standing on one foot, I should have explained to him the second of the Ten Commandments, prohibiting "other gods," and images or idols.(9) It is here that he saw the Great Divide between the two historic faiths.

On the Christian side, Jewish monotheism was often regarded as flat, abstract and formalistic. Sheer unity does not engage the emotions, appeal to man's imagination, or stir the feelings of worship. Does not the doctrine of unity belong more to the pale cast of philosophy than to the flesh and blood religion of men of faith? How can a meaningful, moving, over-powering apprehension of the Divine be conveyed by sheer insistence on unity?(10)

Consequently, many Christian historians of religion interpret Judaism as being the belief in a purely transcendental God, who dwells alone beyond the reach of man, after having laid down laws of conduct for his mortal subjects, and having assigned rewards and penalties to the various provision of His Law. Few indeed are the Christian theologians who acknowledge the richness and complexity of the Jewish God-idea.(10)

Actually, the doctrine of Divine unity is meaningful precisely because it postulates an infinite diversity of God's manifestations. In its first formulation, the "Shema" may have been simply a protest against polytheism. So, the new translation of the Jewish Publication Society substitutes the word, Alone, for the word, One. But, already in the first century of our era, the "Shema" acquired more subtle significance, implying the inner unity of diverse Divine attributes. We learn from Philo that the two Cherubim, at the gateway of the Garden of Eden and in the Holy of Holies, stood for two potencies,(11) or for the two Policies of the Supreme Being - Sovereignty and Beficence. This interpretation corresponds to the rabbinic distinction between the Policy of Law (Middat Hadin) and the Policy of Mercy or Love (Middat Horahmim).(12) A tannaitic commentary describes the Name, Elohim, as standing for law, and the Name YHVH, as meaning, Mercy.(13) The two Policies are employed by God, whose inscrutable Being transcends all our conception.(14) His unity, then, is no longer a

simple affirmation that He alone is God. The great commentator, Rashi, (Rabbi Solomon Yizhaki) interprets the "Shema" as an affirmation of the messianic hope - He, who is now worshipped only in Israel, will at the end of time be acknowledged as the One God of all mankind. (15)

That God manifests HImself to us in diverse and contradictory ways, the Sages conceded in the earliest commentaries that we possess. Sometimes, He appears with avenging wrath and sometimes as one overflowing with pity. (16) There is reason to believe that speculative philosophy was cultivated in the pre-Christian period. Already, then, the contrast was felt between the concept of God that emerges from the contemplation of nature, more or less after the fashion of the Aristotelians, and the concept that emerges from our contemplation of human nature as a dim and feeble "image" of the Creator. The first procedure leads to a philosophic principle of Being, a Prime Mover, while the second leads to an ideal Personality, endowed with the admirable qualities that are adumbrated in our most loved fellow-humans. (17) The former is the end-product of thought, the latter is the postulate of our noblest feelings. But, thought and feeling merge and become one in those blessed moments of religious experience, when the soul in its loneliness is embraced and reassured by the Father of all. The Psalmist articulates this astonishing certainity - "for me, He loved...," "I shall extol Thee, O Lord, for Thou has drawn me up..." , "I shall walk before the Lord in the land of the living..."

"Even when I walk in the valley of the shadow of death, I shall fear no evil..." (18)

In these and in many similar passages, we catch sight of the soul of man, as it becomes aware of the shadow of death, sensing the abyss of nothingness, yet knowing that it is Kin to Him, Who stands beyond all that is material and mortal. Like the flickering flame of a candle, it yearns heavenward, even while it clings precariously to its bodily anchor. Somehow, in all its frailty, it belongs to the realm of the Divine. The Eternal has

"chosen" it, rescued it from the very jaws of death, given it a place at His "table," where it joins the company of the eternal.

How can the personal living God, "The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," be one with the First Cause, the Thought that forever thinks Itself? - In religion, this unity is affirmed, as an inevitable implication of our experience; in philosophy, the task of reconciling the two aspects of the Divine Being is set as the enduring, endless challenge. But, difficult as the task may be for philosophy, we know in the depths of our being that the God of nature and the God of our hearts is one and the same.(19) He is Transcendent and Immanent, the root-idea of all thoughts, and an "ever-present help in trouble." The prophet has Him say - "for your thoughts are not My thoughts, for high as is heaven above the earth, so are My thoughts over yours,"(20) At the same time, He is immanent, "Near is the Lord to all who call upon Him, to all who call upon Him in truth."(21) He is Far - "to whom shall ye compare Me, that I shall be equal," but He is also Near, for "underneath are the everlasting ones."(22)

The philosopher Kant spoke of the two ultimate sources of belief in God - the starry heavens above and the moral law within our hearts. But, the representations of God that come to mind out of these diverse reflections are not easily reconcileable. The Midrash tells how Abraham arrived at idea of One God, by reflecting on the laws of the universe and drawing the consequences of his religious experience. At first, he examined the diverse beliefs of his contemporaries who worshipped the sun, the moon, various stars, or more generally an "assembly of the gods," all of whom were generally friendly to mankind. These gods would differ in power and eminence, protecting their followers or favorites from a host of devils, of diverse shades of wickedness. Abraham concluded that each of these objects of worship was but a tiny fragment of one integrated universe. He began to view the cosmos as one magnificent palace, marvelously structured and intelligently directed, with beautiful lawns, spacious rooms and many well-disciplined servants, each of whom knew precisely what he had to do. "Can it be," he exclaimed,

"that so wondrous a palace is run without a master?" - Thereupon, the Midrash continues, the Master of the palace glanced at him and said, "I am the Master of the palace." (23)

In this tradition, Abraham is described as a philosopher who recognized the vanity of the various idolatries of his time.

He made use of the so called ~~Agreement~~ Argument from Design to prove that one spirit pervades the entire range of being. But, if he had remained at this point, he would not have gone beyond philosophy to found a living faith. Having reached the limit of rational reflection, he longed to encounter the Master of the palace. He wondered, he waited, he hoped. Then, the Lord glanced at him. Abraham felt he was recognized, accepted in all his individuality, assigned a high vocation. Now, he was a man of faith. He had become a preacher of the One God, Who was a Personal Being as well as The Primal Cause of the philosophers. (24)

~~As~~ When the religion of Israel was proclaimed to a hostile world, the prophets and sages had to stress now the immanent phase, now the transcendent phase of the One God. When they were faced by strong pagan influences, they emphasized the transcendence of God - He is not in the thunder and the storms, nor in the surging rhythms of life, but in "the still small voice." (25) When they had to combat the mood of skepticism and cynicism of the so called "Epicureans," for whom God was distant and unconcerned, they stressed His ~~xxxx~~ nearness. So, we find that some prophets stressed the immanent "Glory" of God, while others expatiated on His "holiness," his being far and above aught that is material and human. (26) The Sages were eager to maintain the tension in the soul of the pious between the feeling of God's nearness and the thought of His abstract majesty. So, a third century rabbi sums up the matter - "wherever you find the supreme greatness of the Holy One, blessed be He, there too you find His humility..." (27)

This tension serves to guard the faithful from the errors at both ends of the spectrum - the error of the philosophers, whose God is abstract, ration but unconcerned with mankind, and the error of the common folk, whose god is

an unworthy idol.

In addition to these two ways in which God is revealed, there is the cumulative impetus of the sacred tradition. The 'Aggada taught that monotheism was native to mankind and that Abraham and his descendant were instructed in the school of Shem. His personal faith was reinforced and refined by a protean monotheistic trend of thought.(28) When Moses spoke of the God he encountered at the burning bush in the wilderness, the people did not believe him until he said, "The God of your fathers manifested Himself to me."(29) We can accept new insights only if our prior learning has predisposed us for them. In Judaism, "the God of the fathers" is one with that of "the King of the universe" and with the personal Being, "our God."(30)

The web of tradition from the days of Moses was guided by the"spirit of God." It rested upon the Seventy elders that Moses selected; it spoke through the prophets of the Hebrew Bible; it guided the deliberation of Ezra and His Great Assembly of whom 35 were prophets and 85 were heads of families. The Holy Spirit continued to inspire the discussions in the various academies, lending its sanction to the continuous expansion of the Oral Law. Torah, in the widest sense, including the Talmuds and the Midrashim, might be described as the crystallization of the Holy Spirit, the living bond between Israel and the One God.(31)

The work of the Holy Spirit could be interpreted in a conservative as well as a liberal sense, to use modern terms. The first school tended to restrict the Holy Spirit to the distant past and to the messianic future. The living generation could do no more than learn the truths of the past, apply them to contemporary problems and transmit them to the next generation. The second school of thought considered that the Holy Spirit was immanent in the study-sessions of the Sages. Hence, it was a dynamic thrust, constantly renewing and transforming the truths of Torah. A beuatiful legend of this school tells how Moses visited the school of Rabbi Aqiba and was horrified to learn that he was hardly familiar with the dovtrines that were discussed. When he heard

Rabbi Aqiba say that all ~~their~~ his teaching was really implied in the Pentateuch, Moses was comforted.(32)

It follows that for the Jew, God was one in all His manifestations - particularly, in His rule of the Cosmos as its sole Creator, in His nearness "to the broken-hearted, to all who call upon Him in truth" and in the revelation of His Torah to Israel, accompanied as it was by the continuous thrust of His Holy Spirit. The Targumists and Talmudists employed various locutions for the immanent aspect of the Divine Being. They spoke of the Memra, or the Word of God, of the Shechinah, His Presence, of Kavod or Yakra, His Glory, of Ruah hakodesh, the Holy Spirit. The book of Proverbs, Sirach, The Wisdom of Solomon speak of His Wisdom. Philo writes of the Logos. How could these diverse manifestations derive from the One God? - The rabbis pointed to analogies - the sun is one, yet its rays are everywhere; the soul of man suffuses his entire personality, yet it is a distinctive "pure" entity; the rider directs the horse, yet He is separated from his mount; the tides of the ocean overflow into the caves at the shore, yet the ocean is not exhausted.(33)

Above all, God in His own Being is unknowable. Our knowledge is a mosaic, compounded of tiny bits of glass. All that we know, says Philo, comes from His illumination, but He does not reveal Himself fully. He breaks in upon us from several directions and in diverse guises, which is the reason for the belief of the naive in many gods and for the bitter skepticism of the "Epicureans." True faith implies the knowledge of our limitations as well as trust in His all-sustaining Power.(34)

So, the rabbis tell that when God gave the Torah to Moses, He held on to one third of the Tablets, Moses held on to a third, and the third portion extending between them was blank. In its own picturesque manner, the Midrash asserts that Moses received only a fraction of the Divine Will, another fraction might be attained by the successors of Moses, but a portion will forever remain hidden from man's perception.(35)

An esoteric tradition dealt with the details of creation and providence. (Maasai Bereshit and Maasai Merkabah)(36). Its exact nature is unknown, though we have good reason to assume that the later literature of the Qabbalah incorporated some or all of the ancient speculations. A sixteenth century philosophical Qabbalist asserts that "the hidden wisdom" concerned itself with the following riddles - If God is One, how did the diverse pluralities of the universe derive from Him? If God is all-good, how did the many forces of evil come into existence? If God is the the Author and Guide of the Cosmos, how can we speak of Him as the God of Israel? - These and similar questions point to the manifold aspects of God in Judaism - His metaphysical transcendence (En Sof) to which no predicate of any kind may be applied, His immanence in the good, the harmonious and the holy, "whereon His Name is particularized," and His relation to the revealed Torah and the living tradition of Israel.(37)

Official or exoteric Judaism, as it was taught openly in the academies, refrained from speculating about the nature of the Divine Being, "I prefer that they neglect Me, but keep My Torah," for then its inner light would restore their health."(38) Suffice it for man to know that God exists and that Torah and wisdom derive from Him. The Sages stressed the many-sidedness of His Providence, cautioning against the temptation to identify Him with one quality - such as, His love, His law, or His fiat. If the preceptor expatiated on the goodness and love of God, he was silenced; if a reader extolled only God's love for all His creatures, he was silenced, for God's Will consists of law and love, of inscrutable decrees and arbitrary actions.(39)

There were differences of opinion among the rabbis on this point. Rabbi Aqiba, who entered the Pardes of speculation in peace and emerged in peace, use to say - "all that the Merciful One does is for the sake of goodness." This saying is not quoted in The Ethics of the Fathers where we read instead an assertion by another sage - "all that the Lord has created, He brought into being for the sake of His honor-" that is, as an articulation of His true nature, which must remain incomprehensible to us.(40)

In the various Names of God which the Sages coined, we find the effort to reflect these several aspects of His Being. They spoke of Mi Sheomar vehaya haolom, He who spoke and the world came into being, or Hamokom, The Plac to indicate His transcendence beyond the dimensions of space - "He is the place of the world, but the world is not His place." (41) They referred to "Horohman," or "Rahmono," The Merciful One, or "Hatov," The Good One, to call attention to His immanence. They established at the beginning of the Eighteen Benedictions the formula, "our God and God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob." Frequently, they conjoined two of His aspects, as in the popular prayer - Ovina Malkenu, our Father, our King. And in the general formula of the benedictions for various occasions, we address the Lord by the Tetragrammaton which stands for His transcendent Being, following it with the phrase, King of the universe, indicating the immanence of His Rule, and then speak of "His sanctifying us by His Commandments," pointing to His living Word in our sacred tradition. (42)

In brief, the gulf between the Jewish stress on Divine unity and the Christian doctrine of the Trinity remains deep and unbridgeable. All that we have adduced thus far serves only to demonstrate the parallels in the two traditions - parallels which are understandable since both derived from the one scriptural heritage. (43)

It is a commonplace to contrast the church universal with the Synagogue which remained bound to the ethnic particularism of the Jewish people. We cannot doubt the potent appeal of the proclamation in the apostolic age that a fresh beginning has been made, so that converts could enter the new community as founders of a new fellowship, not merely as late-arrivals to an ancient community. To be sure, the Synagogues in The Diaspora were frequented by sympathetic hangers on, the so called "fearers of the Lord," who were considered semi-converts or spiritual converts. But these peripheral followers of the Jewish faith could not be fully content with their equivocal status, which associated them vaguely and uncertainly with the nuclear people of Israel. Also, their

feeling toward ethnic Jews was ambivalent, compounded of admiration for their ideas and resentment of their historic priority and ethnic pride. Possibly also, Paul was right in his observation that the rejection of the Gospel by the majority of the Jews and their constituted authorities was a positive asset to the Christian missionaries, since their fellowship was not burdened by the incubus of tragedy that weighed so heavy on the Jewish people.(44)

However, these differences should not obscure our perception of the important parallels between the ~~elect-saints~~ concept of the Church as a community of the elect, and the "treasure-people" of the Synagogue. These correspondences will become clear when we examine the several components of that of The Chosen People doctrine:

I. God chooses certain people, predisposing them and their descendants to a superior status and to a special degree of closeness to Him so that they may be called His "sons." Strange as it may seem, His choice is both an unconditioned expression of His Will and also a response to the spiritual preparedness of the people so favored. Strictly speaking, the two motivations are antithetical, but not contradictory, for God employs both policies in order to reach the goal He set for mankind. If His Kingdom is to comprise all mankind in "the end of days," some individuals and groups have to lead the way, so to speak. They receive more abundant grace, as it were, but from them, much more is demanded.

This paradoxical combination of Divine fiat and justice is common to both the rabbinic and the New Testament traditions. The book of Deuteronomy explains the choice of the people Israel as being due to two causes - God's love and His oath to the patriarchs.(45) Both factors are expressions of the Divine initiative, over and above the laws of justice. Yet, in the very chapter of Deuteronomy where the Israelites are cautioned against attributing their special status to their own merit, a rabbinic comment has it that Israel deserved its election on account of its humility.(46)

On the whole, the rabbinic tradition sought to reduce the range of the Divine fiat and to base the choice of the patriarchs and of Israel on their exceptional merit.(47) So, while the Pentateuch begins the story of Abraham with a Divine call, the Midrashim describe him as a lone crusader against idolatry, who was thrown live into the lime-kiln and was saved by a miracle, before the Divine call ordered him to leave his native land.(48) As to the Torah, "the splendi treasure" and mark of His choice, it was offered to all the nations and rejected by them, before the Israelites declared at Sinai, "we shall do and we shall listen." The election of Israel occurred not all at once but through the devious processes of history, and history consists of the interaction of human factors and Divine Providence. In a sense, the Talmud maintains, the union of Israel and Torah was consummated "in the days of Mordecai and Esther-" that is, when the Jews of the Diaspora refused to assimilate, and in spite of Haman's threat of annihilation, determined to be faithful to their sacred heritage. The Talmud symbolizes the momentum of historic forces by the metaphor of the mountain of Sinai uprooted by the hand of God and held suspended over the Israelites to compel their acceptance.(49) The choseness of Israel was a long and slowly maturing process, and the range of freedom of every generation was limited. Naturally, the individual was almost as determined as the historic community. Yet, the rabbis insist that every non-Jew can choose to include himself among the Chosen. They even devised a legal fiction to the effect that "a part of the soul" (their mazzal) of every convert was present at the assembly of Sinai and then purged itself from the taint of the Serpent.(50)

In the Christian tradition, the opposite end of the parodox was generally stressed, with the object of reducing the range of simple justice in the Divine economy and enlarging the domain of God's arbitrary fiat. The position of Augustine was favored as against that of Pelagius. The Lord chooses whomsoever He wills, either for salvation or for perdition. Those who confess, "Jesus is the Lord," belong to the company of the Chosen, for no

one can assert this dogma save through the Holy Spirit.(51) Yet, in nearly all its variations, Christianity continued to maintain the tension between God's justice and His fiat. In spite of Adam's sin and the arbitrary Will of God, human freedom is still a fact and along with it, the reward of the righteous and the punishment of sinners.(52) The missionary ardor of the Church implied that a residual capacity to choose remained. And in medieval casuistry, the atonement required for every sin was assayed in great detail. Through baptism, it was believed, the corruption of original sin was overcome and human freedom was reestablished.(53)

In Judaism, the effect of Adam's sin was restricted to the incidence of death. But, the Talmud too declares that "corruption" was injected into Eve by the Serpent and that all human beings as children of Eve suffer from the same moral "corruption," except for the descendents of those who stood at Sinai and the converts who joined them in the course of time.(54) Man by himself is incapable of overcoming the wiles of the Evil Desire.(55) He needs the help of God, and he needs also the assurance that God had taken the initiative in offering to him the necessary aid. In the one case this assurance is offered through baptism, in the other through the learning and practice of Torah.(56)

II. Those who are "chosen," are not given material preferments but an opportunity to labor and to suffer for the sake of His Kingdom. In Christiani God's election is an invitation to take up the Cross and to share in the redemptive suffering of the Savior.(57) In the Talmud, we are taught that the Lord employs as His instruments the "torments of love" as well as the "torments of rebuke."(58) The distinguishing mark of the former is that they encourage a person to reach higher levels of prayer and study. God enables us through personal agony to feel the pain of creation and to share the anguish of man's slow progress toward His Kingdom. When a person endures pain of the mind or of the body, the Shechinah commiserates with him as follows - "My head hurts, My arm hurts.'"(59)

In regard to mankind as a whole, the angels counselled the Lord not to bring the human race into being, since human wickedness is liable to triumph over whatever goodness humanity possesses.(60) Hence, the honor of God is involved in the career of mankind, and it is the role of the saints to vindicate His honor. So, the Sages criticize Job for not accepting his agonies as "torments of love," Though Scripture describes Job as a perfect saint, the Sages assert that he had not risen to the point of loving God with all his heart, all his soul and all his might.(61)

The suffering of an individual saint or of a whole people may secure atonement for many other people. Great sages would beg for the privilege of suffering in order to atone for the sins of others.(62) ~~(in B.M. & also~~) Thus, most Jewish commentators interpreted the twenty-third Psalm as an image of their destiny, to be the Suffering Servant of mankind.(63) The Deuteronomist interprets the implications of loving God in active terms - to found one's home, teach one's children, conduct one's business and to structure the life of the community, all in the spirit of the love of God. However, Rabbi Aqiba interpreted this commandment to mean the duty of offering the supreme sacrifice of one's life for the sake of the sanctification of the Name. And on the Day of Atonement, the martyrdom of Rabbi Aqiba and his colleagues was recalled in the liturgy.(64)

III. The community of the Chosen is maintained by the natural process of family upbringing, but any one who sincerely desires to do so may enter the community by a rite of conversion.

In Judaism, a male child was brought into the Covenant of Abraham at the age of eight days. Hosever, he becomes a Bar Mizvah, a son of the Commandments at the age of 13, when the Good Desire begins to permeate his personality. In respect of purely religious obligations (matters that are between man and God), he does not become fully responsible till the age of 20.(65) A non-Jew who wishes to convert has to make a formal declaration of intent before a court of three Jews, undergo circucision, if he is a male, and perform the

rite of baptism (dipping into a ritual bath). In the days of the Temple, the final step would consist in his bringing an offering to the Holy Temple.

Similarly in nearly all Christian sects, the rite of baptism is performed in infancy, and some ceremony of Confirmation or First Communion is observed as a parallel to the ritual of Bar Mizvah, when the youth expresses his thankfulness for the privilege of sharing in the life of Torah. A convert must undergo the rite of baptism, and his participation in the eucharist parallels the offering of thanksgiving in the Temple. (korban todah). (65a.)

In both traditions, a person may not withdraw from the community of the Chosen, in the sense of liberating himself from the obligations that he had assumed; however, he may well lose his position of good standing in the community. (66) In Judaism, an apostate, (mumar) is not allowed to participate in the life of the congregation. He is excluded from all the agencies of mutual help in the community. While Gentiles could offer sacrifices in the Holy Temple, the offerings of apostates would not be accepted. (67)

In Judaism as in Christianity, a convert was expected to become part of the community of the faithful. To spearate from the community was equivalent to denying the "root." (68)

While in theory the Shechinah may rest on an individual, it is in a real sense the counterpart of the Congregatinn of Israel. So the convert had to share in the worship of the synagogue, and in the maintenance of its educational and charitable institutions. So, too, Paul enjoined his converts not only to pray and study together, but also to settle their own quarrels and to support "the poor of Jerusalem." The structure of the community was for the Christians "the body of Christ," and whatever gift the Holy Spirit granted to one person was intended for all. (69)

Clearly, then it is wrong to assert that in Judaism a convert had to become part of the Jewish nation as well as of the Jewish faith. The rite of circumcision was a religious commandment, and it was invalid if it was not performed with the intent of submitting to the Divine command. (70)

The fact that Jewish religion and nationality were intertwined in the course of time is a historical development. Many a European nationality was nurtured under the auspices of a religious sect. We find that some of the princes of the Adiabene dynasty that converted to Judaism fought side by side with the Jews of Jerusalem in the Great Revolt. At that time, the ~~Edomites~~ Idumeans, who were forced to accept the Jewish faith by John Hyrkanos, still retained their own ethnic identity. On the other hand, Tiberius Alexander, nephew of Philo, the great Jewish philosopher, was chief of staff for the besieging Roman army led by Titus.(71)

In the course of Jewish history, many converts joined the community as individuals, but the ethnic groups that accepted Judaism were vanquished by other nations. So, the Khazars almost succeeded in forming a mighty nation, Turkish in ethnic character and Jewish in faith.(72) Similarly, southern Arabia might have become a similar hybrid, and the Falashes in Ethiopia who were Negroes by race, were successful for many centuries in holding their own against Moslems, Christians and pagans.(73) We must not allow the victories and defeats on the battlefields of history to be confused with the inner logic of theology. The Covenant with the people of Israel was the central theme of Jewish theology, but any individual or ethnic group could become part of Israel, while the Ten Tribes who first bore the name of Israel disappeared from Jewish history.(74)

Like the Church, the Synagogue in its heyday aimed to control every aspect of personal and communal life. Its ideal was, as Josephus put it, to establish a theocracy, with the political and military phases of life being subjected to the guidance and control of the religious authorities. But, this ideal became purely theoretical after the defeat of the Pharisaic rebellion against Alexander Yannai.(75) In Christianity, the theocratic ideal achieved signal victories during the reign of several medieval popes and in Calvin's Geneva. On the whole the Jews of reborn Israel have outgrown any predilection for theocracy, even as the Christians did.

At this point, we need to call attention to a fundamental contrast between the historic role of Judaism and Christianity. While the Christian faith encouraged the formation of some natioalities, it aimed to combat the separatist trends of the Teutons, the Gauls and the Slavs. Judaism, on the other hand, nurtured the feelings of ethnic consciousness. The Jewish people knew themselves to be set apart, dwelling alone and friendless, facing the demands of God in total isolation from "all" the nations of the earth. It learned to view the mysteries of God and man in the terms of its own experience as a historic community. It used its ethnic identity as a telescope, looking through it to see the total handiwork of God.(76)

IV. One facet of the Chosen People concept is its apparent exclusiveness. Do Judaism and Christianity assert that there can be only one community of the elect? Only one constituted body of those destined for salvation?

The answer of Judaism on this point is by no means clear and unequivocal. On the one hand, Talmud and Midrash reaffirm the biblical contentions that ther is but one Chosen People. It is "betrothed to the Lord," in the sense which betrothal conveyed in a monogamous society. This Convenant is irrevocable. As the Israelites affirm the unity of God in their Phylacteries, the Lord affirms His unique loyalty to Israel in the heavenly Phylacteries which He wears, as it were. There phylacteries bear the inscription, "who is like Thy people Israel, one people in the land?"(77) Underlying the bitter rivalry of the early Christians and the Jews was the impassioned axiomm seemingly held by both groups, that there can be only one Israel, one Chosen People.

On the other hand, Judaism contained the germ of a possible alternaive. The concept of a Noachide covenant could be applied to entire structured communities, as well as to individual "semi-proselytes" or "spiritual proselytes."(78) The Midrash asserts that God had sent prophets to the nations, even as He sent Moses to Israel.(79) Some of the Tannaim exempted their pagan contemporaries altogether from the charge of idolatry.(80) In the second century, one rabbi asserted that the Roman empire was commissioned by God to perform it civilizing mission.(81)

It follows that the decision of St. James, whom the Jews called James the Just, that the Gentile converts be asked only to observe the Noachide commandments was fully in accord with Pharisaic principles, though the Parisees might have refused to grant the status of an independent community to "a congregation of converts." However, the Jewish-Christian community, which asserted that Jews must continue to abide by the laws of Moses while Gentile converts were free from this obligation, somehow failed to impress the main bodies of Jews and Christians. The Talmudic doctrine of the Noachide convenant remained vague and devoid of specific application.(83) It was left to a medieval Jewish philosopher to acknowledge the possibility of two divine faiths or covenants, both equally true, providing they were addressed to different peoples.(84) This bold assertion on the part of Joseph Albo supplemented the position of Maimonide for whom religious rituals were ~~only~~ revealed instruments and illustrations of the univer sal faith of philosophers.(85) Spinoza and later Mendelssohn elaborated the Maimonidean position as a systematic affirmation of the truth of the religion that is revealed in man's conscience and intelligence.(86)

Most medieval Jewish authorities were unwilling to accord Christianity and Islam the explicit status of God-given faiths, for fear of weakening the loyalty of their oppressed brethren.(87) However, since the Enlightenment, Jewish philosophers, like Formstecher and Rosenzeig, came to regard Christianit as a God-given faith for the nations, even as the Torah was given to the Israelites. Hermann Cohen, the greatest German-Jewish philosopher, interpreted the Chosen People doctrine in the sense of an example, rather than as an exception. The Covenant was made with Israel as "My son, the first-born," as a lesson for all nations, that they too might use their collective experience for the purpose of serving God and mankind. As Prof. Mordecai M. Kaplan put it, all peoples must learn from Israel to examine their heritage and utilize the "sancta" of their life in order to become "peoples made in the image of God."(88)

The claim of exclusiveness, insofar as it persists in the postures of Judaism and Christianity, is the sting in their honey. Now, that the Catholic Church has accepted the principle that God brings individuals and peoples to Himself in diverse ways, not necessarily through the rites and dogmas bequeathed to the Church, we have yet another parallel to the evolution of thought within the Jewish tradition.

It was the controversy regarding the continued validity of Torah that most decisively separated the Church and the Synagogue. When in the seventh century the Emperor Heracles asked the Jew Benjamin of Tiberias why he fought against the Christians, the latter answered, "because they hate our Torah."(89) To Paul and his followers, the dawning of the Age of the Messiah meant the ending of the Age of Torah. Hence, any affirmation of the contemporary application of Torah-law was in effect a denial of the advent of the Age of the Messiah.(90)

The difference between the two faiths is here sharp and clear. Yet, even in respect of Torah, a veritable mountain of misunderstandings has served to obscure the family resemblance between the ancient faith and its daughter.

The difference between the New Testament and rabbinic literature is sometimes put in these stark terms - the former presents principles, the latter deals with laws. Upon such a concept of the bifurcation of the two streams, it is easy to base a play like "The Merchant of Venice." Actually, the Christian community did not live without laws. In the early centuries, they attempted to create their own detailed ordinances. Later, they adopted and somewhat modified the laws of the Roman Empire, producing the Theodorian and then the Justinian Codes. Later still, the medieval casuists developed detailed laws for every conceivable situation.(91)

Just as the Church could not do without laws, the Synagogue was not content to restrict itself within the domain of law. The disciples were urged to supplement the virtue of obedience to the Law with the love of all that is "right and good." They were urged to imitate the ways of the Lord - "as He is merciful, so be ye merciful; as He performs deeds of loving kindness, so do you do the same." Only in respect of zealotry or jealosy were they bidden not to imitate the Lord. Many actions were permitted by the Law, which the Talmud condemns by saying "the sages do not approve of such deeds." A whole domain of endeavors was described as being "beyond the limits of the law." (lifnim mishurat hadin) Many border-line deeds which were not actionable in a human court were nevertheless prohibited by "the laws of heaven," (dinai shomayim).(92)

While the Law restricted the manifold agencies of philanthropy to the Jewish community, and within the community only to those who shared in the life of "Torah and mizvot," the principle of assisting "the ways of peace" led the rabbis to ordain that pagans too should be included in the ambit of philanthropy. "We have to support the poor of the pagans along with the poor of Israel, visit the sick of the pagans along with the sick of Israel, bury the dead of the pagans along with the dead of Israel - all because of the ways of peace."(93)

At various times, there were pietistic movements, which trained their followers to give up their own rights and property in order to avoid quarrels. The pietists used to cultivate a whole set of virtues, such as purity, piety, humility and holiness, culminating in a state of readiness for the appearance of the Holy Spirit.(94)

The major motif of Talmudic piety is doubtless that of obedience to the Law of the Master. Whether this motif is actuated by the fear of punishment, or by the hope of reward, or simply by the recognition of one's "creaturely" status in God's universe, the basic posture is that of a servant in the palace of the king.(95) But, this attitude of subservience was combined paradoxically

with that of participation in the Divine Will. The pious Sages were "sons," as well as "slaves," sons whom the Father indulges, allowing them to share in the making of Torah. So, the Sages describe the Lord Himself as being occupied daily with the creative fashioning of Torah. "~~There is no~~ Every day when a new Halachah is ~~not~~ created in the heavenly academy." And in this process, the Sages here on earth had an active role to play. For the Lord delighted in their dialectic and included it in His heavenly instruction and legislation - "~~Hashia,~~ Rabbi Elazar My son teaches as follows, ~~Jonathan~~ R. Meir, My son teaches as follows." (96)

In a number of beautiful metaphors, the Talmud articulates the mystical notion that Torah is part of the Lord's daily activity, like the mysterious springs of love that He activates and like the processes of history whereby He humbles the proud and uplifts the humble. In a real sense, the Torah contains the archetypal ideas of the Platonic system. But, while the philosophers taught that God perpetually contemplates His own perfection, the rabbis insisted on His profound concern for the spiritual growth of man. He has placed His "honor" in His creation, particularly in mankind; hence, its "redemption" is in a way also His "redemption." (97)

It follows that Torah-study itself had a mystical dimension. The students attained communion or participation with God, in their arduous quest of the deeper levels of Torah. The motifs of obedience and creative participation, of fear and love, were commingled in the piety of the Sages. (98) Maimonides considered that the purpose of the exoteric Torah-law was to instil the feelings of fear and obedience, while the esoteric teaching of metaphysical speculation led to the cultivation of the love of God. (99) An eighteenth century mystic was probably closer to the authentic piety of the Talmudic Sages when he wrote that the study of Halachah itself was truly a form of clinging to the Lord and attaining unity with His dynamic Will. (The founder of Hasidic Hassidism) (100)
(Liubavlich Rabbe.)

It is understandable that to many a sinner the Law loomed like a mighty

mountain-range, dark forbidding and impenetrable. Things look different from the distance than they do at close quarters. When the Palestinian Sages declared the very soil of the Diaspora to be "unclean," some of the Jews outside the Holy Land might well have felt like Paul, that the Law excluded them from sharing in the life of holiness.(101) To be sure, the Babylonian Jews rejected this doctrine. They taught that Torah may be studied in "uncleanliness," and that the Shechinah "appeared everywhere," particularly in certain synagogues in Babylonia.(102) But in many outlying regions, the full depth of Torah-study may not have been felt.

In any case, the Sages also taught that one may appeal directly to God, ap-art from the requirements of the Law.

"They asked Wisdom, 'A sinner, what is his end?' And Wisdom replied, 'Evil pursues the sinner.' They asked the same question of Prophecy. Its reply was, 'the soul that sins it shall die.' When this question was put to the Torah, its answer was, 'let him bring a sacrifice, and his sin will be forgiven.' When the question was put to the Holy One, He answered, 'let him repent (lit. turn to me) and all will be forgiven.'"(103)

Now, Wisdom, Prophecy and Torah derive from God; they represent His living Word, as it were; yet, God is more than these articulations of His Will, and nearer to man in his anguish. "Near is the Lord to all who call upon, to all who call upon Him in truth."(104)

Paul thought of the two POLICIES OF God, that of Law and that of Mercy, or Love, as being employed one after the other, the first in the Age of Torah, the second in the Age of the Messiah. The Sages of Talmud and Midrash taught that both policies were held in tension and employed together in this world and in the time of redemption.(105) In the time of the Messiah, there will be a "renewal" of Torah (hiddush), the nature of which will be known only after it happens.(106)

The high esteem of Torah-study brought about an ambivalent attitude toeard the objective search of truth in all walks of life. On the one hand, every intellectual effort in one field generates curiosity in all other

directions. On the other hand, faith in the supreme sanctity of Torah-learning may result in the repudiation of all forms of secular wisdom as wasteful at best and likely to foster skepticism and heresy. In the history of Judaism, both attitudes can be amply illustrated. In the Ethics of the Fathers, we are told, "if there is no wisdom, there is no piety, if there is no piety, there is no wisdom." In the Eighteen Benedictions, the plan for understanding precedes that for a "return to the Lord," since without a gain in wisdom, repentance is meaningless. Yet, there were various times when secular wisdom was scorned as incompatable with piety.(107)

A similar ambivalence thoward wisdom prevails in Christianity. In some passages of the Gospels and Paul's letters, the pursuit of wisdom is regarded as a stubmling block; in others, wisdom is identified with the pre-existent Christ.(108) As in Judaism, there were times when secular wisdom was spurned and times when it was treated as indispensable to a high level of piety.

In the long run, both traditions found that they had to include the component of wisdom in their respective academies. The ferment of an unending quest prevented their stagnation; in the modern era, they became progressive, encouraging the proliferation of the many branches of learning. Still, there are marginal groups in both traditions for whom the independent quest of truth is a snare, a delusion and an abomination.

The polarity of letter and spirit is stressed in the entire New Testament. The letter kills while the spirit is life-giving.(109) Hence, an allegorical interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, which reduces its rich content to lifeless shadows, forecasting the shapes of future events. The vivid imagery of a book reflecting the flesh and blood of reality was torn from the anchorage of plain meaning and converted into the "dark speech" of a mystical oracle. At the same time, the early Christians insisted on a strictly literal reading of the passages dealing with the Messiah being a "son of God."(110) (Psalms II, 7; CX, 1-4; Micah V, 2-4; Zechariah IX, 9-11 and Isaiah IX, 5,6.)

In rabbinic Judaism, the messianic references were regarded as metaphors, since they occur in visions bordering on the dream-world of religious ecstasy. So, the Divine "sonship" of the Messiah was regarded by the rabbis as a hyperbolic expression. They could indulge in lofty metaphors without fear that their followers will take their words literally. So, they spoke of the Messiah as "the Lord of our righteousness," of him sitting on the "throne of the Lord," of his being on "the right hand of God" in the Day of Judgment and of his vanquishing Satan, without according to these lofty designations any prosaic or pedesterian, letter-bound denotation. For them, these metaphors suggested the sublime and the transcendent to which we can only point, but not hope to comprehend.(111)

See marginalia

But, in respect of the domain of life that falls within the reach of rational understanding, the letter and spirit of Torah were cherished jointly. Against the opposition of the Sadducees, the Pharisees maintained that a living tradition, the so called Oral Law, was superimposed upon the letters of the Written Law. They modified many a written injunction, in keeping with the principle that the Torah begins with loving kindness and ends with loving kindness. So, they abolished the ordeal of the suspected woman (sotah), on the ground that sin was too widespread, the law regarding a rebellions son and of an idolatrous city. They did not hesitate to change those ordinances which did not work out in practice. The evils criticized by Jesus were given careful attention by the Sages in their discussion of the laws of vows and of the Sabbath. In general, the later rabbis softened the Sabbath regulations of the pre-Christian period. At all times, they were mindful of the obligation to consider every part of the Torah in the light of its central theme - "her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace."(112)

The basic issue that separated the early Christians from the Jewish community was whether or not the messiah had come in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. It was a specific issue referring to the career of a particular person. To generalize the difference and to state that Jews believe the

Messiah will come in the future, while Christians assert that had already come, is to misrepresent the perspectives of both faiths. For some Sages taught that the Messiah had been born long ago, that he remained "hidden," possibly in the terrestial paradise, waiting for the right time to reveal himself. Hard pressed to maintain the morale of their stricken people, the Sages taught that the Messiah was born on the day the Holy Temple was destroyed. At the same time, the Christians waited daily for the reappearance of their Savior with "power." (113)

In our quest of parallels and correspondencies between the two faiths, we have to consider the Christian belief in the Second Coming and the Jewish hope for "the days of the Messiah."

In both traditions, the task of normative leadership consisted in the search for a viable balance between the vertical, or trans-natural, version of the messianic hope, and the horizontal, or historical interpretation of this ancient dogma.

In the New Testament, one view saw the incursion of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost as the second coming in a new guise. The Church as a whole had become "the body of Christ," the vital nucleus of the expanding Kingdom of God, dedicated to the transformation and total absorption of the City of Man. This goal will be achieved ghrough the regular channels of mundane history, with only occasional interventions of the Deity, by way of miracles in crucial moments. Normally, the pace of progress is slow, and the hand of God in history is hardly visible.

In polar opposition to this view, many members of the early community imagined the Second Coming as a sudden ending of the natural course of events by the manifestation of the supernatural and meta-historical Day of Judgment. The Savior will appear with a loud cry and with the piercing blast of a trumpet, the heavens will split open and reveal the angels and the saints, the hosts of evil will be overcome with one fell blow, the dead

will be resurrected and the living will metamorphased to enjoy the radiance of the messianic era and the glorious aeon of the World to Come.(114)

The Church as a whole resisted the two extremes of the messianic hope. It restrained the impassioned preachers of an impending supernatural deliverance, for fear of encouraging millenarian movements. On the other hand, it did not utterly close the door on the comforting, concrete versions of the Second Advent, since such speculations articulate through symbols and metaphors the inner logic of undying hope. And hope is an integral expression of the life of faith. The Protestant leaders of the post-Reformation period were particularly pressed to maintain a state of creative tension between a theory of spiritual progress that bordered on secular humanism, and an intense expectancy of Armageddon, the Day of Judgment and supernatural salvation.

A similar endeavor to maintain a dynamic balance between the natural and the supernatural visions of the Days of the Messiah may be observed in Judaism from the earliest rabbinic era to the present. The Messianic hope was probably the major reason for Jewish tenacity and perserverance. But, a feverish intensification of this hope was liable to result in a popular outburst of pseudo-messianism. In every generation, it was necessary to keep alive the embers of hope, but to guard against their bursting not to fan them into a consuming fire.

Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, who was the leading Sage during the Great Revolt and later the head of the academy at Yavneh, set the tone for this delicate balance. He opposed the messianic frenzy of the Zealots, who believed that God would intervene at the critical moment and grant them victory, if they fought without fear and resisted every compromise. "Only God is the Lord," and submission to the Roman Caesar is a betrayal of "the' hope of Israel." The Sages were unable to gain control of the runaway pseudo-messianic revolution. Rabban Yohanon ben Zakkai had to employ a ruse in order to escape from the bewieged city of Jerusalem and to begin the process of spiritual reconstruction. No one knew better than he the evil

consequences of inflamed messianic expectations. Yet, he could not rekindle the light of hope in his generation without a version of messianism.

As a practical statesman, he offered this wise counsel to his contemporaries, "If you hold a sapling in your hand, and people rush to tell you, 'behold the Messiah has come,' then first plant the sapling in the soil and only then may you go to welcome the Messiah.'" He followed this sage maxim when he insisted on the right of his newly formed Academy to assume the high authority of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin. A people cannot live indefinitely in a state of suspended animation. At Yavneh, the Sages planted a sapling in the soil, formulating a pattern of services in the synagogue and at home that was calculated to keep the Jewish community in being, until the time when their messianic hopes would be fulfilled. These hopes were restrained but not repressed. At his death he asked his disciples "to prepare a chair for Hezekiah." The hoped for redeemer will be one, like Hezekiah, an exemplary son of David, who followed obediently the guidance of the prophet Isaiah (and won his victory through divine intervention.) (115)

During the revolt of Bar Kochba, the Sages were divided. Rabbi Aqiba pointed to the leader as the potential "King Messiah," while his colleagues protested. A talmudic legend even tells of the Sages bringing Simon ben Kosiba (Bar Kochba) to trial as a false Messiah, condemning and executing him. We must not imagine that Rabbi Aqiba, who was familiar with the esoteric, mystical teachings of Judaism, interpreted the messianic hope in purely military-nationalistic terms. As a matter of fact, he taught that the Messiah would sit on a throne, to the right of God's throne, and would thus co-preside over the judgment of the world. Only under pressure from his colleagues, did Rabbi Aqiba retreat from this apocalyptic concept of the role of the Messiah. (116)

Rabbi Judah the Patriarch endeavored to keep good relations with Rome. Yet, his disciples maintained that "if the Messiah is among the living, he must be our holy teacher." (117) In the discussions of the Sages, many a legal principle was established on the supposition that the Messiah might come "soon," or at any moment, or "tomorrow." (118) There might be no time for a

drunkard to sober up; hence, priests must not drink wine. (Sanhedrin 22b) However, the Sages were certain that the Messiah would not come on the day before the Sabbath or before a holiday - i.e. that his coming would be a continuation or a "fulfillment" of the normal religious routine, not a disruption or denial of it. And they cautioned that "soon" for the Holy One may well last as long as 852 years. (119) (Sanhedrin 38a)

The Sages aimed to nurture the messianic faith as a paradoxical blend of sublime assurance and humble ignorance - to believe that the Messiah will surely inaugurate a new era, but to know that we don't know the shape of things to come. Also, definite times may not be set for his arrival, since at the last moment, the generation then living may not be worthy of deliverance. So, the rabbis rebuked both those who calculated "the End," as if it were fixed and unchanging, and those who "pushed the End," trying to force the hand of God, as it were. They were certain only that the time and manner of the coming of the Messiah will depend on the worthiness of Israel and mankind. (120)

The role of the people Israel in the vision of redemption is comparable to that of the Church in the Christian vision. "The Lord scattered Israel among the nations in order that converts should be added to them." (121) With the advent of the Messiah, all mankind will be converted to Judaism, in whole or in part, with Israel becoming the vital nucleus of a redeemed humanity. Will the Torah itself undergo a "renewal" in the Eschaton, assuming such forms as are presently beyond our ken? Will the Gentiles become part of Israel or will they remain "spiritual converts," accepting the Noachiole principles but retaining their own diverse cultural and religious customs?

Such matters were left vague and uncertain. The improtant point was the role of Israel as the collective co-worker of the Messiah. (122) Theirs is the task of suffering along with the Messiah in order to bring about a reconciliation of God with mankind. Isaiah's portrayal of "the Suffering Servant" was applied by some commentators to the people of Israel, by others to Moses,

by still others to the Messiah. The basic pattern of thought was not affected by these variations. Israel among the nations played the role of the Messiah in Israel. Jewish children learning in their schools were collectively the Messiah. By enduring "the torments of love," they help to speed the course of redemption. In his turn, the Messiah was pictured as volunteering to bear prodigious burdens of anguish in order to lessen the suffering of Israel and to atone for their sins.(123)

The abundant material wealth of the Messianic Era will make possible the dedication of all mankind to the service of God and the joys of "the contemplation of the radiance of the Shechinah." But, this glorious era cannot but be preceded by a period of intense suffering.(124)

In the Middle Ages, Maimonides and Nahmanides represented respectively the horizontal and vertical versions of the messianic hope. At that time, this hope was not yet completely polarized. Maimonides represented the belief that the messianic era would grow naturally out of the existing situation, with no miraculous transformation intervening to break through the physical laws of existence-at least, not in the beginning. At some time, during the messianic era, the resurrection of the righteous will take place. They will arise from the graves, live for a while and then return to their dust. The resurrection is a supernatural episode, which must be believed as "a necessary truth," but it is only an episode of the Messianic era. The World to Come, which is the final hope of mankind, is the life of the souls in the hereafter.

Nahmanides represented the vertical version of the messianic hope. The resurrection will come at the beginning of the era, which will be replete with manifest wonders. The World to Come is the glorious form of existence that body and soul will enjoy together following the messianic era. The whole of man's being, not merely his soul, will enter a new realm of joyous life, delighting in the perfection of happiness and consorting with the angels.(125)

The later mystics elaborated the theory of progress that was implicit in messianism. It is the role of the saints and their followers to liberate "the imprisoned sparks of holiness" in the world, thereby preparing the way for the manifestation of the meta-historical Messianic Era. (126)

In the modern world, the messianic hope was secularized in the Jewish as in the Christian world. The theory of progress in the modern western world is a modern version of Augustine's City of God. As Wm. Blake put it, modern man seeks to build Jerusalem in every land. As to how this goal will be achieved, prevailing opinion differed in the several periods of modern history. The millenium will be achieved through the rational criticism of existing institutions, the sovereignty of pure reason in a cosmopolitan society; it will be attained through a new upsurge of nations, which are the natural creations of history; it will be reached by shattering the sinister idolatry of capitalism and the ushering in of a new age when the humble toilers shall reign, when culture will be purified from any individualistic taint, and all men will live in a paradise from which the serpent has been banished forever; it will be attained through a renewal of nature's war of all against all, for it is through struggle that the weak are eliminated and the strong, who are also the pure, come into their own. Our generation has added an apocalyptic note - only after a final holocaust of nuclear devastation will the final peace be attained.

These several forms of the secular vision of progress are modified and countered by residual religious motifs, which serve as warnings in times of exuberant optimism and as sources of fresh faith in times of disillusionment. So, by way of example, Reinhold Niebuhr's philosophy of history encourages man to share in building the Kingdom of God on earth, knowing all the time that his efforts to achieve the millenium will surely fail. But, though he fail again and again, he will arise with new energy and a fresh vision, if he bears in mind man's relation to God. We are "fallen" creatures, but we bear His ~~courage~~ image in our hearts; all our ideals

are flawed; all our ideologies are idologies; but, knowing ourselves to be under Divine Judgment we can recognize our sins and repent, then by way of stumbling from one illusion to another, we advance and we share in the shaping of a better future.

The secularization of the Jewish messianic vision proceeded along similar lines. At the beginning of the Nineteenth century, the messianic ideal was identified with the ultimate triumph of European liberalism, Jerusalem will indeed be established in every land, with the abolition of bigotry and discrimination, with the dissipation of ancient hates and the building of a universal society on the principles of universal brotherhood. There was one basic difference, however, between the Christian and Jewish visions. Since the latter included the dream of the rebuilding of the Holy Land and the ingathering of all exiles, what are we to make of it in a perfect cosmopolitan society? - Why should the Jews of Europe have to leave their homes and retreat into a bastion of their own? - On the whole, the Jewish liberals proceeded to interpret the Zionist motif in their heritage as a symbol of the redemption of all oppressed and scattered groups. Classical Reform was purely universalist.(127)

Then, toward the end of the Nineteenth century, as European nationalism became more and more blood-based and militant, manifesting the beginnings of genocidal madness, the modern Zionist movement was born. It projected a largely secular version of the messianic vision-largely but not entirely. For it is impossible to nurture the seeds of Jewish nationalism without recourse to the sacred literature of three millenia. And this literature is so thoroughly permeated with ethical and religious ideals, that no Zionist movement can be completely separated from the universalist emphasis of traditional messianism.

Chaim Weizmann, the first president of Israel, regarded himself as a disciple of A'had Ha'am, who thought of the national homeland as a center of universal, ethical movements, a kind of secular-spiritual Zion, out of

which a new Torah of social justice and a new Divine Word of human dignity will come forth for the moral regeneration of mankind. The philosophy of Martin Buber is structured along similar lines.[128] And Chief Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kuk articulated the feelings of the Orthodox masses in his philosophy of national-religious rebirth.[129] To this day, the religious heart-beat continues to throb in the seemingly secular veins of Israel and the Jewish community as a whole. And the perennial task of balancing the pseudo-messianic frenzy against the cold grey fog of the hopelessness of human hatred continues to be the challenge of Jewish leadership. This or that messianic effort may fail, but the dream as a whole cannot but prevail in the end. "Grass withers, flowers fade, but the Word of the Lord endures forever."

Our brief survey of the parallels in the theological thought of Christianity and Judaism is necessarily sketchy and fragmentary. It would take many volumes and the labors of many scholars to fill out the details of the perspective that we outlined. All that we attempted to do is to show the many lines of thought and research that an attitude of mutual appreciation opens up. In the case of our individual existence, we find that the more we penetrate to the depths of our own being, the more we are likely to discover the "images of God" in others. In that case, we can truly say with the ancient Latin humanist, "I deem nothing that is human alien to me."

May it not be that in our labors as Jews and Christians, a similar relationship obtains; the more we penetrate to the inner depths of our own tradition, the more we discover the seal of the Divine in the faith of our neighbors. Perhaps, then, we may coin a phrase for the new ecumenical age of religious humanism - "I deem nothing alien to me, that is Divine in other faiths."