

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

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

superior in understanding to anything you can imagine a savage nation could attain.' To-day 'there are Maoris who are ordained clergymen, qualified doctors and lawyers; there are school teachers, clerks, typists and shop assistants; they in fact pursue many of the ordinary avocations of the white man.' They have their representatives in the Senate and the Representative House of Parliament; and, just as in our own Imperial Parliament, there are some of them natural orators. Mr. Donne out of his lifelong and intimate experience describes them as a highly attractive, intelligent people. His summary of the history of a century puts the stages as follows: 'explorers and firearms; whalers, sealers, tobacco and bad language; traders and trickery; sailor residents and half-castes; missionaries, religion and sectarianism; Government representation and land troubles.' 'In the case of the Maori one cannot include the word conquest, as he was never as a race conquered by the white man; in 1840 he voluntarily ceded sovereign rights over his country to Great Britain.'

'There is a tendency in these days to shrink from definite statements about the Christ, to try to be content with vague descriptions which may mean very little, whilst it remains wholly uncertain to the hearers what exactly they do mean. . . . Yet it is these very questions to which the non-Christian inquirer is demanding an answer.' *The Glory of God in the Incarnation of the Word*, by the Rev. W. H. G. Holmes, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), is

offered as an answer. The writer, during a quarter of a century in India 'trying to hand on the Christian Gospel to intelligent non-Christians,' was compelled seriously to question himself 'as to exactly what he was to set forth as the heart or core of this good news.' His conclusion is that 'Jesus Christ knew Himself to be Personality from within the Eternal Being of God, and that His followers were gradually led to this distinctive faith.' This faith revolutionizes religion, changes modes of prayer and meditation and communion, and gives the possibility of a continual Incarnate Presence. The book is a firmly Christian pronouncement with a strong devotional spirit running through it.

A book that will interest visitors to Rome, and all who are concerned to know something of the condition of the early Church in Rome, is *Early Christians of Rome*, by Mr. G. M. Bevan, S.Th. (S.P.C.K.; paper 2s. 6d., cloth 4s.). Its aim is to illustrate from the remains of Pagan Rome the conditions of life in that city in the days of the early Church, and to show from the monuments of early Christian Rome what was the faith of the multitude of the believers which enabled them to overcome the pagan world and to endure in face of persecution. This is done in a series of interesting chapters which deal with the pleasures and religions of the city, and explain the pictures in the Catacombs, and the many symbols which in their desperate condition the Christians were compelled to use instead of writing. The book is largely illustrated, and might well be used to supplement the ordinary guides.

The Jewish Background to the Christian Liturgy.¹

BY HERBERT LOEWE, M.A., OXFORD.

WITH Oesterley's main thesis, that the Christian liturgy was influenced by the Jewish, I am in general agreement. The questions I would ask are, why is

¹ The following is an abstract of a paper read before the Oxford Society of Historical Theology on the Rev. Dr. Oesterley's learned book, the title of which is given above. The reader began by expressing his admiration of the work, his agreement with the general principles on which it was based, and his intention to confine himself to the purely Jewish aspects of the subject. With certain omissions, the paper is here given as spoken.

that influence not greater, and how can we account for the absence in the Christian Prayer Book of elements which are so fundamental in the Jewish? We ought, at first, to ask ourselves whether we can find any parallels to the situation which we are investigating. Schisms have arisen so frequently in the history of religion that possibly analogous conditions may be found elsewhere. Possibly the treatment by sects of the liturgy of their parent-body follows conventional lines and justifies the formulation of broad axioms which, no doubt, special circumstances may vary. From Judaism, for example,

have gone forth indirectly the Muslims, and directly the Samaritans, the Qaraites, and the Dönmeh. From the trunk of the Christian Church leaders such as Luther and Wesley have founded subsidiary branches. May we, after examination of movements like these, trace in the treatment of liturgy any common phenomena which we should expect to find mirrored in the first century? The most important of all problems confronting a new religious community is the ordering of divine services. Before all others this problem insistently demands settlement, and a settlement which cannot be deferred. One is perhaps safe in asserting that most examples of religious development pass through several stages. Friendly discussion at the outset and the preliminary weighing of new ideas soon give place to definite conclusions: the new ideas are firmly held by one party, and no less firmly rejected by another. Controversy arises and ultimately leads to such acrimony as to render separation inevitable. When the breach is final, do those who go forth break fresh ground in framing their liturgy, or do they strive to retain as much of the old material as they conveniently can? Reasonable it is to believe that elements which are cardinal tend to survive unless they are deliberately eliminated for dogmatic purposes. Such elements may eventually be displaced because relatively minor considerations, such as the proper time-limits of a service, demand their excision, to make room for newer material which, in the process of time, calls for inclusion. One is tempted to think that new sects do not deliberately create a new liturgy. Inherent conservatism and the force of the appeal to tradition tend towards preservation rather than towards destruction. Even innovators claim usually to be reverting to an original source. So Muhammad asserted that he was a *Hanif*, a follower of the primeval Abrahamic religion. And just as Jesus said definitely that He came to fulfil the Law, just as Christians call themselves the true Israel, so one cannot help feeling (1) that the disciples would have strained every nerve to maintain the liturgy of their ancestors, introducing merely such modifications as their new doctrines required, and (2) that the liturgy of the Jewish Christians in Palestine would have influenced that of the congregations in the diaspora, both Judæo-Christian and Gentile, especially as Gentile converts could not have brought any of their ancestral prayers with them, for surely no relic of pagan worship would have been tolerated or desired. But the Jewish sources were not tainted in this way, and the disciples must have clung to their old liturgy. This is, after all, what the

Protestant Reformers did to the Catholic Prayer Book. How far the situation may be paralleled by comparison with other liturgies, such as those of the Old Catholics or of the Wesleyans, for example, I am not in a position to say. One has to remember also, that when a religion is split by a new idea, there is, besides the extremists at both ends, those who approve and those who condemn the idea with equal zeal, a large body of moderate opinion which would prefer to adopt the change while avoiding a breach, and which would never despair of reconciliation, and which would regard the maintenance of the old liturgy as particularly important for this reason. So while the first two classes would avoid unnecessary change, even the third would be in agreement on this issue, for the motives outlined above.

If, then, we may regard this as the first axiom, (1) that new sects prefer, where possible, old liturgies, may we proceed to (2), that fundamental elements in the liturgy do not disappear by chance, but (3) by deliberate elimination due to dogmatic exigencies, just as is the case in ceremonial. *Ramadan* replaces the Day of Atonement, not as an accident, but as part of a clear plan; similarly in regard to baptism and circumcision the Church and the Synagogue each made their own considered selection. (4) Finally, when in a new liturgy we find an obvious and unexpected gap, some explanation of its origin ought to be forthcoming.

On these lines it should not be impossible to compare the Jewish *Siddur* with the Christian Prayer Book, disregarding irrelevant accretions and tracing the component parts to a common origin. One should seek to understand why certain essentials are no longer to be found and what substitutes have replaced them. But such a task involves a thorough knowledge of the Christian liturgy, and this knowledge I do not possess even in a slight degree, hence the tentative character of the following remarks.

One may assume that Oesterley's careful analysis of the three important elements in the daily liturgy has been studied and that the composition of the *Shema* with its framework, and also of the *Amidah*, is completely understood. In regard to the *Shema*, the framework of benedictions is highly significant. The *Shema* was to be said early in the morning, and it was necessary that sufficient light should be visible to enable one to differentiate blue from green—a rough-and-ready test of daylight. It may seem strange that so much stress should always have been laid on the early recital of the *Shema*. It will be recalled that the same conditions do not apply to the *Amidah*. I think the reason is

obvious. The framework of benedictions in which the *Shema'* is set has expanded considerably during the ages, but the sequence of themes is so logical that one is inclined to believe that even the later compositions in this part of the liturgy reflect ideas which were old and traditional, long before they found definite expression in a set prayer. Therefore we may treat the *Shema'* and its blessings, for our purpose, as a whole, regarding the chain of ideas as connected, although some of the links appear in a relatively modern garb in the Prayer Book of to-day. And so we begin, appropriately enough in the early morning, with a reference to light, and with a final reference to light does the first blessing to the *Shema'* conclude. In the liturgy, as it now stands, from the first mention of light we are led on to luminaries, God's hosts. God's hosts suggest angels, who laud God continually and with whose perfect praises man seeks to intertwine his own faltering words. This is a germ of the theory of the communion of Saints. And so, after the Angelic praise of God we revert to light again. Awakening light suggests God's unsleeping love, and with this theme the close of the second blessing introduces us to the *Shema'* itself. It is generally held that most of these intermediate stages are later developments. Angelology, it is said, is typical of *Qabbalah*. But it is no less characteristic of Babylon. Granted that the present form of some of these intermediate stages is late, I see nothing improbable in holding that they are merely written expression of infinitely older ideas, which had to wait for long before being incorporated in the liturgy.

[The reader then discussed the use of the *Shema'* as a creed, the possibility of its liturgical use during the Persian period, and the choice of Is 45⁷ as the introductory benediction ('Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who formest light and createst darkness, makest peace and createst all things'), the reference to light and darkness and Zoroastrian dualism and the parallel allusions to light and darkness in the evening benedictions of the *Shema'*.]

It is interesting to note that the last word of the benediction has been changed. In Is 45⁷ we read *bo're' ra'*, 'creating evil': in the liturgy this has become *bo're' hak-Kol*, 'creating all things.' It was, perhaps, meat too strong for the multitude to ascribe evil so directly to God. *Ra'* might so easily be misunderstood to refer to moral and not to physical evil. Hence in the true Targumic spirit 'all things' was substituted. The meaning is unaltered because the greater includes the less.

Into the different forms of Temple, synagogal

and domestic liturgy, we cannot now enter. It must suffice to say that scholars generally hold that from the first sprang the second and third, and that in all three, certainly in the first two, the *Shema'* figured, combining the functions of prayer and creed. So the term for reciting the *Shema'* was 'taking upon oneself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven': to do this was the daily duty of man. The angels, in the central but later portion of the first benediction, willingly accept this yoke, and man strives to equate his service with theirs. The importance of the *Shema'* in the life of the Jew cannot be over-emphasized. With this the Mishnah begins. However heedless a Jew may grow of his religious behests, the *Shema'* must and does remain for him a symbol which he will never abandon. With the *Shema'* on his lips he dies, and long before Aqiba expired in torment while uttering *Ehad*, the *Shema'* must have become the martyr's profession of faith. Josephus speaks of the command to recite the *Shema'* twice daily as being of Mosaic origin. From Mk 12²⁹⁻³⁴ we know that to Jesus the *Shema'* represented just as much as it did to the Rabbis. There can be little doubt that to the disciples the *Shema'* was as precious as it was to their Master. Why, then, has it completely disappeared from the Christian liturgy? This is a question surely of considerable importance. If so fundamental a change was made after careful consideration and out of serious motives, one would expect, either on the Jewish or on the Christian side, to find some record of the circumstances that led up to this parting of the ways. Thus, if the early Christians abandoned the *Shema'* as incompatible with the new dispensation, it would have been natural for them to have taken this step openly, to have been thankful for relief from a burden and to have reproached the Jews with adhering to something effete. The parallels with the dietary laws and the Sabbath will at once suggest themselves. That the abrogation of the dietary laws is sufficiently weighty to be recorded, and that this abrogation needed the special sanction of a vision, make a tacit abrogation of the *Shema'* unthinkable. I do not know whether early Christians in controversy with Jews spoke of the *Shema'*, nor do I know whether early patristic literature anywhere regards the *Shema'* as a Jewish prayer which Christians definitely should not use. On the Jewish side there is a similar silence, and a silence that is all the more difficult to explain in view of analogy. Thus we know that the doxology was altered on account of the *Minim*, here probably Sadducees, since the question at issue was the future life. We

know also that the daily recital of the Decalogue was stopped because 'of the cavilling of the heretics.' (Heretics here no doubt are Christians, since the dispute is about the Law.) But I know of no indication that the *Shema* was recited in spite of the cavilling of the heretics, or because the heretics ceased to recite it. So far as the argument from silence is admissible, evidence is in favour of the recitation by Christians of the *Shema* during the Apostolic age. There could not have been free intercourse with Jewish congregations, participation in the service by joining in the prayers, by acting as precentor or as *Meturgeman* or *Darshan* on the part of those who rejected the *Shema*. The impression conveyed by the Acts is clearly that the *Shema* was used by the disciples. To my mind, while the number of Jewish Christians remained considerable, the *Shema* retained its position in the common liturgy. I cannot easily bring myself to believe that any Jews, even if they recognized Jesus as Messiah and acquiesced in the abrogation of the Law, would have consented to the abrogation of the *Shema*. Let me offer you a parallel which is comical but forcible. On February 19th, 1665-6, Pepys records in his diary the following entry :

'I am told for certain, what I have heard once or twice already, of a Jew in town, that in the name of the rest do offer to give any man £10 to be paid £100, if a certain person now at Smyrna be within these two years owned by all the Princes of the East, and particularly the Grand Signor as the King of the world, in the same manner we do the King of England here, and that this man is the true Messiah. One named a friend of his that had received ten pieces in gold upon this score, and says that the Jew hath disposed of £1100 in this manner, which is very strange; and certainly this year of 1666 will be a year of great action; but what the consequences of it will be, God knows!'

The individual in question was the famous Shabbethai Zebi, the pseudo-Messiah, who was born at Smyrna in 1626, and who died at Dulcigno, in Albania, in 1676. The controversy which he aroused was stupendous. Judaism was rent in twain and there was no middle party. His claims were whole-heartedly accepted or equally whole-heartedly rejected. The most rigorous propaganda arose on both sides and enormous interest was aroused. The instigator of this tumult cannot lightly be brushed aside as a quack, because so many saints and scholars clung to him. There must have been some good in him. Shabbethai ultimately founded a new sect, which still exists under the name of Dönme. Here you have a

community of Jews who left the general body, and the reason for their going forth was their recognition of a Messiah and their acceptance of His decree annulling the Law. The prayers used for Shabbethai are clear beyond shadow of doubt. To take merely one example, the conventional prayer for the temporal sovereign (Gaster, *Prayer Book*, p. 112) was altered to read thus :

'He Who gives salvation unto kings and dominion unto princes, Whose Kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, the Great, Mighty and Terrible God, Supreme King of kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He, like Whom there is none else, Who causeth Kings to pass away, Who raiseth up Kings, Who maketh a covenant with David His servant to establish for eternity the throne of his Kingdom, may He bless, guard, preserve, assist, exalt and highly aggrandize our Sovereign Lord, the holy, righteous saintly Master, Sultan Shabbethai Zebi, Messiah of the God of Jacob, may his glory be increased and his rule exalted; to him is given dominion and honour and power and all peoples, nations and tongues obey him. His government is an everlasting government which shall not pass away and his lordship shall not be destroyed. In honour is his horn exalted and the crown of his God is on his brow. Kings see and arise, and princes bow down to him, for the sake of God who is faithful, even the Holy one of Israel Who did choose him. His name shall endure for ever: his Name shall remain under the sun for all generations. Through him shall all nations exchange benediction, they shall declare him blessed. May our eyes see and our heart rejoice in the rebuilding of our temple . . . amen. (See also variants in Freimann, *op. cit. infra*, p. 113.)

Now what did these people do with the daily liturgy? One short note will show. I cite from p. 67 of Freimann's *Sammelband kleiner Schriften ueber Sabbatai Zebi*, published by the *M'kize Nirdamim* Society, Berlin, 1912. The note, which is taken from the contemporary record of Barukh b. Gershon of Arezzo, a follower of Shabbethai, refers to a Jewish envoy to Shabbethai. It was at first doubtful whether the people whom the envoy represented were Jews. The point is easily settled. Barukh says, 'The envoy wore Muslim garb and spoke Arabic, Aramaic, and Hebrew. He says that his people recite the *Shema* with the blessing, as we do, but they have certain slight variants in the *'Amidah*.' Here, then, is the obvious conclusion that the *Shema* is the test of Judaism; secondly, the followers of Shabbethai Zebi, who claimed to be the Messiah and who abrogated the Law of Moses, still adhered to the *Shema*. As stated above, here there was no middle party, here there was no hesitation in abolishing old customs, annulling prayers and generally making the most sweeping

changes. Yet the *Shema* survived. When we further remember that not for one moment can a comparison between Jesus and Shabbethai be thought of, the argument strikes home the more forcibly. The deluded followers of a politician shrank from laying hands on the *Shema*; would the followers of a saint have wished to do so?

The point, then, that seems to emerge is that some factor of great power must have intervened to banish the *Shema* from the Christian liturgy of the second century. The date of its disappearance may be inferred from the *Didaché*, which in the eighth chapter orders (a) the abandonment of the two Jewish weekly fasts, and (b) the substitution of the Lord's Prayer for the Jewish prayer. The Lord's Prayer is to be said three times a day, and this number would suggest that it was intended to replace not the *Shema*—which was said twice a day—but the *Amidah*. I am not clear about this. On the one hand, if the *Amidah* is here meant, why is the *Shema* ignored? Perhaps it had been already abolished? I hardly think so. If the people to whom the *Didaché* was addressed still fasted on Mondays and Thursdays, I cannot for one moment believe that they had ceased to say the *Shema*. In that case, why is the abandonment of the less ordained and the retention of the greater seemingly allowed? Is the conclusion to be that the *entire* Jewish liturgy is to be abolished?

Why, then, was the *Shema* superseded? That it quietly fell out of use I am unwilling to admit. It seems to me that there must have been some definite act of elimination which expelled it: what this act was perhaps we may some day know.

You will remember that to recite the first paragraph of the *Shema* is termed 'taking upon oneself the yoke of the kingdom.' This first paragraph was to be read before the second, for the recital of the second was termed 'taking upon oneself the yoke of the commandments,' and there was due precedence in the order of the acts and a logical connexion underlay them. Was this the reason why the *Shema* was discontinued? Was the association with the Law and the connexion with *tefillin* and *mezuzoth* too strong? This, I venture to suggest, was the cause of the abandonment of the *Shema*. For the words of the *Shema* were written inside the *tefillin*, and both typified the Law. The *Shema* was inevitably followed by the 'yoke of the commandments' and could not be isolated. Because of the 'cavilling of the Christians,' the Jews abandoned the Decalogue, and similarly, because, we may say, of the 'cavilling of the Jews,' the Christians abandoned the *Shema*. The question of the Law was

at issue and prompted each decision. Hence the treatment of the *Shema* and the Decalogue affords an exact analogy to the rites of baptism and circumcision.

Oesterley suggests that the uncompromising monotheism of the *Shema* was the reason for its rejection. To my mind this is rather a reason for its retention. When have Christians abandoned the belief in one God? Need the staunchest Trinitarian hesitate before saying the *Shema*? Surely the whole basis of the Trinity is that it is not incompatible with the unity of God? Besides, if the *Shema* is to be omitted on account of its monotheism, what about the Decalogue? Moreover, if the Lord's Prayer replaces the *Shema* for this reason, where is the Trinity mentioned in the Lord's Prayer? The early Christian would surely have held close to the *Shema*, though he would have explained it in a Trinitarian sense: to abandon the *Shema* would rather have declared him to be no longer a monotheist. I believe that the *Shema* was abandoned because it led up to the belief in the Law.

When we come to the *Amidah*, the position is somewhat similar. In the first place, the *Amidah* goes back into the pre-Christian era, as the citations in Sirach prove. Secondly, the *Amidah* was known to Jesus and used by Him. Only in this light can we explain the method employed by Jesus to demonstrate the future life: 'God of Abraham, God of Israel, God of the living, not God of the dead.' Now the first two blessings of the *Amidah* are called respectively *Aboth* (Patriarchs) and *Geburoth* (powers). These two blessings deal with three themes which are closely associated. Not only their association but their logical sequence is discussed in the Mishna and Gemara (*Berakhoth*), and the fixing of the order is ascribed to the Men of the Great Synagogue. This fixing of the order implies that one idea is intended to link and support the other. The three themes are:

- (1) May the God of the patriarchs (*Aboth*) redeem their posterity.
- (2) May the God of power, who sends the rain to revive the earth,
- (3) Quicken the dead.

The association of rain with the Resurrection is a natural symbol: the connexion was based on Is 26¹⁹, 'thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth her dead.' Thrice a day, then, was a Jew reminded of the future life by recalling the God of the Patriarchs and by avowing the eternal endurance of His loving-kindness. That is

the reason why Jesus says, 'Ye err, not knowing the scriptures (*i.e.* Moses and the burning bush), nor *Aboth* and the power of God (*i.e.* *Geburoth*).' In other words, the reply is, 'how can you ask such a question! Think of the Bible and also of the *'Amidah*, which is said thrice each day!' That Jesus cited the *'Amidah* as a 'concession' without personally holding the prayer sacred is an impossible suggestion. Besides, in 2 Clement the same method of proof is applied to the Divinity of Jesus Himself.

Now I feel inclined to agree with Dr. Oesterley that the abrogation prescribed in *Didaché* viii. refers to the *'Amidah* and not to the *Shema*.¹ Noteworthy also are the instances which he gives of the influence of isolated phrases of the *'Amidah* on certain Christian prayers.¹ In my opinion the *'Amidah* disappeared gradually. It was a long prayer and the occasional use of an abstract is discussed in the Mishnah. No doubt various forms of such abstracts existed. Two survive in the Jewish prayer-book to-day; the former is called *Habinenu*, and is an abstract of the Eighteen Benedictions of the daily *'Amidah*. It is used when time is lacking. Thus, during the War, it replaced the 'Eighteen Benedictions' in the pocket prayer-book issued to Jewish troops. The latter abstract, called *Me'en Sheba*, is said on Friday evenings in lieu of the repetition of the whole *'Amidah* by the reader.

In the ordinary *'Amidah*, excluding one or two passages, there is nothing that the early Christians could not have said. They would have wished to make additions of a Christological nature, and these additions would have expanded the prayer to a considerable length. One feels tempted to believe that for this purpose one of the abstracts may have been chosen, and so, in process of time, the divergence from the original may have become so great that no apparent connexion remained. But the objection to this is the *Didaché*, which implies the total and deliberate supersession of the *'Amidah* by the Lord's Prayer. If this is the case, we have once more to ask ourselves why a prayer which Jesus used so effectively should, within a short time, have been rejected by His followers. If the *Didaché* dates from after the time of Bar-Kochba, and if it is a Jewish Christian document, it is possible to say that it was the Bar-Kochba fight for freedom which abrogated the *'Amidah*. Here was the parting of the ways. Immediately Aqiba recognized Bar-Kochba as the Messiah, the Jewish Christians felt that the time had come for them to go forth. I know that I stand alone² in putting the final breach

so late, but I firmly believe (*a*) that the desire to 'remain within' was overpoweringly strong, and (*b*) that no event previous to Bar-Kochba's heroic struggle was sufficiently weighty to overcome this desire. Once the breach was final, the desire not only died away, but was replaced by an opposite feeling, and this feeling grew mutual because the Judæo-Christians, if they did not actually side with the Romans, at least abstained from helping the Jews. Think of the bitterness which must have been aroused against the Judæo-Christians when Aqiba and his martyrs died, when Bether fell amid rivers of blood! Such intense bitterness must have awakened similar sentiments against the Jews. Converts, as we know, are always more royalist than the king, and the complete severance of all ties was natural and inevitable. Of these ties what was the most obvious one to be broken? Surely the liturgy. And so, lest it be thought that they had even the smallest link with the Jews, the Judæo-Christians reformed their liturgy and cast out the *'Amidah*.³ But this action was probably not universal. Variety in worship must have prevailed for a long time, because so many Christian rites are known to have existed. Consequently the traces of the *'Amidah*, which Dr. Oesterley has pointed out in his book, are readily explicable as survivals.

There are, in the Church of England service of to-day, three places where the influence of the *'Amidah* might, at first sight, seem to be clear. But of these instances two will not, I fancy, bear investigation. The first is the invocation, 'O Lord, open thou our lips.' I understand that this is an old element at the beginning of Matins, but I am not sure that it formed part of the *'Amidah* in early times. It is not, to my knowledge, mentioned in the Mishnah, although it is found in early Jewish rites. Therefore this instance is not a certain one. Besides it is too obvious an invocation to be explained as a case of definite borrowing. From the beginning of the *'Amidah* we may turn to the end. Here we have the threefold priestly benediction. May this have suggested the concluding blessing at morning and evening prayer, from 2 Co 13? That this blessing is threefold and that it comes at the conclusion of the service is certainly parallel to the Aaronic benediction in the *'Amidah*. But 2 Co is an obvious benediction, and a benediction is an obvious end to a service. Besides, I understand that the final recital of the last verse of 2 Co is

³ Which now contained the paragraph contesting the Messiahship of Jesus (so A. Mishcon, *J.Q.R.*, xviii. 1) and the *Minim* paragraph.

¹ This was vigorously contested in the discussion.

² This is the view of G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i. 91.

not of great antiquity. The third instance is later, but, nevertheless, I venture to think, more satisfactory. I refer to the *Te Deum*. This is an obvious *Qedush-shah*. There can, I fancy, be little doubt that the fourth-century author of this hymn had seen a *Qedush-shah* and had remodelled it for Christian use. The *Qedush-shath hash-Shem* (sanctification of the Name), or third benediction of the *'Amidah*, as distinguished from the *Qedush-shath hay-Yom* (sanctification of the day, *i.e.* Sabbath or festival), was probably known, in its responsive form, to Hillel and Shammai. Had merely the formula which occurs in the silent *'Amidah* been ancient, the introduction of the responsive variant would have been discussed in the Talmud. As the 'thrice holy' is found in the *Didascalia*, the *Qedush-shah* must have been retained in the early Christian liturgies, especially as the application to the Trinity would be so obvious.

The community which the author of *Didascalia* addressed was clearly Judæo-Christian. The members of it recited the *'Amidah* thrice on Sabbath,

standing, referring to the Exodus and to the Manna, probably in the *Qiddush*, and reading from the Pentateuch. An analysis of their liturgy and of their grace after meals is too long to be attempted here. Moreover, the excellent and exhaustive treatment of this subject by Kohler is probably so well known that no more need be said. I would merely cite his reference to the *Qedush-shah*: he says, 'Especially is the *trisagion* in Bk. VIII. ch. xii., an adaptation from Jewish prayers. It has, in more or less modified form, been universally adopted in the Churches, based on a somewhat older form of the Jewish sanctification.' Kohler's remarks should be carefully studied. With regard to the *'Amidah* one may, in conclusion, recognize in the *Te Deum* the last trace of its influence on the Christian Prayer Book, and one may feel safe in thinking that the *'Amidah* was not deliberately abrogated in Christianity, but that it was used in the form of various abstracts, such as the two which survive to this day in the Jewish liturgy, until it gradually disappeared in the Church liturgy.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

A Holy Place of Remembrance.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,
GLASGOW.

'Thou shalt remember.'—Dt 8^a.

'They may forget, yet will I not forget thee.'—Is 49¹⁵.

WHEN November comes round, it brings Armistice Day, a solemn day of remembrance. People's thoughts go away on pilgrimage to graves at home and graves beyond the seas, and to places where the sea itself is the grave, where brave men lie who gave their lives for us all. In these short minutes of silence, how far our thoughts can go! We are remembering, and praying that we may never forget.

I want your fancy to take you where a great many folk's feet will be taking them on Armistice Day—to Scotland's National Memorial in Edinburgh Castle. It is a long climb up, easier to fancy than to foot, up the Mound, up the old High Street, up the Esplanade, up the winding way through all the Castle gates till at last you reach the highest point of the city. There stands the National Memorial.

Every village has its monument to its own brave

men; every regiment has its own; every church has its own; but here is something that gathers them all together. It is the nation's memorial. From the height of the Castle the views are fair and far, whichever way you look, but this has added another view, fairer and farther than any, for the eyes of the soul to see, and made the summit of the old rock a high place of sacred remembrance.

It is a wonderful work, beautifully thought out and lovingly wrought out by skilled hands. Old stones grey with the years, and new stones freshly chiselled, tell us that this is part of the heroic history of our beloved Scotland. Every sort of service is remembered and finds its place upon the walls. Even the beasts are not forgotten, even the mice and canaries who helped, not knowing, in mine and submarine are there, 'the miner's friends.'

You go into a long and stately hall with a great company of people who tread softly and talk quietly. Each regiment has a panel which tells of its battles and its losses, and before each is a book in which the names of those who fell are written, and every book has some sad searcher looking to see if some dear name is there, and comforted when she finds it.