

Hillel, Hieronymus and Praetextatus

BURTON L. VISOTZKY
Jewish Theological Seminary

He was a pagan's pagan.¹ The Vestal Virgins liked him so much they bent the rules a bit and erected a statue in his honor.² And the inscription that his wife, Paulina, raised to him after his death read like a *Who's Who* of pagan priesthoods.³ Vettius Agorius Praetextatus so embodied the greatness of hellenistic culture that when Macrobius wrote his *Saturnalia* some years after the former's death, Praetextatus led the cast of characters. He enshrined the moribund civilization that was crushed under the weight of a Christian exclusivism legally manifested as intolerance.⁴

Praetextatus' culture took many forms, hinted at in the inscriptions and surviving literature which mention him. He was a senator, praetorian praefect, and at the time of his death, consul designate for the year 385.⁵ He translated, edited and held forth at symposia.⁶ Praetextatus' pagan credentials dated back to his association with the emperor Julian.⁷ But these classical activities were of less import (*sed ista parva*) to this great Roman than his religious life (*omnis me beatam*).⁸ Macrobius refers to him as *praesul omnium sacrorum* (I 17, 1) and even (perhaps in opposition to the Christian

1 The specific era which is the focus of this study lies beyond the general scope of the late Prof. Bickerman's research. Still, those who knew him will recognize my debt to his method, which I strive for in this article. Bickerman himself characterized this approach to the literatures of antiquity with the disarming explanation he offered his students, "I teach you to read slow."

2 *CIL* vi 2145, Symmachus, *Ep.* ii 36, see S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* (rpnt. 1958²), 17 and H. Bloch, "A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West 393-394 A.D.," *HTR* 38 (1945), 216-17 (henceforth: "Document").

3 *CIL* vi 1778, 1779, 1780. See Dill, 18, 77; Bloch, "Document," 204ff., 242f., and the chart there, nos. 7 and 23; and *idem.*, "The Pagan Revival in the West at the End of the Fourth Century," in *Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. Momigliano (Oxford, 1963), 203f., and figs. 7 and 8 where the monumental inscriptions are shown. In addition, see Otto Seeck, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Auctorum Antiquissimorum* VI (1883), lxxxiii-xc, and Johanna Nistler, "Vettius Agorius Praetextatus," *Klio* X (1910), 462-75, where much of the primary material on Praetextatus is collected. For a competent overview of the era see F. Homes Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Oxford, 1935). Two important biographies are P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (California, 1967) and J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome* (New York, 1975). The primary sources not only include the works of these three Church figures, but also the works of Symmachus, Ammianus Marcellinus and Macrobius. See, too, the appropriate entries in *P.-W.* and *PLRE*.

4 E.g., *C.Th.* xvi 4-11; *Nov.Th.* 3. For Macrobius see A. Cameron, "The Date and Identity of Macrobius," *JRS* 56 (1966), 25-38.

5 *CIL* vi 102, 1777-1780; *C.Th.* viii 14, 1; xiv 4, 4; ix 40, 10; vi 35, 7; xiii 3, 8; i 6, 6. Cf. Seeck, lxxxvii f., n. 403 and Nistler, 465, n. 4.

6 Macrobius, *passim*; Bloch, "Pagan Revival," 210; *idem.*, "Document," 205, 240.

7 *Amm. Mar.* xxii 7, 6; Bloch, "Document," 204-8.

8 *CIL* vi 1779d and Brown, *Augustine*, 27.

emperors who, since the advent of Gratian had refused the robes of *pontifex maximus*) *princeps religiosorum* (I 11, 1). Yet for all his knowledge of Roman antiquities and all of his classical priesthoods, Praetextatus was a thoroughgoing syncretist.⁹ Now it is true that paganism and syncretism may go hand in hand, but Praetextatus' mixture of Roman and Eastern cults stands in stark contrast to the "pure" Roman religion of his stuffy colleague Symmachus.

Symmachus was liberal enough to declare (albeit in defense of paganism before the bar of Christianity) that "one cannot reach so great a secret by one way alone" (*Rel.* iii 10) and "everyone has his custom, his religion" (*Rel.* iii 8).¹⁰ But Symmachus limited his praxis to the old Roman religion and did not go in for those new-fangled religions of the East, be they pagan or Christian. The limitations of his point of view are well expressed by Arthur Darby Nock, "Symmachus merely asked for toleration of the survivals of a dead faith."¹¹ His prissiness in this regard led to an extreme conservatism which caused him to oppose the Vestals' statue to Praetextatus, mentioned above, and to advocate the extremities of ancient punishment for a lapsed Vestal in another instance.¹² Nonetheless, Symmachus seemed to possess a self-awareness of the limitations of his chosen avenue of paganism. When the more eclectic Praetextatus died, Symmachus did not feel up to the challenge of carrying on the fight alone. Perhaps he knew that his particular umbrella could not extend widely enough to cover all the factions in the pagan cause. In any case, Symmachus resigned his public office and retired as leader of the pagan revival.¹³

Praetextatus' syncretism bears closer examination since his and his many followers' fascination with Eastern cults set them apart from Symmachus and the many other particularists of the old religion. To explain Praetextatus' religious interest as merely showing that "the accumulation of priesthoods is evidence of the scarcity of people who were willing to shoulder the responsibility of these cults" misses the point somewhat.¹⁴ Though it is a truism that economic hardship was the rule of the day and that the wealth necessary to pursue priesthoods and public office was becoming evermore concentrated in the hands of the few, this negative factor is hardly sufficient to explain such a widespread religious phenomenon.

In the first place, the economic picture, though bleak, was not sufficiently dire to limit distribution of offices among a wide spectrum. Constrasting the vast wealth and conspicuous consumption of earlier ages, Macrobius can but point out that peahens' eggs, meat stuffed pig and fatted hares and snails are no longer banquet fare in his day. Still, they managed to dine on oysters and doormice. Folks remained wealthy enough to be pestered by legacy hunters, while pagan and Christian alike sketched an upper class that knew how to luxuriate and make the most of its advantages.¹⁵

9 See Bloch, "Document," 207 and the chart there following, 244.

10 Translated by Bloch, "Pagan Revival," 196f. Cf. Dill, *Society*, 30 at n. 6.

11 Nock, *Sallustius ciii*, n. 19 *apud* Bloch, "Document," 209.

12 See n. 2.

13 *Rel.* x 2-3; Bloch, "Document," 217-20.

14 Bloch, "Pagan Revival," 203.

15 Macrobius, *Sat.* iii 13 *passim*; Amm. Mar. xiv 6; Hieron. *Epp.* 22, 52, 125. Even Ambrose notes the wealth surrounding him; see Dudden, *Ambrose*, 28-33 and Dill, *Society*, 129-36.

It is important to note that the high life was not limited to pagans. Jerome (the Hieronymus of the title of this essay) describes a priest who boasts as follows:

I can tell unerringly on what coast a mussel has been picked. I can distinguish by the flavor the province from which a bird comes. Dainty dishes delight me because their ingredients are scarce and I end by finding pleasure in their ruinous cost.

To another he writes:

A clergyman who engages in business, and who rises from poverty to wealth, and from obscurity to high position, avoid as you would the plague . . . You despise gold; he loves it. You spurn wealth; he eagerly pursues it. You love silence, meekness, privacy; he takes delight in talking and effrontery . . .

And of the monks, Jerome is equally bald in his assertions:

I myself have seen monks . . . whose . . . property has increased rather than diminished. They still have the same servants and keep the same table. Out of cheap glasses and common earthenware they swallow gold. With servants about them in swarms they claim for themselves the name of hermit.¹⁶

Given this charge from a churchman, it is not surprising to find Ammianus Marcellinus write:

Bearing in mind the ostentation in city life, I do not deny that those who are desirous of such a thing ought to struggle with the exercise of all their strength to gain what they seek; for when they attain it, they will be so free from care that they are enriched from the offerings of matrons, ride seated in carriages, wearing clothing chosen with care, and serve banquets so lavish that their entertainments outdo the table of kings.

Ammianus is not here describing social-climbing pagans or even priests, he is describing a conflict for the papacy that took place in Rome, ca. 366–67:

Damasus and Ursinus, burning with a superhuman desire of seizing the bishopric, engaged in a bitter strife because of their opposing interests; and the supporters of both parties went even so far as conflicts ending in bloodshed and death . . . In the struggle Damasus was victorious through the efforts of the party which favored him. It is a well-known fact that in the basilica of Sicinius, where the assembly of the Christian sect is held, in a single day a hundred and thirty-seven corpses of the slain were found, and that it was only with difficulty that the long-continued frenzy of the people was afterwards quieted.¹⁷

This last incident sets the background for what is to come, so I have allowed Ammianus to describe it at length. Damasus became Pope through the intervention of the pagan praefect of Rome, Vettius Agorius Praetextatus. Shortly afterward Praetextatus restored the *Porticus Deorum Consentium*, “the last pagan religious monument dedicated by an official of Rome.”¹⁸ In 384, Praetextatus would be the Praetorian Praefect of Italy while Jerome was there acting as Damasus’ secretary. In the same year,

16 Hieron. *Ep.* 52:6, 5; *Ep.* 125:16.

17 Amm. Mar. xxvii 3, 14 and 12–13.

18 *CIL* vi 102; Bloch, “Pagan Revival,” 195.

the pagan Symmachus wrote a recommendation for the professorship of rhetoric in Milan. His cousin, the powerful bishop, Ambrose, accepted the recommendation and appointed Augustine to the post.¹⁹

We see that the world of the upper classes was small and wealthy. In such a world the concentration of power among an "ol' boys" network was not unusual. But to presume that an upper class exclusivism accounts for the "accumulation of priesthoods" underestimates the priesthoods themselves. Surely there was enough power and honor around to keep the most ambitious pagans and Christians busy. And, there were enough ambitious pagans and Christians to keep the positions widely distributed. I would suggest that the answer to the prosopographical dilemma of pagan priesthoods concentrated among the very few lies in the religious satisfaction those priesthoods offered.

Paganism exercised an attraction at many points along its compass. The most common contact with Roman religion came early in one's education, be he pagan, Christian or Jew.²⁰ The influence of a grammar and rhetoric steeped in the blood of pagan sacrifice extended far beyond Julian, Libanius and the literati of Praetextatus' and Symmachus' circles. As mentioned above, Augustine taught rhetoric; he was a convert to philosophy well before his more famous conversion to Christianity. Even following that latter conversion, he was "preoccupied with Cicero and the Neoplatonists . . . he was deeply immersed in philosophical and literary labours."²¹ Ambrose, that stalwart defender of Christianity, quoted liberally from the classics all the while he was prosecuting paganism. The Arians could even accuse him of the heinous crime of levity because he cited pagan myths to illustrate his points. Ambrose archly replied that if an apostle might quote Aratus, surely a bishop could refer to Homer or Virgil.²²

Jerome was chief among the Christians of this period who grappled with the theological problem which the study of classics offered. He laid out the dilemma in a letter to Eustochium, written from Rome, ca. 384:

Many years ago . . . when I was on my way to Jerusalem to wage my warfare, I still could not bring myself to forego the library which I had formed for myself at Rome with great care and toil. And so, miserable man that I was, I would fast only that I might afterwards read Cicero. After many nights spent in vigil . . . after the recollection of my past sins, I would once more take up Plautus. And when at times I returned to my right mind, and began to read the prophets, their style seemed rude and repellent . . . Suddenly, I was caught up in the spirit and dragged before the judgement seat . . . Asked who and what I was I replied: "I am a Christian." But He who presided said: "Thou liest, thou art a follower of Cicero and not of Christ" . . . Accordingly I made oath and called upon

19 Augustine, *Conf.* v. 13; Dudden, *Ambrose*, 327; Brown, *Augustine*, 66f.

20 On the thoroughgoing pagan character of grammatical and rhetorical education, see H. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York, 1956), part 3 and especially chapter 9 there for the Christian educational issues. I hope to demonstrate on another occasion the formal nature of the hellenistic rhetoric taught in the rabbinic academies, but for the general background see the various studies collected in H. Fischel, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature* (New York, 1977) as well as S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1942), and *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1962).

21 *Confessions*, *passim*. See P. Brown, *Augustine*, 101ff. and A. D. Nock, *Conversion* (Oxford, 1933), 259-66. The quote is from Dudden, *Ambrose*, 335, who devotes an entire chapter to Augustine (321-44).

22 Dudden, *Ambrose*, 8-10; for Aratus see Hieron. *Ep.* 70:2 and below.

His name, saying: "Lord, if I ever again possess worldly books, or if ever again I read such, I have denied Thee" . . . thenceforth I read the books of God with a greater zeal than I had previously given to the books of men.²³

Of course, Jerome went right on studying and quoting the classics. He claims to have held out against the lure of pagan literature for fifteen years; but recommends rhetoric to Paulinus of Nola a decade after his letter to Eustochium, and avidly defends his citations of the classics in a long apologetic to the Roman orator Magnus in 397.²⁴

The lure of literature, however, is not the call of the cult. What separated the encyclopaedic Christian clergy from the pagan priesthood was the difference in their respective altars. One might say that the persistence of paganism, especially following the removal of the altar of Victory by Constantius, indicated that the blood of sacrifice was sometimes thicker than the water of baptism.²⁵ The simple fact is that the pagans believed in the efficacy of their sacrifices. When famine struck Rome in 380, Symmachus was quick to place the blame on the Christian emperors' abandonment of the cult.²⁶ As A. D. Nock so aptly puts it,

What did the ancients love? They loved . . . the worships of the household and of the State . . . What did they fear? The possible loss of the benefits thought to be derived by State and individual from these inherited ways . . . So long as you did not try to take from these men anything which they had in religion, they could not as a rule object . . . So long as the priest and the silent Vestal climbed the Capitol, Balbus might build his Mithraeum, with the feeling that the established order was secured . . . But ask of him that he should consent to the ending of the Capitoline cult, and he would be shocked or even frightened: and if you were to win him you had to convince him, to convert him.²⁷

The attempt of the emperors to employ the proscriptions previously used against Christianity spurred the pagans to cling more firmly to the old ways. It was just so that individual's priesthoods began to accumulate. Rational explanation or appeal was futile. The pagans had already moved toward monotheism. Praetextatus himself—*pontifex Vestae, augur, quindecimvir, pontifex Solis*, priest of Hercules, Liber and Hecate, initiate of Eleusis, Lerna, Aegina, Serapis, Magna Mater and Mithra—it is he who early in the *Saturnalia* (I 17, 1) explains the answer to Avienus' query:

What is the reason that we venerate the Sun sometimes as Apollo, sometimes as Liber, sometimes under a variety of other names? Please explain to me the reason of so great variety in the names of one deity?²⁸

23 *Ep.* 22:30. Cf. B. Ned. 8a for a method of release from bans pronounced in a dream.

24 *Com. in Gal.* iii, praef; *Epp.* 53 and 58 to Paulinus; *Ep.* 70 to Magnus. See Kelly, *Jerome*, 41f.

25 Constantius removed the altar in 356. It became a *cause célèbre* for the pagans and was restored and removed again and bickered over from the time of Julian until 392. See Symmachus, *Rel* iii; J. Wytzes, *Der Streit um den Altar der Viktoria* (Amsterdam, 1936); Bloch, "Document," 213–15; *idem.*, "Pagan Revival," 196; and A. Alföldi, "A Festival of Isis in Rome Under the Christian Emperors of the Fourth Century," *Diss. Pannon.* ser. 2, vii (1937).

26 Symmachus to Flavianus ii 7; Bloch, "Document," 214.

27 Nock, *Conversion*, 162f.

28 *CIL* vi 1779; Bloch, "Document," 205ff., and chart.

Praetextatus' answer, which equates a string of some dozen and a half gods with the Sun, shows the ease with which Eastern and Western deities had been syncretized in his theology. It is a theology which explicates his priesthoods—he served them all because all were one. One can imagine him standing before his *lararium*, arm in arm with Fabia Paulina, sighing, "What can be a greater source of happiness than belief in a household god!"²⁹

It was this belief which accounted for the many priesthoods. It was the liberalism of pagan theology which, though monotheistic in tendency, mitigated against Old Testament exclusivism. And, in the end, it was the inability to be exclusive which prevented the conversion of these tenacious pagans, despite the Herculean efforts of Ambrose and his charges. Not only their theology prevented their exclusivism, a certain *laissez faire* attitude contributed as well. Symmachus exemplified it in his statements, quoted above, about many ways to the secret. He also reports that Praetextatus might altogether miss his turn at service in the Sacred Colleges when he was off at his country home or vacationing in Campania.³⁰

Serious though they may have been about protecting their cults from the onslaught of Christian legislation, the ease with which these old pagans took to their religion made them somewhat mirthful about the attempts to convert them to Christianity. This very mirth enraged the Christian clergy all the more. Jerome cannot conceal his bile when he writes to Marcella immediately after Praetextatus' death in 384:

The consul-elect . . . is now in Tartarus . . . See the consul, not now in his triumphal robe but clothed in mourning . . . A few days ago the highest dignitaries of the city walked before him as he ascended the ramparts of the capitol like a general celebrating a triumph; the Roman people leapt up to welcome and applaud him, and at the news of his death the whole city was moved. Now he is desolate and naked, a prisoner in the foulest darkness, and not, as his unhappy wife falsely asserts, set in the royal abode of the Milky Way.³¹

The public acclaim for Praetextatus annoyed Jerome no end, but his flippant attitude about conversion to Christianity galled Jerome even more. Still brooding, at least a dozen years after the deaths of Praetextatus and Damasus, he writes from Bethlehem:

That unhappy man Praetextatus, who died after he had been chosen consul, a profane person and an idolater, was wont in sport to say to blessed Pope Damasus, "Make me bishop of Rome, and I will at once be a Christian."

Given the role Praetextatus played in elevating Damasus to bishop of Rome and the fortune Damasus achieved upon attainment of that office, Praetextatus' *bon mot* is

29 Aphorism #65 in Franz Kafka, *The Great Wall of China: Stories and Reflections* (New York, 1970), 175. On the syncretism see F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York, rpt., 1956), 208 and 211. Cf. R. MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven, 1981), 83-94.

30 Symmachus, *Epp.* i 47-51; ii 53. See Dill, *Society*, 152.

31 *Ep.* 23:2-3. Cf. *CIL* vi 1779 for Paulina's assertions. Symmachus generously eulogizes Praetextatus in his communications to the emperors regarding his death, *Rel.* x and xi. See Bloch, "Document," 216.

quite understandable. To Jerome, however, it was unforgivable, for it betrayed a total lack of seriousness about the very thing Jerome cared for most.³²

Praetextatus' attitude may be profitably contrasted with the famous account of a conversion that took place two years after his death. In his *Confessions* (VIII 6 [14]ff.), Augustine reports that Ponticianus told him the story of Anthony, the Egyptian monk, and how reading his *Life* had led to conversion. Augustine then reports his own profound reaction to the story, describes his physical discomfort and spiritual anguish. Then, as with Anthony:

I heard the voice of a boy or girl coming from the Church (lit. Divine house) which repeatedly uttered in a sing-song manner: take up and read, take up and read . . . I went hurriedly back to the place where . . . I had placed there the copy of the Apostle . . . snatching it up, I opened it and read in silence the first passage on which my eyes fell, "Not in revelry and drunkenness . . . but put on the Lord Jesus Christ . . ." (Rom 13:13f.). No further did I desire to read, nor was there need.

Now here was a conversion to be reckoned with! *A kledon* leads Augustine to yet a second divination—the appropriate passage from Paul.³³ Augustine, who had grown up in Christian surroundings only to convert to Manichaeism and Philosophy, had finally come home.³⁴ Accordingly, his attitude toward conversion to Christianity differed radically from that of his pagan contemporaries.

These two remarkably different stories about conversion which I've just recalled are made all the more remarkable by the combination of their motifs in a roughly contemporary rabbinic legend on the same topic. As part of a series of *chreiai* about the early first century sage, Hillel, we read:³⁵

A story about a gentile who was passing behind a school house (synagogue) and heard the voice of a child reading,³⁶ "These are the garments . . . a breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a tunic of cheque work, and a mitre . . ." (Ex. 28:4). He asked, Whom are these [clothes] for? They told him, For the High Priest. That gentile said to himself, I'll go convert so they can make me High Priest . . .

32 Jerome's report is found in *Against John*, 8. On the elevation of Damasus to bishop see above at n. 17. For the problems in dating Jerome's letter see the introduction to it in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, vol. vi (Michigan, rpnt. 1979), 424f.

33 *Conf.* viii 12 [29]. For the text and translation I am following the readings adopted in Lieberman, *Hellenism*, 197f. See the entire section there (194–99) on the nature of these forms of divination. Note also B. Hag. 15a and parallels (cited by Lieberman, n. 20) where a child's voice, reading from Scripture, is divined as a sign to apostasize!

34 There is a voluminous literature on Augustine and his conversions. For bibliography see Brown, *Augustine*; Dudden, *Ambrose*; and Nock, *Conversion*.

35 B. Shab. 31a with parallels in ARN A 15 (p. 61); ARN B 29 (p. 61); *Midrash Haggadol* Exodus 28:4; Yal. Sh. 1 #379; and *Sefer Hamma'asiot* #13 (ed. Gaster, Hebrew p. 23). The version in the Babylonian Talmud is the earliest, upon which the others depend. They have, however, access to variant readings of that tradition. I date it late fourth to early fifth century because it is reported anonymously and clearly redacted into the cycle of Hillel legends collected on that folio. The Hebrew is late and, obviously, the motifs of the legend are also appropriate to the late dating. For more on the Hillel *chreia* see H. Fischel, "Story and History: Observations on Greco-Roman Rhetoric and Pharisaism," *A.O.S. Midwest Branch Semi-Centennial Volume* (1969), 59–88 and *idem.*, "Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a *Chreia*," *E. R. Goodenough Memorial Volume Suppl. Numen* 14 (1968), 372–411.

36 Following the reading in ARN A, *Midrash Haggadol* and *Sefer Hamma'asiot*.

He came to Hillel who converted him and said, One cannot be made a king unless one knows the appointments of a king; go learn the appointments of kingship. He went and studied. When he came to the verse, "The stranger who draws near shall die" (Num. 1:51), he asked, To whom does this verse refer? [Hillel] replied to him, Even to David, king of Israel. The convert reasoned to himself *a fortiori*: If of Israelites . . . it says, "The stranger who draws near shall die," a simple convert who has converted with his staff and wallet, how much the more so! . . . It is not appropriate for me to be High Priest . . . He came to Hillel and said to him, Humble Hillel, may blessings rest upon your head for you have drawn me close, beneath the wings of the Divine Presence.

I think the parallels are obvious. Like Augustine, the voice of a child reveals a verse of Scripture that leads the hearer to conversion. Like Praetextatus, the listener is willing to convert on the condition that he become High Priest (= bishop of Rome). The rabbinic tale has combined these motifs to provide the background of a *chreia* about Hillel. The story differs from its Christian and pagan counterparts in that the convert comes to understand the inappropriateness of his motives for conversion through his study of Torah. Thus prepared, he converts for the sake of Torah itself.

These three stories of conversion must be seen in the light of imperial religious legislation in the late fourth century.³⁷ Paganism had become increasingly proscribed. The empire no longer supported the cult; it persecuted it. By 392 it was illegal to venerate an image in the privacy of one's own household.³⁸ The Jews, who were trained in such logic, could reason *a fortiori* about what to expect for themselves. And the Christians, for all that they harried one another and worried about the barbarians camped along their borders, were quick to assume the reins of power and crack the whip previously employed against them.

Hieronymus, cantankerous as ever, whinnies with delight at the triumph. He tramples his enemies under the beating hooves of his rampant rhetoric and assigns them to Tartarus. Praetextatus and his pagan followers, though they hear the death knell sounding, retain their liberal outlook and wry inability to take seriously Christian pretensions to exclusivism. And the rabbis, who could not hope to legislate their own exclusivism, turn to wistful legends of Hillel to voice the one hope they could have, and from which they drew their solace—that the truth of their Torah would accomplish what an empire could not.

37 See n. 4 above for anti-pagan legislation. The anti-Jewish laws are conveniently summarized in J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (New York, rpt. 1969).

38 *C. Th.* xvi 10, 4.