

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
HISTORICAL

**THE LIFE & TIMES OF
JESUS THE MESSIAH
VOL. 1**

by Alfred Edersheim

Books For The Ages
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA
Version 1.0 © 1999

VOLUME 1

BOOK 1

THE PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL: THE JEWISH WORLD IN THE DAYS OF CHRIST

CHAPTER 1

THE JEWISH WORLD IN THE DAYS OF CHRIST, THE JEWISH DISPERSION IN THE EAST.

AMONG the outward means by which the religion of Israel was preserved, one of the most important was the centralization and localization of its worship in Jerusalem. If to some the ordinances of the Old Testament may in this respect seem narrow and exclusive, it is at least doubtful, whether without such a provision Monotheism itself could have continued as a creed or a worship. In view of the state of the ancient world, and of the tendencies of Israel during the earlier stages of their history, the strictest isolation was necessary in order to preserve the religion of the Old Testament from that mixture with foreign elements which would speedily have proved fatal to its existence. And if one source of that danger had ceased after the seventy years' exile in Babylonia, the dispersion of the greater part of the nation among those manners and civilization would necessarily influence them, rendered the continuance of this separation of as great importance as before. In this respect, even traditionalism had its mission and use, as a hedge around the Law to render its infringement or modification impossible.

Wherever a Roman, a Greek, or an Asiatic might wander, he could take his gods with him, or find rites kindred to his own. It was far otherwise with the Jew. He had only one Temple, that in Jerusalem; only one God, Him Who had once throned there between the Cherubim, and Who was still King over Zion. That Temple was the only place where a God-appointed, pure priesthood could offer acceptable sacrifices, whether for forgiveness

of sin, or for fellowship with God. Here, in the impenetrable gloom of the innermost sanctuary, which the High-Priest alone might enter once a year for most solemn expiation, had stood the Ark, the leader of the people into the Land of Promise, and the footstool on which the Schechinah had rested. From that golden altar rose the cloud in incense, symbol of Israel's accepted prayers; that seven-branched candlestick shed its perpetual light, indicative of the brightness of God's Covenant Presence; on that table, as it were before the face of Jehovah, was laid, week by week, 'the Bread of the Face,' ^{f1} a constant sacrificial meal which Israel offered unto God, and wherewith God in turn fed His chosen priesthood. On the great blood-sprinkled altar of sacrifice smoked the daily and festive burnt-offerings, brought by all Israel, and for all Israel, wherever scattered; while the vast courts of the Temple were thronged not only by native Palestinians, but literally by 'Jews out of every nation under heaven.' Around this Temple gathered the sacred memories of the past; to it clung the yet brighter hopes of the future. The history of Israel and all their prospects were intertwined with their religion; so that it may be said that without their religion they had no history, and without their history no religion. Thus, history, patriotism, religion, and hope alike pointed to Jerusalem and the Temple as the center of Israel's unity.

Nor could the depressed state of the nation alter their views or shake their confidence. What mattered it, that the Idumaeen, Herod, had usurped the throne of David, except so far as his own guilt and their present subjection were concerned? Israel had passed through deeper waters, and stood triumphant on the other shore. For centuries seemingly hopeless bondsmen in Egypt, they had not only been delivered, but had raised the God-inspired morning-song of jubilee, as they looked back upon the sea cleft for them, and which had buried their oppressors in their might and pride. Again, for weary years had their captives hung Zion's harps by the rivers of that city and empire whose colossal grandeur, wherever they turned, must have carried to the scattered strangers the desolate feeling of utter hopelessness. And yet that empire had crumbled into dust, while Israel had again taken root and sprung up. And now little more than a century and a half had passed, since a danger greater even than any of these had threatened the faith and the very existence of Israel. In his daring madness, the Syrian king, Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes) had forbidden their religion, sought to destroy their sacred books, with unsparing ferocity forced on them conformity to heathen rites, desecrated the Temple by dedicating it to Zeus

Olympios, what is translated by ‘shewbread.’ a constant sacrificial and even reared a heathen altar upon that of burnt-offering. ^{f2} Worst of all, his wicked schemes had been aided by two apostate High-Priests, who had outvied each other in buying and then prostituting the sacred office of God’s anointed. ^{f3} Yet far away in the mountains of Ephraim ^{f4} God had raised for them most unlooked-for and unlikely help. Only three years later, and, after a series of brilliant victories by undisciplined men over the flower of the Syrian army, Judas the Maccabee — truly God’s Hammer ^{f5} — had purified the Temple, and restored its altar on the very same day ^{f6} on which the ‘abomination of desolation’ ^{f7} had been set up in its place. In all their history the darkest hour of their night had ever preceded the dawn of a morning brighter than any that had yet broken. It was thus that with one voice all their prophets had bidden them wait and hope. Their sayings had been more than fulfilled as regarded the past. Would they not equally become true in reference to that far more glorious future for Zion and for Israel, which was to be ushered in by the coming of the Messiah?

Nor were such the feelings of the Palestinian Jews only. These indeed were now a minority. The majority of the nation constituted what was known as the dispersion; a term which, however, no longer expressed its original meaning of banishment by the judgment of God, ^{f8} since absence from Palestine was now entirely voluntary. But all the more that it referred not to outward suffering, ^{f9} did its continued use indicate a deep feeling of religious sorrow, of social isolation, and of political strangership ^{f10} in the midst of a heathen world. For although, as Josephus reminded his countrymen, there was ‘no nation in the world which had not among them part of the Jewish people,’ since it was ‘widely dispersed over all the world among its inhabitants,’ yet they had nowhere found a real home. A century and a half before our era comes to us from Egypt ^{f11} — where the Jews possessed exceptional privileges — professedly from the heathen, but really from the Jewish ^{f12} Sibyl, this lament of Israel: —

*Crowding with thy numbers every ocean and country,
Yet an offense to all around thy presence and customs!* ^{f13}

Sixty years later the Greek geographer and historian Strabo bears the like witness to their presence in every land, but in language that shows how true had been the complaint of the Sibyl. ^{f14} The reasons for this state of feeling will by-and-by appear. Suffice it for the present that, all unconsciously, Philo tells its deepest ground, and that of Israel’s loneliness

in the heathen world, when speaking, like the others, of his countrymen as in ‘all the cities of Europe, in the provinces of Asia and in the islands,’ he describes them as, wherever sojourning, having but one metropolis, not Alexandria, Antioch, or Rome, but ‘the Holy City with its Temple, dedicated to the Most High God.’ ^{f15} A nation, the vast majority of which was dispersed over the whole inhabited earth, had ceased to be a special, and become a world-nation. ^{f16} Yet its heart beat in Jerusalem, and thence the life-blood passed to its most distant members. And this, indeed, if we rightly understand it, was the grand object of the ‘Jewish dispersion’ throughout the world.

What has been said applies, perhaps, in a special manner, to the *Western*, rather than to the *Eastern* ‘dispersion.’ The connection of the latter with Palestine was so close as almost to seem one of continuity. In the account of the truly representative gathering in Jerusalem on that ever-memorable Feast of Weeks, { ~~41B~~ Acts 2:9-11 } the division of the ‘dispersion’ into two grand sections, the Eastern or Trans-Euphratic, and the Western or Hellenist — seems clearly marked. ^{f17} In this arrangement the former would include ‘the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia,’ Judaea standing, so to speak, in the middle, while ‘the Bretes and Arabians’ would typically represent the farthest outrunners respectively of the Western and the Eastern Diaspora. The former, as we know from the New Testament, commonly bore in Palestine the name of the ‘dispersion of the Greeks,’ { St. ~~41B~~ John 7:35. } and of ‘Hellenists’ or ‘Grecians.” { ~~41B~~ Acts 6:19, 29; 11:20. } On the other hand, the Trans-Euphratic Jews, who ‘inhabited Babylon and many of the other satrapies,’ { Philo ad Cajum, p. 1023; *Jos. Ant.* 15 3, 1. } were included with the Palestinians and the Syrians under the term ‘Hebrews,’ from the common language which they spoke.

But the difference between the ‘Grecians’ and the ‘Hebrews’ was far deeper than merely of language, and extended to the whole direction of thought. There were mental influences at work in the Greek world from which, in the nature of things, it was impossible even for Jews to withdraw themselves, and which, indeed, were as necessary for the fulfillment of their mission as their isolation from heathenism, and their connection with Jerusalem. At the same time it was only natural that the Hellenists, placed as they were in the midst of such hostile elements, should intensely wish to be Jews, equal to their Eastern brethren. On the other hand, Pharisaism, in its pride of legal purity and of the possession of traditional lore, with all

that it involved, made no secret of its contempt for the Hellenists, and openly declared the Grecian far inferior to the Babylonian ‘dispersion.’ ^{f18} That such feelings, and the suspicions which they engendered, had struck deep into the popular mind, appears from the fact, that even in the Apostolic Church, and that in her earliest days, disputes could break out between the Hellenists and the Hebrews, arising from suspicion of unkind and unfair dealings grounded on these sectional prejudices. {~~400~~ Acts 6:1.}

Far other was the estimate in which the Babylonians were held by the leaders of Judaism. Indeed, according to one view of it, Babylonia, as well as ‘Syria’ as far north as Antioch, was regarded as forming part of the land of Israel. ^{f19} Every other country was considered outside ‘the land,’ as Palestine was called, with the exception of Babylonia, which was reckoned as part of it. {Erub. 21 a Gritt. 6 a.} For Syria and Mesopotamia, eastwards to the banks of the Tigris, were supposed to have been in the territory which King David had conquered, and this made them ideally for ever like the land of Israel. But it was just between the Euphrates and the Tigris that the largest and wealthiest settlements of the Jews were, to such extent that a later writer actually designated them ‘the land of Israel.’ Here *Nehardaa*, on the *Nahar Malka*, or royal canal, which passed from the Euphrates to the Tigris, was the oldest Jewish settlement. It boasted of a Synagogue, said to have been built by King Jechoniah with stones that had been brought from the Temple. ^{f20} In this fortified city the vast contributions intended for the Temple were deposited by the Eastern Jews, and thence conveyed to their destination under escort of thousands of armed men. Another of these Jewish treasure-cities was Nisibis, in northern Mesopotamia. Even the fact that wealth, which must have sorely tempted the cupidity of the heathen, could be safely stored in these cities and transported to Palestine, shows how large the Jewish population must have been, and how great their general influence.

In general, it is of the greatest importance to remember in regard to this Eastern dispersion, that only a minority of the Jews, consisting in all of about 50,000, originally returned from Babylon, first under Zerubbabel and afterwards under Ezra. {537 B.C., and 459-’8 B.C.} Nor was their inferiority confined to numbers. The wealthiest and most influential of the Jews remained behind. According to Josephus, {Ant. 11:5. 2; 15:2. 2; 18:9.} with whom Philo substantially agrees, vast numbers, estimated at millions, inhabited the Trans-Euphratic provinces. To judge even by the number of those slain in popular risings (50,000 in Seleucia alone ^{f21}),

these figures do not seem greatly exaggerated. A later tradition had it, that so dense was the Jewish population in the Persian Empire, that Cyrus forbade the further return of the exiles, lest the country should be depopulated. ^{f22} So large and compact a body soon became a political power.

Kindly treated under the Persian monarchy, they were, after the fall of that empire, {330 B. C.} favored by the successors of Alexander. When in turn the Macedono-Syrian rule gave place to the Parthian Empire, {63 B.C.} the Jews formed, from their national opposition to Rome, an important element in the East. Such was their influence that, as late as the year 40 A.D., the Roman legate shrank from provoking their hostility. ^{f23} At the same time it must not be thought that, even in these favored regions, they were wholly without persecution. Here also history records more than one tale of bloody strife on the part of those among whom they dwelt. ^{f24}

To the Palestinians, their brethren of the East and of Syria, to which they had wandered under the fostering rule of the Macedono-Syrian monarchs (the Seleucidae), were indeed pre-eminently the Golah, or 'dispersion.' To them the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem intimated by fire-signals from mountain-top to mountain-top the commencement of each month for the regulation of the festive calendar, ^{f25} even as they afterwards despatched messengers into Syria for the same purpose. ^{f26} In some respects the Eastern dispersion was placed on the same footing; in others, on even a higher level than the mother country. Tithes and Terumoth, or first-fruits in a prepared condition, ^{f27} were due from them, while the Bikkurim, or first-fruits in a fresh state, were to be brought from Syria to Jerusalem. Unlike the heathen countries, whose very dust defiled, the soil of Syria was declared clean, like that of Palestine itself. {Ohol. 23:7.} So far as purity of descent was concerned, the Babylonians, indeed, considered themselves superior to their Palestinian brethren. They had it, that when Ezra took with him those who went to Palestine, he had left the land behind him as pure as fine flour. {Kidd. 69.} To express it in their own fashion: In regard to the genealogical purity of their Jewish inhabitants, all other countries were, compared to Palestine, like dough mixed with leaven; but Palestine itself was such by the side of Babylonia. ^{f28} It was even maintained, that the exact boundaries could be traced in a district, within which the Jewish population had preserved itself unmixed. Great merit was in this respect also ascribed to Ezra. In the usual mode of exaggeration, it was asserted, that, if all the genealogical studies and researches ^{f29} had been put together,

they would have amounted to many hundred camel-loads. There was for it, however, at least this foundation in truth, that great care and labor were bestowed on preserving full and accurate records so as to establish purity of descent. What importance attached to it, we know from the action on Ezra {Chs. 9:10.} in that respect, and from the stress which Josephus lays on this point. {Life i.; Ag Apion 1:7.} Official records of descent as regarded the priesthood were kept in the Temple. Besides, the Jewish authorities seem to have possessed a general official register, which Herod afterwards ordered to be burnt, from reasons which it is not difficult to infer. But from that day, laments a Rabbi, the glory of the Jews decreased!
 f30

Nor was it merely purity of descent of which the Eastern dispersion could boast. In truth, Palestine owed everything to Ezra, the Babylonian, f31 a man so distinguished that, according to tradition, the Law would have been given by him, if Moses had not previously obtained that honor. Putting aside the various traditional ordinances which the Talmud ascribes to him, f32 we know from the Scriptures what his activity for good had been. Altered circumstances had brought many changes to the new Jewish State. Even the language, spoken and written, was other than formerly. Instead of the characters anciently employed, the exiles brought with them, on their return, those now common, the so-called square Hebrew letters, which gradually came into general use. {Sanh. 21 b.} f33 The language spoken by the Jews was no longer Hebrew, but Aramaean, both in Palestine and in Babylonia; f34 in the former the Western, in the latter the Eastern dialect. In fact, the common people were ignorant of pure Hebrew, which henceforth became the language of students and of the Synagogue. Even there a Methurgeman, or interpreter, had to be employed to translate into the vernacular the portions of Scripture read in the public services, f35 and the address delivered by the Rabbis. This was the origin of the so-called *Targumim*, or paraphrases of Scripture. In earliest times, indeed, it was forbidden to the Methurgeman to read his translation or to write down a Targum, lest the paraphrase should be regarded as of equal authority with the original. It was said that, when Jonathan brought out his Targum on the Prophets, a voice from heaven was heard to utter: 'Who is this that has revealed My secrets to men?' {Megill. 3.} Still, such *Targumim* seem to have existed from a very early period, and, amid the varying and often incorrect renderings, their necessity must have made itself increasingly felt. Accordingly, their use was authoritatively sanctioned before the end of the

second century after Christ. This is the origin of our two oldest extant *Targumim*: that of Onkelos (as it is called), on the Pentateuch; and that on the Prophets, attributed to Jonathan the son of Uzziel. These names do not, indeed, accurately represent the authorship of the oldest Targumim, which may more correctly be regarded as later and authoritative recensions of what, in some form, had existed before. But although these works had their origin in Palestine, it is noteworthy that, in the form in which at present we possess them, they are the outcome of the schools of Babylon.

But Palestine owed, if possible, a still greater debt to Babylonia. The new circumstances in which the Jews were placed on their return seemed to render necessary an adaptation of the Mosaic Law, if not new legislation. Besides, piety and zeal now attached themselves to the outward observance and study of the letter of the Law. This is the origin of the *Mishnah*, or Second Law, which was intended to explain and supplement the first. This constituted the only Jewish dogmatics, in the real sense, in the study of which the sage, Rabbi, scholar, scribe, and *Darshan*,^{f36} were engaged. The result of it was the *Midrash*, or investigation, a term which afterwards was popularly applied to commentaries on the Scriptures and preaching. From the outset, Jewish theology divided into two branches: the *Halakhah* and the *Haggadah*. The former (from *halakh*, to go) was, so to speak, the Rule of the Spiritual Road, and, when fixed, had even greater authority than the Scriptures of the Old Testament, since it explained and applied them. On the other hand, the *Haggadah*^{f37} (from *nagad*, to tell) was only the personal saying of the teacher, more or less valuable according to his learning and popularity, or the authorities which he could quote in his support. Unlike the *Halakhah*, the *Haggadah* had no absolute authority, either as to doctrine practice, or exegesis. But all the greater would be its popular influence^{f38} and all the more dangerous the doctrinal license which it allowed. In fact, strange as it may sound, almost all the doctrinal teaching of the Synagogue is to be derived from the *Haggadah* and this also is characteristic of Jewish traditionalism. But, alike in *Halakhah* and *Haggadah*, Palestine was under the deepest obligation to Babylonia. For the father of Halakhic study was Hillel, the Babylonian, and among the popular Haggadists there is not a name better known than that of Eleazar the Mede, who flourished in the first century of our era.

After this, it seems almost idle to inquire whether, during the first period after the return of the exiles from Babylon, there were regular theological academies in Babylon. Although it is, of course, impossible to furnish

historical proof, we can scarcely doubt that a community so large and so intensely Hebrew would not have been indifferent to that study, which constituted the main thought and engagement of their brethren in Palestine. We can understand that, since the great Sanhedrin in Palestine exercised supreme spiritual authority, and in that capacity ultimately settled all religious questions, at least for a time, the study and discussion of these subjects should also have been chiefly carried on in the schools of Palestine; and that even the great Hillel himself, when still a poor and unknown student, should have wandered thither to acquire the learning and authority, which at that period he could not have found in his own country. But even this circumstance implies, that such studies were at least carried on and encouraged in Babylonia. How rapidly soon afterwards the authority of the Babylonian schools increased, till they not only overshadowed those of Palestine, but finally inherited their prerogatives, is well known. However, therefore, the Palestinians in their pride or jealousy might sneer, ^{f39} that the Babylonians were stupid, proud, and poor ('they ate bread upon bread'), ^{f40} even they had to acknowledge that, 'when the Law had fallen into oblivion, it was restored by Ezra of Babylon; when it was a second time forgotten, Hillel the Babylonian came and recovered it; and when yet a third time it fell into oblivion, Rabbi Chija came from Babylon and gave it back once more.' ^{f41}

Such then was that Hebrew dispersion which, from the first, constituted really the chief part and the strength of the Jewish nation, and with which its religious future was also to lie. For it is one of those strangely significant, almost symbolical, facts in history, that after the destruction of Jerusalem the spiritual supremacy of Palestine passed to Babylonia, and that Rabbinical Judaism, under the stress of political adversity, voluntarily transferred itself to the seats of Israel's ancient dispersion, as if to ratify by its own act what the judgment of God had formerly executed. But long before that time the Babylonian 'dispersion' had already stretched out its hands in every direction. Northwards, it had spread through Armenia, the Caucasus, and to the shores of the Black Sea, and through Media to those of the Caspian. Southwards, it had extended to the Persian Gulf and through the vast extent of Arabia, although Arabia Felix and the land of the Homerites may have received their first Jewish colonies from the opposite shores of Ethiopia. Eastwards it had passed as far as India. ^{f42} Everywhere we have distinct notices of these wanderers, and everywhere they appear as in closest connection with the Rabbinical hierarchy of Palestine. Thus the

Mishnah, in an extremely curious section, ^{f43} tells us how on Sabbaths the Jewesses of Arabia might wear their long veils, and those of India the kerchief round the head, customary in those countries, without incurring the guilt of desecrating the holy day by needlessly carrying what, in the eyes of the law, would be a burden; {Shabb. 6:6.} while in the rubric for the Day of Atonement we have it noted that the dress which the High-Priest wore 'between the evenings' of the great fast, that is, as afternoon darkened into evening, was of most costly 'Indian' stuff. {Yoma 3:7.}

That among such a vast community there should have been poverty, and that at one time, as the Palestinians sneered, learning may have been left to pine in want, we can readily believe. For, as one of the Rabbis had it in explanation of ~~<RB>~~Deuteronomy 30:13: 'Wisdom is not "beyond the sea", that is, it will not be found among traders or merchants,' {Er. 55 a.} whose mind must be engrossed by gain. And it was trade and commerce which procured to the Babylonians their wealth and influence, although agriculture was not neglected. Their caravans, — of whose camel drivers, by the way, no very flattering account is given {Kidd. 4:14}, — carried the rich carpets and woven stuffs of the East, as well as its precious spices, to the West: generally through Palestine to the Phoenician harbors, where a fleet of merchantmen belonging to Jewish bankers and shippers lay ready to convey them to every quarter of the world. These merchant princes were keenly alive to all that passed, not only in the financial, but in the political world. We know that they were in possession of State secrets, and entrusted with the intricacies of diplomacy. Yet, whatever its condition, this Eastern Jewish community was intensely Hebrew. Only eight days' journey, though, according to Philo's western ideas of it, by a difficult road ^{f44}, separated them from Palestine; and every pulsation there vibrated in Babylonia. It was in the most outlying part of that colony, in the wide plains of Arabia, that Saul of Tarsus spent those three years of silent thought and unknown labor, which preceded his re-appearance in Jerusalem, when from the burning longing to labor among his brethren, kindled by long residence among these Hebrews of the Hebrews, he was directed to that strange work which was his life's mission. {~~<RB>~~Galatians 1:17;} And it was among the same community that Peter wrote and labored, {~~<RB>~~1 Peter 5:13.} amidst discouragements of which we can form some conception from the sad boast of Nehardaa, that up to the end of the third century it had not numbered among its members any convert to Christianity. ^{f45}

In what has been said, no notice has been taken of those wanderers of the ten tribes, whose trackless footsteps seem as mysterious as their after-fate. The Talmudists name four countries as their seats. But, even if we were to attach historic credence to their vague statements, at least two of these localities cannot with any certainty be identified.^{f46} Only thus far all agree as to point us northwards, through India, Armenia, the Kurdish mountains, and the Caucasus. And with this tallies a curious reference in what is known as IV. Esdras, which locates them in a land called Arzareth, a term which has, with some probability, been identified with the land of Ararat.^{f47} Josephus {Ant. 11:5.2.} describes them as an innumerable multitude, and vaguely locates them beyond the Euphrates. The Mishnah is silent as to their seats, but discusses their future restoration; Rabbi Akiba denying and Rabbi Eliezer anticipating it. {Sanh. 10:3.}^{f48} Another Jewish tradition {Ber. R. 73.} locates them by the fabled river Sabbatyon, which was supposed to cease its flow on the weekly Sabbath. This, of course, is an implied admission of ignorance of their seats. Similarly, the Talmud {Jer. San b 29 c.} speaks of three localities whither they had been banished: the district around the river Sabbatyon; Daphne, near Antioch; while the third was overshadowed and hidden by a cloud.

Later Jewish notices connect the final discovery and the return of the 'lost tribes' with their conversion under that second Messiah who, in contradistinction to 'the Son of David' is styled 'the Son of Joseph,' to whom Jewish tradition ascribes what it cannot reconcile with the royal dignity of 'the Son of David,' and which, if applied to Him, would almost inevitably lead up to the most wide concessions in the Christian argument.^{f49} As regards the ten tribes there is this truth underlying the strange hypothesis, that, as their persistent apostacy from the God of Israel and His worship had cut them off from his people, so the fulfilment of the Divine promises to them in the latter days would imply, as it were, a second birth to make them once more Israel. Beyond this we are travelling chiefly into the region of conjecture. Modern investigations have pointed to the Nestorians,^{f50} and latterly with almost convincing evidence (so far as such is possible) to the Afghans, as descended from the lost tribes.^{f51} Such mixture with, and lapse into, Gentile nationalities seems to have been before the minds of those Rabbis who ordered that, if at present a non-Jew weds a Jewess, such a union was to be respected, since the stranger might be a descendant of the ten tribes. {Yebam 16 b.} Besides, there is reason to believe that part of them, at least, had coalesced with their brethren of

the later exile; ^{f52} while we know that individuals who had settled in Palestine and, presumably, elsewhere, were able to trace descent from them. ^{f53} Still the great mass of the ten tribes was in the days of Christ, as in our own, lost to the Hebrew nation.

CHAPTER 2.

THE JEWISH DISPERSION IN THE WEST, THE HELLENISTS, ORIGIN OF HELLENIST LITERATURE IN THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE, CHARACTER OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

When we turn from the Jewish ‘dispersion’ in the East to that in the West, we seem to breathe quite a different atmosphere. Despite their intense nationalism, all unconsciously to themselves, their mental characteristics and tendencies were in the opposite direction from those of their brethren. With those of the East rested the future of Judaism; with them of the West, in a sense, that of the world. The one represented old Israel, stretching forth its hands to where the dawn of a new day was about to break. These Jews of the West are known by the term *Hellenists*, from *ἡellenίζειν*, to conform to the language and manners of the Greeks.^{f54}

Whatever their religious and social isolation, it was, in the nature of thing, impossible that the Jewish communities in the West should remain unaffected by Grecian culture and modes of thought; just as, on the other hand, the Greek world, despite popular hatred and the contempt of the higher classes, could not wholly withdraw itself from Jewish influences. Witness here the many converts to Judaism among the Gentiles;^{f55} witness also the evident preparedness of the lands of this ‘dispersion’ for the new doctrine which was to come from Judea. Many causes contributed to render the Jews of the West accessible to Greek influences. They had not a long local history to look back upon, nor did they form a compact body, like their brethren in the East. They were craftsmen, traders, merchants, settled for a time here or there, units might combine into communities, but could not form one people. Then their position was not favorable to the sway of traditionalism. Their occupations, the very reasons for their being in a ‘strange land,’ were purely secular. That lofty absorption of thought and life in the study of the Law, written and oral, which characterized the East, was to them something in the dim distance, sacred, like the soil and the institutions of Palestine, but unattainable. In Palestine or Babylonia numberless influences from his earliest years, all that he saw and heard, the very force of circumstances, would tend to make an earnest Jew a disciple of the Rabbis; in the West it would lead him to ‘hellenise.’ It was, so to speak, ‘in the air’; and he could no more shut his mind against Greek

thought than he could withdraw his body from atmospheric influences. That restless, searching, subtle Greek intellect would penetrate everywhere, and flash its light into the innermost recesses of his home and Synagogue.

To be sure, they were intensely Jewish, these communities of strangers. Like our scattered colonists in distant lands, they would cling with double affection to the customs of their home, and invest with the halo of tender memories the sacred traditions of their faith. The Grecian Jew might well look with contempt, not unmingled with pity, on the idolatrous rites practiced around, from which long ago the pitiless irony of Isaiah had torn the veil of beauty, to show the hideousness and unreality beneath. The dissoluteness of public and private life, the frivolity and aimlessness of their pursuits, political aspirations, popular assemblies, amusements, — in short, the utter decay of society, in all its phases, would lie open to his gaze. It is in terms of lofty scorn, not unmingled with indignation, which only occasionally gives way to the softer mood of warning, or even invitation, that Jewish Hellenistic literature, whether in the Apocrypha or in its Apocalyptic utterances, address heathenism.

From that spectacle the Grecian Jew would turn with infinite satisfaction, — not to say, pride, — to his own community, to think of its spiritual enlightenment, and to pass in review its exclusive privileges.^{f56} It was with no uncertain steps that he would go past those splendid temples to his own humbler Synagogue, pleased to find himself there surrounded by those who shared his descent, his faith, his hopes; and gratified to see their number swelled by many who, heathens by birth, had learned the error of their ways, and now, so to speak, humbly stood as suppliant ‘strangers of the gate,’ to seek admission into his sanctuary.^{f57} How different were the rites which he practiced, hallowed in their Divine origin, rational in themselves, and at the same time deeply significant, from the absurd superstitions around. Who could have compared with the voiceless, meaningless, blasphemous heathen worship, if it deserved the name, that of the Synagogue, with its pathetic hymns, its sublime liturgy, its Divine Scriptures, and those ‘stated sermons’ which ‘instructed in virtue and piety,’ of which not only Philo, {*De Vita Mosis*, p. 685; *Leg ad Caj.* p. 1014.} Agrippa, {*Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1035.} and Josephus, {*Ag. Apion* 2:17.} speak as a regular institution, but whose antiquity and general prevalence is attested in Jewish writings,^{f58} and nowhere more strongly than in the book of the Acts of the Apostles?

And in these Synagogues, how would 'brotherly love' be called out, since, if one member suffered, all might soon be affected, and the danger which threatened one community would, unless averted, ere long overwhelm the rest. There was little need for the admonition not to 'forget the love of strangers.' ^{f59} To entertain them was not merely a virtue; in the Hellenist dispersion it was a religious necessity. And by such means not a few whom they would regard as 'heavenly messengers' might be welcomed. From the Acts of the Apostles we knew with what eagerness they would receive, and with what readiness they would invite, the passing Rabbi or teacher, who came from the home of their faith, to speak, if there were in them a word of comforting exhortation for the people. {~~4135~~ Acts 13:15.} We can scarcely doubt, considering the state of things, that this often bore on 'the consolation of Israel.' But, indeed, all that came from Jerusalem, all that helped them to realize their living connection with it, or bound it more closely, was precious. 'Letters out of Judaea,' the tidings which some one might bring on his return from festive pilgrimage or business journey, especially about anything connected with that grand expectation, the star which was to rise on the Eastern sky, would soon spread, till the Jewish peddler in his wanderings had carried the news to the most distant and isolated Jewish home, where he might find a Sabbath, welcome and Sabbath-rest.

Such undoubtedly was the case. And yet, when the Jew stepped out of the narrow circle which he had drawn around him, he was confronted on every side by Grecianism. It was in the forum, in the market, in the counting-house, in the street; in all that he saw, and in all to whom he spoke. It was refined; it was elegant; it was profound; it was supremely attractive. He might resist, but he could not push it aside. Even in resisting, he had already yielded to it. For, once open the door to the questions which it brought, if it were only to expel, or repel them, he must give up that principle of simple authority on which traditionalism as a system rested. Hellenic criticism could not so be silenced, nor its searching light be extinguished by the breath of a Rabbi. If he attempted this, the truth would not only be worsted before its enemies, but suffer detriment in his own eyes. He must meet argument with argument, and that not only for those who were without, but in order to be himself quite sure of what he believed. He must be able to hold it, not only in controversy with others, where pride might bid him stand fast, but in that much more serious contest within, where a man meets the old adversary alone in the secret arena of his

own mind, and has to sustain that terrible hand-to-hand fight, in which he is uncheered by outward help. But why should he shrink from the contest, when he was sure that his was Divine truth, and that therefore victory must be on his side? As in our modern conflicts against the one-sided inferences from physical investigations we are wont to say that the truths of nature cannot contradict those of revelation, both being of God, and as we are apt to regard as truths of nature what sometimes are only deductions from partially ascertained facts, and as truths of revelation what, after all, may be only our own inferences, sometimes from imperfectly apprehended premises, so the Hellenist would seek to conciliate the truths of Divine revelation with those others which, he thought, he recognized in Hellenism. But what were the truths of Divine revelation? Was it only the substance of Scripture, or also its form, the truth itself which was conveyed, or the manner in which it was presented to the Jews; or, if both, then did the two stand on exactly the same footing? On the answer to these questions would depend how little or how much he would ‘hellenise.’

One thing at any rate was quite certain. The Old Testament, leastwise, the Law of Moses, was directly and wholly from God; and if so, then its form also, its letter, must be authentic and authoritative. Thus much on the surface, and for all. But the student must search deeper into it, his senses, as it were, quickened by Greek criticism; he must ‘meditate’ and penetrate into the Divine mysteries. The Palestinian also searched into them, and the result was the *Midrash*. But, whichever of his methods he had applied, the *Peshat*, or simple criticism of the words, the *Derush*, or search into the possible applications of the text, what might be ‘trodden out’ of it; or the *Sod*, the hidden, mystical, supranatural bearing of the words, — it was still only the *letter* of the text that had been studied. There was, indeed, yet another understanding of the Scriptures, to which St. Paul directed his disciples: the spiritual bearing of its spiritual truths. But that needed another qualification, and tended in another direction from those of which the Jewish student knew. On the other hand, there was the intellectual view of the Scriptures, — their philosophical understanding, the application to them of the results of Grecian thought and criticism. It was this which was peculiarly Hellenistic. Apply that method, and the deeper the explorer proceeded in his search, the more would he feel himself alone, far from the outside crowd; but the brighter also would that light of criticism, which he carried, shine in the growing darkness, or, as he held it up, would the precious ore, which he laid bare, glitter and sparkle with a thousand

varying hues of brilliancy. What was Jewish, Palestinian, individual, concrete in the Scriptures, was only the outside, true in itself, but not *the* truth. There were depths beneath. Strip these stories of their nationalism; idealize the individual of the persons introduced, and you came upon abstract ideas and realities, true to all time and to all nations. But this deep symbolism was Pythagorean; this pre-existence of ideas which were the types of all outward actuality, was Platonism! Broken rays in them, but the focus of truth in the Scriptures. Yet these were rays, and could only have come from the Sun. All truth was of God; hence theirs must have been of that origin. Then were the sages of the heathen also in a sense God-taught — and God-teaching, or inspiration, was rather a question of degree than of kind!

One step only remained; and that, as we imagine, if not the easiest, yet, as we reflect upon it, that which in practice would be most readily taken. It was simply to advance towards Grecianism; frankly to recognize truth in the results of Greek thought. There is that within us, name it mental consciousness, or as you will, which, all unbidden, rises to answer to the voice of intellectual truth, come whence it may, just as conscience answers to the cause of moral truth or duty. But in this case there was more. There was the mighty spell which Greek philosophy exercised on all kindred minds, and the special adaptation of the Jewish intellect to such subtle, if not deep, thinking. And, in general, and more powerful than the rest, because penetrating everywhere, was the charm of Greek literature, with its brilliancy; of Greek civilization and culture, with their polish and attractiveness; and of what, in one word, we may call the ‘time-spirit,’ that *tyrannos*, who rules all in their thinking, speaking, doing, whether they list or not.

Why, his sway extended even to Palestine itself, and was felt in the innermost circle of the most exclusive Rabbiniism. We are not here referring to the fact that the very language spoken in Palestine came to be very largely charged with Greek, and even Latin, words Hebraised, since this is easily accounted for by the new circumstances, and the necessities of intercourse with the dominant or resident foreigners. Nor is it requisite to point out how impossible it would have been, in presence of so many from the Greek and Roman world, and after the long and persistent struggle of their rulers to Grecianise Palestine, nay — even in view of so many magnificent heathen temples on the very soil of Palestine, to exclude all knowledge of, or contact with Grecianism. But not to be able to exclude

was to have in sight the dazzle of that unknown, which as such, and in itself, must have had peculiar attractions to the Jewish mind. It needed stern principle to repress the curiosity thus awakened. When a young Rabbi, *Ben Dama*, asked his uncle whether he might not study Greek philosophy, since he had mastered the 'Law' in every aspect of it, the older Rabbi replied by a reference to ~~ῥῆμα~~ Joshua 1:8:

‘Go and search what is the hour which is neither of the day nor of the night, and in it thou mayest study Greek philosophy.’

{Men. 99 *b*, towards the end.} Yet even the Jewish patriarch, Gamaliel II., who may have sat with Saul of Tarsus at the feet of his grandfather, was said to have busied himself with Greek, as he certainly held liberal views on many points connected with Grecianism. To be sure, tradition justified him on the ground that his position brought him into contact with the ruling powers, and, perhaps, to further vindicate him, ascribed similar pursuits to the elder Gamaliel, although groundlessly, to judge from the circumstance that he was so impressed even with the wrong of possessing a Targum on Job in Aramaean, that he had it buried deep in the ground.

But all these are indications of a tendency existing. How wide it must have spread, appears from the fact that the ban had to be pronounced on all who studied 'Greek wisdom.' One of the greatest Rabbis, Elisha ben Abujah, seems to have been actually led to apostacy by such studies. True, he appears as the '*Acher*' — the 'other', in Talmudic writings, whom it was not proper even to name. But he was not yet an apostate from the Synagogue when those 'Greek songs' ever flowed from his lips; and it was in the very Beth-ha-Midrash, or theological academy, that a multitude of *Siphrey Minim* (heretical books) flew from his breast, where they had lain concealed. {Jer. Chag. 2:1; comp. Chag. 15.} It may be so, that the expression '*Siphrey Homeros*' (Homeric writings), which occur not only in the Talmud {Jer. Sanh. 10:28 *a*.} but even in the Mishnah {Yad. 4:6.} referred pre-eminently, if not exclusively, to the religious or semi-religious Jewish Hellenistic literature, outside even the Apocrypha.^{f60} But its occurrence proves, at any rate, that the Hellenists were credited with the study of Greek literature, and that through them, if not more directly, the Palestinians had become acquainted with it.

This sketch will prepare us for a rapid survey of that Hellenistic literature which Judaea so much dreaded. Its importance, not only to the Hellenists but to the world at large, can scarcely be over-estimated. First and

foremost, we have here the Greek translation of the Old Testament, venerable not only as the oldest, but as that which at the time of Jesus held the place of our 'Authorized Version,' and as such is so often, although freely, quoted, in the New Testament. Nor need we wonder that it should have been the people's Bible, not merely among the Hellenists, but in Galilee, and even in Judaea. It was not only, as already explained, that Hebrew was no longer the 'vulgar tongue' in Palestine, and that written Targumim were prohibited. But most, if not all, at least in towns, would understand the Greek version; it might be quoted in intercourse with Hellenist brethren or with the Gentiles; and, what was perhaps equally, if not more important, it was the most readily procurable. From the extreme labor and care bestowed on them, Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible were enormously dear, as we infer from a curious Talmudical notice, {Gitt. 35 last line and *b.*} where a common woolen wrap, which of course was very cheap, a copy of the Psalms, of Job, and torn pieces from Proverbs, are together valued at *five maneh*, say, about 19*l.* Although this notice dates from the third or fourth century, it is not likely that the cost of Hebrew Biblical MSS. was much lower at the time of Jesus. This would, of course, put their possession well nigh out of common reach. On the other hand, we are able to form an idea of the cheapness of Greek manuscripts from what we know of the price of books in Rome at the beginning of our era.

Hundreds of slaves were there engaged copying what one dictated. The result was not only the publication of as large editions as in our days, but their production at only about double the cost of what are now known as 'cheap' or 'people's editions.' Probably it would be safe to compute, that as much matter as would cover sixteen pages of small print might, in such cases, be sold at the rate of about sixpence, and in that ratio. ^{f61}

Accordingly, manuscripts in Greek or Latin, although often incorrect, must have been easily attainable, and this would have considerable influence on making the Greek version of the Old Testament the 'people's Bible.' ^{f62}

The Greek version, like the Targum of the Palestinians, originated, no doubt, in the first place, in a felt national want on the part of the Hellenists, who as a body were ignorant of Hebrew. Hence we find notices of very early Greek versions of at least parts of the Pentateuch. ^{f63} But this, of course, could not suffice. On the other hand, there existed, as we may suppose, a natural curiosity on the part of students, especially in Alexandria, which had so large a Jewish population, to know the sacred books on which the religion and history of Israel were founded. Even more

than this, we must take into account the literary tastes of the first three Ptolemies (successors in Egypt of Alexander the Great), and the exceptional favor which the Jews for a time enjoyed. Ptolemy I. (Lagi) was a great patron of learning. He projected the Museum in Alexandria, which was a home for literature and study, and founded the great library. In these undertakings Demetrius Phalereus was his chief adviser. The tastes of the first Ptolemy were inherited by his son, Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus), who had for two years been co-regent. {286-284 B.C.} In fact, ultimately that monarch became literally book-mad, and the sums spent on rare MSS., which too often proved spurious, almost pass belief. The same may be said of the third of these monarchs, Ptolemy III. (Euergetes). It would have been strange, indeed, if these monarchs had not sought to enrich their library with an authentic rendering of the Jewish sacred books, or not encouraged such a translation.

These circumstances will account for the different elements which we can trace in the Greek version of the Old Testament, and explain the historical, or rather legendary, notices which we have of its composition. To begin with the latter. Josephus has preserved what, no doubt in its present form, is a spurious letter from one Aristeeas to his brother Philocrates,^{f64} in which we are told how, by the advice of his librarian (?), Demetrius Phalereus, Ptolemy II. had sent by him (Aristeeas) and another officer, a letter, with rich presents, to Eleazar, the High-Priest at Jerusalem; who in turn had selected seventy-two translators (six out of each tribe), and furnished them with a most valuable manuscript of the Old Testament. The letter then gives further details of their splendid reception at the Egyptian court, and of their sojourn in the island of Pharos, where they accomplished their work in seventy-two days, when they returned to Jerusalem laden with rich presents, their translation having received the formal approval of the Jewish Sanhedrin at Alexandria. From this account we may at least derive as historical these facts: that the Pentateuch, for to it only the testimony refers, was translated into Greek, at the suggestion of Demetrius Phalereus, in the reign and under the patronage, — if not by direction, — of Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus).^{f65} With this the Jewish accounts agree, which describe the translation of the Pentateuch under Ptolemy, the Jerusalem Talmud {Meg. i.} in a simpler narrative, the Babylonian {Meg. 9 a.} with additions apparently derived from the Alexandrian legends; the former expressly noting thirteen, the latter marking fifteen, variations from the original text.^{f66}

The Pentateuch once translated, whether by one, or more likely by several persons,^{f67} the other books of the Old Testament would naturally soon receive the same treatment. They were evidently rendered by a number of persons, who possessed very different qualifications for their work, — the translation of the Book of Daniel having been so defective, that in its place another by Theodotion was afterwards substituted. The version, as a whole, bears the name of the LXX., — as some have supposed from the number of its translators according to Aristæus' account, only that in that case it should have been seventy-two; or from the approval of the Alexandrian Sannædion^{f68} — although in that case it should have been seventy-one; or perhaps because, in the popular idea, the number of the Gentile nations, of which the Greek (Japheth) was regarded as typical, was seventy. We have, however, one fixed date by which to compute the completion of this translation. From the prologue to the Apocryphal 'Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach,' we learn that in his days the Canon of Scripture was closed; and that on his arrival, in his thirty-eighth year,^{f69} In Egypt, which was then under the rule of Euergetes, he found the so-called LXX. version completed, when he set himself to a similar translation of the Hebrew work of his grandfather. But in the 50th chapter of that work we have a description of the High-Priest Simon, which is evidently written by an eye-witness. We have therefore as one term the pontificate of Simon, during which the earlier Jesus lived; and as the other, the reign of Euergetes, in which the grandson was at Alexandria. Now, although there were two High-Priests who bore the name Simon, and two Egyptian kings with the surname Euergetes, yet on purely historical grounds, and apart from critical prejudices, we conclude that the Simon of Ecclus. L. was Simon I., the Just, one of the greatest names in Jewish traditional history; and similarly, that the Euergetes of the younger Jesus was the first of that name, Ptolemy III., who reigned from 247 to 221 B.C.^{f70} In his reign, therefore, we must regard the LXX. version as, at least substantially, completed.

From this it would, of course, follow that the Canon of the Old Testament was then practically fixed in Palestine.^{f71} That Canon was accepted by the Alexandrian translators, although the more loose views of the Hellenists on 'inspiration,' and the absence of that close watchfulness exercised over the text in Palestine, led to additions and alterations, and ultimately even to the admission of the Apocrypha into the Greek Bible. Unlike the Hebrew arrangement of the text into the Law, the Prophets,^{f72} and the (sacred)

Writings, or Hagiographa, the LXX. arrange them into historical, prophetical, and poetic books, and count twenty-two, after the Hebrew alphabet, instead of twenty-four, as the Hebrews. But perhaps both these may have been later arrangements, since Philo evidently knew the Jewish order of the books. {De Vita Contempl. section 3.} What text the translators may have used we can only conjecture. It differs in almost innumerable instances from our own, though the more important deviations are comparatively few.^{f73} In the great majority of the lesser variations our Hebrew must be regarded as the correct text.^{f74}

Putting aside clerical mistakes and misreadings, and making allowance for errors of translation, ignorance, and haste, we note certain outstanding facts as characteristic of the Greek version. It bears evident marks of its origin in Egypt in its use of Egyptian words and references, and equally evident traces of its Jewish composition. By the side of slavish and false literalism there is great liberty, if not license, in handling the original; gross mistakes occur along with happy renderings of very difficult passages, suggesting the aid of some able scholars. Distinct Jewish elements are undeniably there, which can only be explained by reference to Jewish tradition, although they are much fewer than some critics have supposed.^{f75} This we can easily understand, since only those traditions would find a place which at that early time were not only received, but in general circulation. The distinctively Grecian elements, however, are at present of chief interest to us. They consist of allusions to Greek mythological terms, and adaptations of Greek philosophical ideas. However few,^{f76} even one well-authenticated instance would lead us to suspect others, and in general give to the version the character of Jewish Hellenising. In the same class we reckon what constitutes the prominent characteristic of the LXX. version, which, for want of better terms, we would designate as rationalistic and apologetic. Difficulties, — or what seemed such, — are removed by the most bold methods, and by free handling of the text; it need scarcely be said, often very unsatisfactorily. More especially a strenuous effort is made to banish all anthropomorphisms, as inconsistent with their ideas of the Deity. The superficial observer might be tempted to regard this as not strictly Hellenistic, since the same may be noted, and indeed is much more consistently carried out, in the Targum of Onkelos. Perhaps such alterations had even been introduced into the Hebrew text itself.^{f77} But there is this vital difference between Palestinainism and Alexandrianism, that, broadly speaking, the Hebrew avoidance of

anthropomorphisms depends on objective, theological and dogmatic, the Hellenistic on subjective, — philosophical and apologetic, — grounds. The Hebrew avoids them as he does what seems to him inconsistent with the dignity of Biblical heroes and of Israel. ‘Great is the power of the prophets,’ he writes, ‘who liken the Creator to the creature;’ or else {Mechilta on Exodus 19.} ‘a thing is written only to break it to the ear’, — to adapt it to our human modes of speaking and understanding; and again, {Ber. 31 *b.*} the ‘words of the Torah are like the speech of the children of men.’ But for this very purpose the words of Scripture may be presented in another form, if need be even modified, so as to obviate possible misunderstanding, or dogmatic error. The Alexandrians arrived at the same conclusion, but from an opposite direction. They had not theological but philosophical axioms in their minds, — truths which the *highest* truth could not, and, as they held, did not contravene. Only dig deeper; get beyond the letter to that to which it pointed; divest abstract truth of its concrete, national, Judaistic envelope, penetrate through the dim porch into the temple, and you were surrounded by a blaze of light, of which, as its portals had been thrown open, single rays had fallen into the night of heathendom. And so the truth would appear glorious, — more than vindicated in their own sight, triumphant in that of others!

In such manner the LXX. version became really the people’s Bible to that large Jewish world through which Christianity was afterwards to address itself to mankind. It was part of the case, that this translation should be regarded by the Hellenists as inspired like the original. Otherwise it would have been impossible to make final appeal to the very words of the Greek; still less, to find in them a mystical and allegorical meaning. Only that we must not regard their views of inspiration, except as applying to Moses, and even there only partially, as identical with ours. To their minds inspiration differed quantitatively, not qualitatively, from what the rapt soul might at any time experience, so that even heathen philosophers might ultimately be regarded as at times inspired. So far as the version of the Bible was concerned (and probably on like grounds), similar views obtained at a later period even in Hebrew circles, where it was laid down that the Chaldee Targum on the Pentateuch had been originally spoken to Moses on Sinai, {Ned. 37 *b.*; Kidd. 49 *a.*} though afterwards forgotten, till restored and re-introduced. {Meg. 3 *a.*}

Whether or not the LXX. was read in the Hellenist Synagogues, and the worship conducted, wholly or partly, in Greek, must be matter of

conjecture. We find, however, a significant notice {Jer. Meg. 4:3, ed. Krot. p. 75a.} to the effect that among those who spoke a barbarous language (not Hebrew, the term referring specially to Greek), it was the custom for one person to read the whole Parashah (or lesson for the day), while among the Hebrew-speaking Jews this was done by seven persons, successively called up. This seems to imply that either the Greek text alone was read, or that it followed a Hebrew reading, like the Targum of the Easterns. More probably, however, the former would be the case, since both Hebrew manuscripts, and persons qualified to read them, would be difficult to procure. At any rate, we know that the Greek Scriptures were authoritatively acknowledged in Palestine,¹⁷⁸ and that the ordinary daily prayers might be said in Greek.¹⁷⁹ The LXX. deserved this distinction from its general faithfulness, — at least, in regard to the Pentateuch, — and from its preservation of ancient doctrine. Thus, without further referring to its full acknowledgment of the doctrine of Angels (comp. ~~638~~ Deuteronomy 32:8, 33:2), we specially mark that is preserved the Messianic interpretation of ~~0490~~ Genesis 49:10, and ~~0047~~ Numbers 24:7, 17, 23, bringing us evidence of what had been the generally received view two and a half centuries before the birth of Jesus. It must have been on the ground of the use made of the LXX. in argument, that later voices in the Synagogue declared this version to have been as great calamity to Israel as the making of the golden calf, {Mass. Sopher 1 Hal. 7, — at the close of vol. 9 of the Bab. Talmud.} and that its completion had been followed by the terrible omen of an eclipse, that lasted three days. {Hilch. Ged. Taan.} For the Rabbis declared that upon investigation it had been found that the Torah could be adequately translated only into Greek, and they are most extravagant in their praise of the Greek version of *Akylas*, or Aquila, the proselyte, which was made to counteract the influence of the LXX. {Jer. Meg. 1:11, ed. Krot. p. 71 b and c.} But in Egypt the anniversary of the completion of the LXX. was celebrated by a feast in the island of Pharos, in which ultimately even heathens seem to have taken part. {*Philo*, Vita Mos. 2 ed. Francf. p. 660}

CHAPTER 3

THE OLD FAITH PREPARING FOR THE NEW, DEVELOPMENT OF HELLENIST THEOLOGY: THE APOCRYPHA, ARISTEAS, ARISTOBULUS, AND THE PSEUDO-EPIGRAPHIC WRITINGS.

The translation of the Old Testament into Greek may be regarded as the starting-point of Hellenism. It rendered possible the hope that what in its original form had been confined to the few, might become accessible to the world at large. { *Philo*, de Vita Mos. ed. Mangey, 2 p. 140. } But much yet remained to be done. If the religion of the Old Testament had been brought near to the Grecian world of thought, the latter had still to be brought near to Judaism. Some intermediate stage must be found; some common ground on which the two might meet; some original kindredness of spirit to which their later divergences might be carried back, and where they might finally be reconciled. As the first attempt in this direction, — first in order, if not always in time, — we mark the so-called Apocryphal literature, most of which was either written in Greek, or is the product of Hellenising Jews.^{f80} Its general object was twofold. First, of course, it was apologetic, — intended to fill gaps in Jewish history or thought, but especially to strengthen the Jewish mind against attacks from without, and generally to extol the dignity of Israel. Thus, more withering sarcasm could scarcely be poured on heathenism than in the apocryphal story of ‘Bel and the Dragon,’ or in the so-called ‘Epistle of Jeremy,’ with which the Book of ‘Baruch’ closes. The same strain, only in more lofty tones, resounds through the Book of the ‘Wisdom of Solomon,’ { *Comp.* 10:20. } along with the constantly implied contrast between the righteous, or Israel, and sinners, or the heathen. But the next object was to show that the deeper and purer thinking of heathenism in its highest philosophy supported, — nay, in some respects, was identical with, — the fundamental teaching of the Old Testament. This, of course, was apologetic of the Old Testament, but it also prepared the way for a reconciliation with Greek philosophy. We notice this especially in the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees, so long erroneously attributed to Josephus,^{f81} and in the ‘Wisdom of Solomon.’ The first postulate here would be the acknowledgment of truth among the Gentiles, which was the outcome of Wisdom, and Wisdom was the revelation of God. This seems already implied in so thoroughly Jewish a

book as that of Jesus the Son of Sirach. {Comp. for ex. Ecclus. 24:6.} Of course there could be no alliance with Epicureanism, which was at the opposite pole of the Old Testament. But the brilliancy of Plato's speculations would charm, while the stern self-abnegation of Stoicism would prove almost equally attractive. The one would show why they believed, the other why they lived, as they did. Thus the theology of the Old Testament would find a rational basis in the ontology of Plato, and its ethics in the moral philosophy of the Stoics. Indeed, this is the very line of argument which Josephus follows in the conclusion of his treatise against Apion. {2:39, 40.} This, then, was an unassailable position to take: contempt poured on heathenism as such, {Comp. also Jos. Ag. Ap. 2:34.} and irrational philosophical basis for Judaism. They were not deep, only acute thinkers, these Alexandrians, and the result of their speculations was a curious Eclecticism, in which Platonism and Stoicism are found, often heterogeneously, side by side. Thus, without further details, it may be said that the Fourth Book of Maccabees is a Jewish Stoical treatise on the Stoical theme of 'the supremacy of reason', the proposition, stated at the outset, that 'pious reason bears absolute sway over the passions,' being illustrated by the story of the martyrdom of Eleazar, and of the mother and her seven sons. {Comp. 2 Macc. 6:18-7. 41.} On the other hand, that sublime work, the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' contains Platonic and Stoic elements ^{f82}, — chiefly perhaps the latter, — the two occurring side by side. Thus {Ch. 7:22-27.} 'Wisdom,' which is so concretely presented as to be almost hypostatized, ^{f83} is first described in the language of Stoicism, {Vv. 22-24.} and afterwards set forth, in that of Platonism, {Vv. 25-29.} as 'the breath of the power of God;' as 'a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty;' 'the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of His goodness.' Similarly, we have {In ch. 8:7.} a Stoical enumeration of the four cardinal virtues, temperance, prudence, justice, and fortitude, and close by it the Platonic idea of the soul's pre-existence, {In vv. 19, 20.} and of earth and matter pressing it down. {9:15.} How such views would point in the direction of the need of a perfect revelation from on high, as in the Bible, and of its rational possibility, need scarcely be shown.

But how did Eastern Judaism bear itself towards this Apocryphal literature? We find it described by a term which seems to correspond to our 'Apocrypha,' as '*Sepharim Genuzim*,' 'hidden books,' i.e., either such whose origin was hidden, or, more likely, books withdrawn from common

or congregational use. Although they were, of course, carefully distinguished from the canonical Scriptures, as not being sacred, their use was not only allowed, but many of them are quoted in Talmudical writings.^{f84} In this respect they are placed on a very different footing from the so-called *Sepharim Chitsonim*, or 'outside books,' which probably included both the products of a certain class of Jewish Hellenistic literature, and the *Siphrey Minim*, or writings of the heretics. Against these Rabbinism can scarcely find terms of sufficient violence, even debarring from share in the world to come those who read them. {Sanh 100.} This, not only because they were used in controversy, but because their secret influence on orthodox Judaism was dreaded. For similar reasons, later Judaism forbade the use of the Apocrypha in the same manner as that of the *Sepharim Chitsonim*. But their influence had already made itself felt. The Apocrypha, the more greedily perused, not only for their glorification of Judaism, but that they were, so to speak, doubtful reading, which yet afforded a glimpse into that forbidden Greek world, opened the way for other Hellenistic literature, of which unacknowledged but frequent traces occur in Talmudical writings.^{f85}

To those who thus sought to weld Grecian thought with Hebrew revelation, two objects would naturally present themselves. They must try to connect their Greek philosophers with the Bible, and they must find beneath the letter of Scripture a deeper meaning, which would accord with philosophic truth. So far as the text of Scripture was concerned, they had a method ready to hand. The Stoic philosophers had busied themselves in finding a deeper *allegorical* meaning, especially in the writings of Homer. By applying it to mythical stories, or to the popular beliefs, and by tracing the supposed symbolical meaning of names, numbers, etc., it became easy to prove almost anything, or to extract from these philosophical truths ethical principles, and even the later results of natural science.^{f86} Such a process was peculiarly pleasing to the imagination, and the results alike astounding and satisfactory, since as they could not be proved, so neither could they be disproved. This allegorical method^{f87} was the welcome key by which the Hellenists might unlock the hidden treasury of Scripture. In point of fact, we find it applied so early as in the 'Wisdom of Solomon.'^{f88}

But as yet Hellenism had scarcely left the domain of sober interpretation. it is otherwise in the letter of the Pseudo-Aristeas, to which reference has already been made.^{f89} Here the wildest symbolism is put into the mouth of the High-Priest Eleazar, to convince Aristeas and his fellow-ambassador that the Mosaic ordinances concerning food had not only a political reason,

—to keep Israel separate from impious nations, — and a sanitary one, but chiefly a mystical meaning. The birds allowed for food were all tame and pure, and they fed on corn or vegetable products, the opposite being the case with those forbidden. The first lesson which this was intended to teach was, that Israel must be just, and not seek to obtain aught from others by violence; but, so to speak, imitate the habits of those birds which were allowed them. The next lesson would be, that each must learn to govern his passions and inclinations. Similarly, the direction about cloven hoofs pointed to the need of making separation, that is, between good and evil; and that about chewing the cud to the need of remembering, viz. God and His will. ^{f90} In such manner, according to Aristeas, did the High Priest go through the catalogue of things forbidden, and of animals to be sacrificed, showing from their ‘hidden meaning’ the majesty and sanctity of the Law. ^{f91}

This was an important line to take, and it differed in principle from the allegorical method adopted by the Eastern Jews. Not only the *Dorshey Reshumoth*, ^{f92} or searches out of the subtleties of Scripture, of their indications, but even the ordinary Haggadist employed, indeed, allegoric interpretations. Thereby Akiba vindicated for the ‘Song of Songs’ its place in the Canon. Did not Scripture say: ‘One thing spake God, twofold is what I heard,’ {~~Psalm~~ Psalm 62:11; Sanh. 34 *a.*} and did not this imply a twofold meaning; nay, could not the Torah be explained by many different methods? ^{f93} What, for example, was the water which Israel sought in the wilderness, or the bread and raiment which Jacob asked in Bethel, but the *Torah* and the dignity which it conferred? But in all these, and innumerable similar instances, the allegorical interpretation was only an application of Scripture for homiletical purposes, not a searching into a *rationale* beneath, such as that of the Hellenists. The latter the Rabbis would have utterly repudiated, on their express principle that ‘Scripture goes not beyond its plain meaning.’ ^{f94} They sternly insisted, that we ought not to search into the ulterior object and rationale of a law, but simply obey it. But it was this very *rationale* of the Law which the Alexandrians sought to find under its letter. It was in this sense that Aristobulus, a Hellenist Jew of Alexandria, {About 160 B.C.} sought to explain Scripture. Only a fragment of his work, which seems to have been a Commentary on the Pentateuch, dedicated to King Ptolemy (Philometor), has been preserved to us (by Clement of Alexandria, and by Eusebius {Praepar. Evang. 7:14. 1; 7:10. 1-17; 13:12.}). According to Clement of Alexandria, his aim was, ‘to bring

the Peripatetic philosophy out of the law of Moses, and out of the other prophets.' Thus, when we read that God stood, it meant the stable order of the world; that He created the world in six days, the orderly succession of time; the rest of the Sabbath, the preservation of what was created. And in such manner could the whole system of Aristotle be found in the Bible. But how was this to be accounted for? Of course, the Bible had not learned from Aristotle, but he and all the other philosophers had learned from the Bible. Thus, according to Aristobulus, Pythagoras, Plato, and all the other sages had really learned from Moses, and the broken rays found in their writings were united in all their glory in the Torah.

It was a tempting path on which to enter, and one on which there was no standing still. It only remained to give fixedness to the allegorical method by reducing it to certain principles, or canons of criticism, and to form the heterogeneous mass of Grecian philosophemes and Jewish theologumena into a compact, if not homogeneous system. This was the work of Philo of Alexandria, born about 20 *B.C.* It concerns us not here to inquire what were the intermediate links between Aristobulus and Philo. Another and more important point claims our attention. If ancient Greek philosophy knew the teaching of Moses, where was the historic evidence for it? If such did not exist, it must somehow be invented. Orpheus was a name which had always lent itself to literary fraud, {As Val. Kenaer puts it, *Daitr. de Aristob. Jud.* p. 73.} and so Aristobulus boldly produces (whether of his own or of others' making) a number of spurious citations from Hesiod, Homer, Linus, but especially from Orpheus, all Biblical and Jewish in their cast. Aristobulus was neither the first nor the last to commit such fraud. The Jewish Sibyl boldly, and, as we shall see, successfully personated the heathen oracles. And this opens, generally, quite a vista of Jewish-Grecian literature. In the second, and even in the third century before Christ, there were Hellenist historians, such as Eupolemus, Artapanus, Demetrius, and Aristeas; tragic and epic poets, such as Ezekiel, Pseudo-Philo, and Theodotus, who, after the manner of the ancient classical writers, but for their own purposes, described certain periods of Jewish history, or sang of such themes as the Exodus, Jerusalem, or the rape of Dinah.

The mention of these spurious quotations naturally leads us to another class of spurious literature, which, although not Hellenistic, has many elements in common with it, and, even when originating with Palestinian Jews is not Palestinian, nor yet has been preserved in its language. We allude to what are known as the Pseudepigraphic, or Pseudonymic

Writings, so called because, with one exception, they bear false names of authorship. It is difficult to arrange them otherwise than chronologically, — and even here the greatest difference of opinions prevails. Their general character (with one exception) may be described as anti-heathen, perhaps missionary, but chiefly as Apocalyptic. They are attempts at taking up the key-note struck in the prophecies of Daniel; rather, we should say, to lift the veil only partially raised by him, and to point, — alike as concerned Israel, and the kingdoms of the world, — to the past, the present, and the future, in the light of the Kingship of the Messiah. Here, if anywhere, we might expect to find traces of New Testament teaching; and yet, side by side with frequent similarity of form, the greatest difference, we had almost said contrast, in spirit, prevails.

Many of these works must have perished. In one of the latest of them {4 Esdras 14:44, 46.} they are put down at seventy, probably a round number, having reference to the supposed number of the nations of the earth, or to every possible mode of interpreting Scripture. They are described as intended for ‘the wise among the people,’ probably those whom St. Paul, in the Christian sense, designates as ‘knowing the time’ {~~cf.~~ Romans 13:11.} ^{f95} of the Advent of the Messiah. Viewed in this light, they embody the ardent aspirations and the inmost hopes ^{f96} of those who longed for the ‘consolation of Israel,’ as they understood it. Nor should we judge their personations of authorship according to our Western ideas. ^{f97} Pseudonymic writings were common in that age, and a Jew might perhaps plead that, even in the Old Testament, books had been headed by names which confessedly were not those of their authors (such as Samuel, Ruth, Esther). If those inspired poets who sang in the spirit, and echoed the strains, of Asaph, adopted that designation, and the sons of Korah preferred to be known by that title, might not they, who could no longer claim the authority of inspiration seek attention for their utterances by adopting the names of those in whose spirit they professed to write?

The most interesting as well as the oldest of these books are those known as the *Book of Enoch*, the *Sibylline Oracles*, the *Psalter of Solomon*, and the *Book of Jubilees*, or *Little Genesis*. Only the briefest notice of them can here find a place. ^{f98} The Book of Enoch, the oldest parts of which date a century and a half before Christ, comes to us from Palestine. It professes to be a vision vouchsafed to that Patriarch, and tells of the fall of the Angels and its consequences, and of what he saw and heard in his rapt journeys through heaven and earth. Of deepest, though often sad, interest,

is what it says of the Kingdom of Heaven, of the advent of Messiah and His Kingdom, and of the last things.

On the other hand, the *Sibylline Oracles*, of which the oldest portions date from about 160 B.C., come to us from Egypt. It is to the latter only that we here refer. Their most interesting parts are also the most characteristics. In them the ancient heathen myths of the first ages of man are welded together with Old Testament notices, while the heathen Theogony is recast in a Jewish mold. Thus Noah becomes Uranos, Shem Saturn, Ham Titan, and Japheth Japetus. Similarly, we have fragments of ancient heathen oracles, so to speak, recast in a Jewish edition. The strangest circumstance is, that the utterances of this Judaizing and Jewish Sibyl seem to have passed as the oracles of the ancient Erythraean, which had predicted the fall of Troy, and as those of the Sibyl of Cumae, which, in the infancy of Rome, Tarquinius Superbus had deposited in the Capitol.

The collection of eighteen hymns known as the *Psalter of Solomon* dates from more than half a century before our ear. No doubt the original was Hebrew, though they breathe a somewhat Hellenistic spirit. They express ardent Messianic aspirations, and a firm faith in the Resurrection, and in eternal rewards and punishments.

Different in character from the preceding works is *The Book of Jubilees*, — so called from its chronological arrangement into ‘Jubilee-periods’, — or ‘*Little Genesis*.’ It is chiefly a kind of legendary supplement to the Book of Genesis, intended to explain some of its historic difficulties, and to fill up its historic *lacunae*. It was probably written about the time of Christ, — and this gives it a special interest, — by a Palestinian, and in Hebrew, or rather Aramaean. But, like the rest of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic literature which comes from Palestine, or was originally written in Hebrew, we possess it no longer in that language, but only in translation.

If from this brief review of Hellenist and Pseudepigraphic literature we turn to take a retrospect, we can scarcely fail to perceive, on the one hand, the development of the old, and on the other the preparation for the new, in other words, the grand expectancy awakened, and the grand preparation made. One step only remained to complete what Hellenism had already begun. That completion came through one who, although himself untouched by the Gospel, perhaps more than any other prepared alike his co-religionists the Jews, and his countrymen the Greeks, for the new teaching, which, indeed, was presented by many of its early advocates in

the forms which they had learned from him. That man was Philo the Jew, of Alexandria.

CHAPTER 4

THE PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL: THE JEWISH WORLD IN THE DAYS OF CHRIST

It is strange how little we know of the personal history of the greatest of uninspired Jewish writers of old, though he occupied so prominent a position in his time. ^{f99} Philo was born in Alexandria, about the year 20 before Christ. He was a descendant of Aaron, and belonged to one of the wealthiest and most influential families among the Jewish merchant-princes of Egypt. His brother was the political head of that community in Alexandria, and he himself on one occasion represented his co-religionists, — though unsuccessfully, — at Rome, {39 or 40 A.D.} as the head of an embassy to entreat the Emperor Caligula for protection from the persecutions consequent on the Jewish resistance to placing statues of the Emperor in their Synagogues. But it is not with Philo, the wealthy aristocratic Jew of Alexandria, but with the great writer and thinker who, so to speak, completed Jewish Hellenism, that we have here to do. Let us see what was his relation alike to heathen philosophy and to the Jewish faith, of both of which he was the ardent advocate, and how in his system he combined the teaching of the two.

To begin with, Philo united in rare measure Greek learning with Jewish enthusiasm. In his writings he very frequently uses classical modes of expression; ^{f100} he names not fewer than sixty-four Greek writers; ^{f101} and he either alludes to, or quotes frequently from, such sources as Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Solon, the great Greek tragedians, Plato, and others. But to him these men were scarcely ‘heathen.’ He had sat at their feet, and learned to weave a system from Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics. The gatherings of these philosophers were ‘holy,’ and Plato was ‘the great.’ But holier than all was the gathering of the true Israel; and incomparably greater than any, Moses. From him had all sages learned, and with him alone was all truth to be found, — not, indeed, *in* the letter, but *under* the letter, of Holy Scripture. If in ^{<0239>}Numbers 23:19 we read ‘God is not a man,’ and in ^{<0133>}Deuteronomy 1:31 that the Lord was ‘as a man,’ did it not imply, on the one hand, the revelation of absolute truth by God, and, on the other, accommodation to those who were weak? Here, then, was the principle of a twofold interpretation of the Word of God, — the

literal and the allegorical. The letter of the text must be held fast; and Biblical personages and histories were real. But only narrow-minded slaves of the letter would stop here; the more so, as sometimes the literal meaning alone would be tame, even absurd; while the allegorical interpretation gave the true sense, even though it might occasionally run counter to the letter. Thus, the patriarchs represented states of the soul; and, whatever the letter might bear, Joseph represented one given to the fleshly, whom his brothers rightly hated; Simeon the soul aiming after the higher; the killing of the Egyptian by Moses, the subjugation of passion, and so on. But this allegorical interpretation, — by the side of the literal (the *Peshat* of the Palestinians), — though only for the few, was not arbitrary. It had its ‘laws,’ and ‘canons’, — some of which excluded the literal interpretation, while others admitted it by the side of the higher meaning.^{f102}

To begin with the former: the literal sense must be wholly set aside, when it implied anything unworthy of the Deity, anything unmeaning, impossible, or contrary to reason. Manifestly, this canon, if strictly applied, would do away not only with all anthropomorphisms, but cut the knot wherever difficulties seemed insuperable. Again, Philo would find an allegorical, along with the literal, interpretation indicated in the reduplication of a word, and in seemingly superfluous words, particles, or expressions.^{f103} These could, of course, only bear such a meaning on Philo’s assumption of the actual inspiration of the LXX. version. Similarly, in exact accordance with a Talmudical canon, {Baba K 64 *a.*} any repetition of what had been already stated would point to something new. These were comparatively sober rules of exegesis. Not so the license which he claimed of freely altering the punctuation^{f104} of sentences, and his notion that, if one from among several synonymous words was chosen in a passage, this pointed to some special meaning attaching to it. Even more extravagant was the idea, that a word which occurred in the LXX. might be interpreted according to every shade of meaning which it bore in the Greek, and that even another meaning might be given it by slightly altering the letters. However, like other of Philo’s allegorical canons, these were also adopted by the Rabbis, and Haggadic interpretations were frequently prefaced by: ‘Read not thus, — but thus.’ If such violence might be done to the text, we need not wonder at interpretations based on a play upon words, or even upon parts of a word. Of course, all seemingly strange or peculiar modes of expression, or of designation, occurring in Scripture, must have their special meaning, and so also every particle, adverb, or preposition. Again,

the position of a verse, its succession by another, the apparently unaccountable presence or absence of a word, might furnish hints for some deeper meaning, and so would an unexpected singular for a plural, or vice versa, the use of a tense, even the gender of a word. Most serious of all, an allegorical interpretation might be again employed as the basis of another. ^{f105}

We repeat, that these allegorical canons of Philo are essentially the same as those of Jewish traditionalism in the Haggadah, ^{f106} only the latter were not rationalizing, and far more brilliant in their application. ^{f107} In another respect also the Palestinian had the advantage of the Alexandrian exegesis. Reverently and cautiously it indicated what might be omitted in public reading, and why; what expressions of the original might be modified by the Meturgeman, and how; so as to avoid alike one danger by giving a passage in its literality, and another by adding to the sacred text, or conveying a wrong impression of the Divine Being, or else giving occasion to the unlearned and unwary of becoming entangled in dangerous speculations. Jewish tradition here lays down some principles which would be of great practical use. Thus we are told, {Ber. 31 *b*.} that Scripture uses the modes of expression common among men. This would, of course, include all anthropomorphisms. Again, sometimes with considerable ingenuity, a suggestion is taken from a word, such as that Moses knew the Serpent was to be made of brass from the similarity of the two words *nachash*, a serpent, and *nechosheth*, brass. {Ber. R. 31.} Similarly, it is noted that Scripture uses euphemistic language, so as to preserve the greatest delicacy. {Ber. R. 70.} These instances might be multiplied, but the above will suffice.

In his symbolical interpretations Philo only partially took the same road as the Rabbis. The symbolism of numbers and, so far as the Sanctuary was concerned, that of colors, and even materials, may, indeed, be said to have its foundation in the Old Testament itself. The same remark applies partially to that of names. The Rabbis certainly so interpreted them. ^{f108} But the application which Philo made of this symbolism was very different. Everything became symbolical in his hands, if it suited his purpose: numbers (in a very arbitrary manner), beasts, birds, fowls, creeping things, plants, stones, elements, substances, conditions, even sex, — and so a term or an expression might even have several and contradictory meanings, from which the interpreter was at liberty to choose.

From the consideration of the method by which Philo derived from Scriptures his theological views, we turn to a brief analysis of these views. ^{f109}

1. Theology — In reference to God, we find, side by side, the apparently contradictory views of the Platonic and the Stoic schools. Following the former, the sharpest distinction was drawn between God and the world. God existed neither in space, nor in time; He had neither human qualities nor affections; in fact, He was without any qualities ἄποιος, and even without any name ἄρρητος; hence, wholly uncognizable by man ἀκατάληπτος. Thus, changing the punctuation and the accents, the LXX. of ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲃ~~ Genesis 3:9 was made to read: ‘Adam, thou art somewhere;’ but God had no somewhere, as Adam seemed to think when he hid himself from Him. In the above sense, also, ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲃ~~ Exodus 3:14, and 6:3, were explained, and the two names *Elohim* and *Jehovah* belonged really to the two supreme Divine ‘Potencies,’ while the fact of God’s being uncognizable appeared from ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲃ~~ Exodus 20:21.

But side by side with this we have, to save the Jewish, or rather Old Testament, idea of creation and providence, the Stoic notion of God as immanent in the world, in fact, as that alone which is real in it, as always working: in short, to use his own Pantheistic expression, as ‘Himself one and the all’ εἷς καὶ τὸ πᾶν. Chief in His Being is His goodness, the forthgoing of which was the ground of creation. Only the good comes from Him. With matter He can have nothing to do, — hence the plural number in the account of creation. God only created the soul, and that only of the good. In the sense of being ‘immanent,’ God is everywhere, — nay, all things are really only in Him, or rather He is the real in all. But chiefly is God the wellspring and the light of the soul, — its ‘Savior’ from the ‘Egypt’ of passion. Two things follow. With Philo’s ideas of the separation between God and matter, it was impossible always to account for miracles or interpositions. Accordingly, these are sometimes allegorized, sometimes rationalistically explained. Further, the God of Philo, whatever he might say to the contrary, was not the God of that Israel which was His chosen people.

2. Intermediary Beings. Potencies δυνάμεις λόγοι. If, in what has preceded, we have once and again noticed a remarkable similarity between Philo and the Rabbis, there is a still more curious analogy between his teaching and that of Jewish Mysticism, as ultimately fully developed in the ‘Kabbalah.’ The very term Kabbalah (from *qibbel*, to hand down) seems to

point out not only its descent by oral tradition, but also its ascent to ancient sources.^{f110} Its existence is presupposed, and its leading ideas are sketched in the Mishnah. {Chag. 2:1.} The Targums also bear at least one remarkable trace of it. May it not be, that as Philo frequently refers to ancient tradition, so both Eastern and Western Judaism may here have drawn from one and the same source, — we will not venture to suggest, how high up, — while each made such use of it as suited their distinctive tendencies? At any rate the Kabbalah also, likening Scripture to a person, compares those who study merely the letter, to them who attend only to the dress; those who consider the moral of a fact, to them who attend to the body; while the initiated alone, who regard the hidden meaning, are those who attend to the soul. Again, as Philo, so the oldest part of the Mishnah {Ab. 5:4.} designates God as *Maqom*, — ‘the place’, — the τόπος all-comprehending, what the Kabbalists called the *En-Soph*, ‘the boundless,’ that God, without any quality, Who becomes cognizable only by His manifestations.^{f111}

The manifestations of God! But neither Eastern mystical Judaism, nor the philosophy of Philo, could admit of any direct contact between God and creation. The Kabbalah solved the difficulty by their *Sephiroth*,^{f112} or emanations from God, through which this contact was ultimately brought about, and of which the *En-Soph*, or crown, was the spring: ‘the source from which the infinite light issued.’ If Philo found greater difficulties, he had also more ready help from the philosophical systems to hand. His *Sephiroth* were ‘Potencies’ (δυνάμεις), ‘Words’ (λόγοι), intermediate powers. ‘Potencies,’ as we imagine, when viewed Godwards; ‘Words,’ as viewed creationwards. They were not emanations, but, according to Plato, ‘archetypal ideas,’ on the model of which all that exists was formed; and also, according to the Stoic idea, the cause of all, pervading all, forming all, and sustaining all. Thus these ‘Potencies’ were wholly in God, and yet wholly out of God. If we divest all this of its philosophical coloring, did not Eastern Judaism also teach that there was a distinction between the Unapproachable God, and God manifest?^{f113}

Another remark will show the parallelism between Philo and Rabbinism.^{f114} As the latter speaks of the two qualities (*Middoth*) of Mercy and Judgment in the Divine Being, {Jer. Ber. 9:7.} and distinguishes between *Elohim* as the God of Justice, and *Jehovah* as the God of Mercy and Grace, so Philo places next to the Divine Word Θεῖος λόγος, Goodness ἀγαθοτης, as the Creative Potency ποιητική δύναμις, and Power ἐξουσια, as the Ruling

Potency βασιλική δύναμις, proving this by a curious etymological derivation of the words for ‘God’ and ‘Lord’ Θεός and κύριος, — apparently unconscious that the LXX., in direct contradiction, translated Jehovah by Lord κύριος, and Elohim by God Θεός! These two potencies of goodness and power, Philo sees in the two Cherubim, and in the two ‘Angels’ which accompanied God (the Divine Word), when on his way to destroy the cities of the plain. But there were more than these two Potencies. In one place Philo enumerates six, according to the number of the cities of refuge. The Potencies issued from God as the beams from the light, as the waters from the spring, as the breath from a person; they were immanent in God, and yet also without him — motions on the part of God, and yet independent beings. They were the ideal world, which in its impulse outwards, meeting matter, produced this material world of ours. They were also the angels of God, His messengers to man, the *media* through whom He revealed Himself. ^{f115}

3. The Logos. Viewed in its bearing on New Testament teaching, this part of Philo’s system raises the most interesting questions. But it is just here that our difficulties are greatest. We can understand the Platonic conception of the Logos as the ‘archetypal idea,’ and that of the Stoics as the ‘world-reason’ pervading matter. Similarly, we can perceive, how the Apocrypha, — especially the Book of Wisdom, — following up the Old Testament typical truth concerning “Wisdom” (as specially set forth in the Book of Proverbs) almost arrived so far as to present ‘Wisdom’ as a special ‘Subsistence’ (hypostatizing it). More than this, in Talmudical writings, we find mention not only of the *Shem*, or ‘Name,’ ^{f116} but also of the ‘Shekhinah,’ God as manifest and present, which is sometimes also presented as the *Ruach ha Qodesh*, or Holy Spirit. {Or Ruach ham Maqom, Ab. 3:10, and frequently in the Talmud.} But in the Targumim we meet yet another expression, which, strange to say, *never occurs in the Talmud.* ^{f117} It is that of the *Memra*, Logos, or ‘Word.’ Not that the term is exclusively applied to the Divine Logos. ^{f118} But it stands out as perhaps the most remarkable fact in this literature, that God — not as in His permanent manifestation — or manifest Presence, but as revealing Himself, is designated *Memra*. Altogether that term, as applied to God, occurs in the Targum Onkelos 179 times, in the so-called Jerusalem Targum 99 times, and in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan 321 times. A critical analysis shows that in 82 instances in Onkelos, in 71 instances in the Jerusalem Targum, and in 213 instances in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, the

designation *Memra* is not only distinguished from God, but evidently refers to God as revealing Himself.^{f119} But what does this imply? The distinction between God and the *Memra of Jehovah* is marked in many passages.^{f120} Similarly, the *Memra of Jehovah* is distinguished from the *Shekhinah*.^{f121} Nor is the term used instead of the sacred word *Jehovah*;^{f122} nor for the well-known Old Testament expression ‘the Angel of the Lord,’^{f123} nor yet for the *Metatron* of the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and of the Talmud.^{f124} Does it then represent an older tradition underlying all these?^{f125} Beyond this Rabbinic theology has not preserved to us the doctrine of Personal distinctions in the Godhead. And yet, if words have any meaning, the *Memra* is a hypostasis, though the distinction of permanent, personal Subsistence is not marked. Nor yet, to complete this subject, is the *Memra* identified with the Messiah. In the Targum Onkelos distinct mention is twice made of Him, { <0490>Genesis 49:10, 11; <0247>Numbers 24:17. } while in the other Targumim no fewer than seventy-one Biblical passages are rendered with explicit reference to Him.

If we now turn to the views expressed by Philo about the Logos we find that they are hesitating, and even contradictory. One thing, however, is plain: the Logos of Philo is *not* the *Memra* of the Targumim. For, the expression *Memra* ultimately rests on theological, that of *Logos* on philosophical grounds. Again, the Logos of Philo approximates more closely to the *Metatron* of the Talmud and Kabbalah. As they speak of him as the ‘Prince of the Face,’ who bore the name of his Lord, so Philo represents the Logos as ‘the eldest Angel,’ ‘the many-named Archangel,’ in accordance with the Jewish view that the name JeHoVaH unfolded its meaning in seventy names for the Godhead.^{f126} As they speak of the ‘Adam Qadmon,’ so Philo of the Logos as the human reflection of the eternal God. And in both these respects, it is worthy of notice that he appeals to ancient teaching.^{f127}

What, then, is the Logos of Philo? Not a concrete personality, and yet, from another point of view, not strictly impersonal, nor merely a property of the Deity, but the shadow, as it were, which the light of God casts — and if Himself light, only the manifested reflection of God, His spiritual, even as the world is His material, habitation. Moreover, the Logos is ‘the image of God’ εἰκών upon which man was made, { <0027>Genesis 1:27. } or, to use the platonic term, ‘the archetypal idea.’ As regards the relation between the Logos and the two fundamental Potencies (from which all others issue), the latter are variously represented — on the one hand, as

proceeding from the Logos; and on the other, as themselves constituting the Logos. As regards the world, the Logos is its real being. He is also its archetype; moreover the instrument ὄργανον through Whom God created all things. If the Logos separates between God and the world, it is rather as intermediary; He separates, but He also unites. But chiefly does this hold true as regards the relation between God and man. The Logos announces and interprets to man the will and mind of God ἑρμηνεὺς καὶ προφήτης. He acts as mediator; He is the real High-Priest, and as such by His purity takes away the sins of man, and by His intercession procures for us the mercy of God, Hence Philo designates Him not only as the High-Priest, but as the ‘Paraclete.’ He is also the sun whose rays enlighten man, the medium of Divine revelation to the soul; the Manna, or support of spiritual life; He Who dwells in the soul. And so the Logos is, in the fullest sense, Melchizedek, the priest of the most high God, the king of righteousness βασιλεὺς δίκαιος, and the king of Salem βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης Who brings righteousness and peace to the soul. {De Leg. Alleg. 3:25,26.} But the Logos ‘does not come into any soul that is dead in sin.’ That there is close similarity of form between these Alexandrian views and much in the argumentation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, must be evident to all — no less than that there is the widest possible divergence in substance and spirit.

^{f128} The Logos of Philo is shadowy, unreal, not a Person; ^{f129} there is no need of an atonement; the High-Priest intercedes, but has no sacrifice to offer as the basis of His intercession, least of all that of Himself; the old Testament types are only typical ideas, not typical facts; they point to a Prototypal Idea in the eternal past, not to an Antitypal Person and Fact in history; there is no cleansing of the soul by blood, no sprinkling of the Mercy Seat, no access for all through the rent veil into the immediate Presence of God; nor yet a quickening of the soul from dead works to serve the living God. If the argumentation of the Epistle to the Hebrews is Alexandrian, it is an Alexandrianism which is overcome and past, which only furnishes the form, not the substance, the vessel, not its contents. The closer therefore the outward similarity, the greater is the contrast in substance.

The vast difference between Alexandrianism and the New Testament will appear still more clearly in the views of Philo on *Cosmology* and *Anthropology*. In regard to the former, his results in some respects run parallel to those of the students of mysticism in the Talmud, and of the Kabbalists. Together with the Stoic view, which represented God as ‘the

active cause' of this world, and matter as 'the passive,' Philo holds the Platonic idea, that matter was something existent, and that is resisted God.^{f130} Such speculations must have been current among the Jews long before, to judge by certain warning given by the Son of Sirach. {As for example Ecclus. 3:21-24.}^{f131} And Stoic views of the origin of the world seem implied even in the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon (1:7; 7:24; 8:1; 12:1).^{f132} The mystics in the Talmud arrived at similar conclusions, not through Greek, but through Persian teaching. Their speculations^{f133} boldly entered on the dangerous ground,^{f134} forbidden to the many, scarcely allowed to the few,^{f135} where such deep questions as the origin of our world and its connection with God were discussed. It was, perhaps, only a beautiful poetic figure that God had taken of the dust under the throne of His glory, and cast it upon the waters, which thus became earth. {Shem. R. 13.} But so far did isolated teachers become intoxicated^{f136} by the new wine of these strange speculations, that they whispered it to one another that water was the original element of the world,^{f137} which had successively been hardened into snow and then into earth. {Jer. Chag. 77a}^{f138} Other and later teachers fixed upon the air or the fire as the original element, arguing the pre-existence of matter from the use of the word 'made' in ~~Gen~~Genesis 1:7. instead of 'created.' Some modified this view, and suggested that God had originally created the three elements of water, air or spirit, and fire, from which all else was developed.^{f139} Traces also occur of the doctrine of the pre-existence of things, in a sense similar to that of Plato. {Ber. R. i.}

Like Plato and the Stoics, Philo regarded matter as devoid of all quality, and even form. Matter in itself was dead — more than that, it was *evil*. This matter, which was already existing, God formed (not made), like an architect who uses his materials according to a pre-existing plan — which in this case was the archetypal world.


This was creation, or rather formation, brought about not by God Himself, but by the Potencies, especially by the Logos, Who was the connecting bond of all. As for God, His only direct work was the soul, and that only of the good, not of the evil. Man's immaterial part had a twofold aspect: earthwards, as Sensuousness **αἰσθησις**; and heavenwards, as Reason **νοῦς**. The sensuous part of the soul was connected with the body. It had no heavenly past, and would have no future. But 'Reason' **νοῦς** was that breath of true life which God had breathed into man **πνεῦμα** whereby the earthy became the higher, living spirit, with its various faculties. Before time began the soul was without body, an archetype, the 'heavenly man,'

pure spirit in Paradise (virtue), yet even so longing after its ultimate archetype, God. Some of these pure spirits descended into bodies and so lost their purity. Or else, the union was brought about by God and by powers lower than God (daemons δημιουργοί). To the latter is due our earthly part. God breathed on the formation, and the ‘earthly Reason’ became ‘intelligent’ ‘spiritual’ soul ψυχὴ νοερά. Our earthly part alone is the seat of sin. ^{f140}

This leads us to the great question of Original Sin. Here the views of Philo are those of the Eastern Rabbis. But both are entirely different from those on which the argument in the Epistle to the Romans turns. It was neither at the feet of Gamaliel, nor yet from Jewish Hellenism, that Saul of Tarsus learned the doctrine of original sin. The statement that as in Adam all spiritually died, so in Messiah all should be made alive, ^{f141} finds absolutely no parallel in Jewish writings. ^{f142} What may be called the starting point of Christian theology, the doctrine of hereditary guilt and sin, through the fall of Adam, and of the consequent entire and helpless corruption of our nature, is entirely unknown to Rabbinical Judaism. The reign of physical death was indeed traced to the sin of our first parents. ^{f143} But the Talmud expressly teaches, {Ber. 61 a} that God originally created man with two propensities, ^{f144} one to good and one to evil (*Yetser tobh*, and *Yetser hara* ^{f145}). The evil impulse began immediately after birth. {Sanh. 91 b} ^{f146} But it was within the power of man to vanquish sin, and to attain perfect righteousness; in fact, this stage had actually been attained. ^{f147}

Similarly, Philo regarded the soul of the child as ‘naked’ (Adam and Eve), a sort of *tabula rasa*, as wax which God would fain form and mold. But this state ceased when ‘affection’ presented itself to reason, and thus sensuous lust arose, which was the spring of all sin. The grand task, then, was to get rid of the sensuous, and to rise to the spiritual. In this, the ethical part of his system, Philo was most under the influence of Stoic philosophy. We might almost say, it is no longer the Hebrew who hellenizes, but the Hellene who Hebraises. And yet it is here also that the most ingenious and wide-reaching allegorisms of Scripture are introduced. It is scarcely possible to convey an idea of how brilliant this method becomes in the hands of Philo, how universal its application, or how captivating it must have proved. Philo describes man’s state as, first one of sensuousness, but also of unrest, misery and unsatisfied longing. If persisted in, it would end in complete spiritual insensibility. ^{f148} But from this state the soul must pass to one of devotion to reason. ^{f149} This change

might be accomplished in one of three ways: first, by study — of which physical was the lowest; next, that which embraced the ordinary circle of knowledge; and lastly, the highest, that of Divine philosophy. The second method was *Askesis*: discipline, or practice, when the soul turned from the lower to the higher. But the best of all was the third way: the free unfolding of that spiritual life which cometh neither from study nor discipline, but from a natural good disposition. And in that state the soul had true rest ^{f150} and joy. ^{f151}

Here we must for the present pause. ^{f152} Brief as this sketch of Hellenism has been, it must have brought the question vividly before the mind, whether and how far certain parts of the New Testament, especially the fourth Gospel, ^{f153} are connected with the direction of thought described in the preceding pages. Without yielding to that school of critics, whose perverse ingenuity discerns everywhere a sinister motive or tendency in the Evangelic writers, ^{f154} it is evident that each of them had a special object in view in constructing his narrative of the One Life; and primarily addressed himself to a special audience. If, without entering into elaborate discussion, we might, according to St.  Luke 1:2, regard the narrative of St. Mark as the grand representative of that authentic ‘narration’, διήγησις though not by Apostles, ^{f155} which was in circulation, and the Gospel by St. Matthew as representing the ‘tradition’ handed down, παράδοσις by the Apostolic eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word, ^{f156} we should reach the following results. Our oldest Gospel-narrative is that by St. Mark, which, addressing itself to no class in particular, sketches in rapid outlines the picture of Jesus as the Messiah, alike for all men. Next in order of time comes our present Gospel by St. Matthew. It goes a step further back than that by St. Mark, and gives not only the genealogy, but the history of the miraculous birth of Jesus. Even if we had not the *consensus* of tradition, every one must feel that this Gospel is Hebrew in its cast, in its citations from the Old Testament, and in its whole bearing. Taking its key-note from the Book of Daniel, that grand Messianic text-book of Eastern Judaism at the time, and as re-echoed in the Book of Enoch, which expresses the popular apprehension of Daniel’s Messianic idea, it presents the Messiah chiefly as ‘the Son of Man,’ ‘the Son of David,’ ‘the Son of God.’ We have here the fulfilment of Old Testament law and prophecy; the realization of Old Testament life, faith, and hope. Third in point of time is the Gospel by St. Luke, which, passing back another step, gives us not only the history of the birth of Jesus, but also that of John, ‘the preparer of the way.’ It is

Pauline, and addresses itself, or rather, we should say, presents the Person of the Messiah, it may be ‘to the Jew first,’ but certainly ‘also to the Greek.’ The term which St. Luke, alone of all Gospel writers, ^{f157} applies to Jesus, is that of the or ‘servant’ of God, in the sense in which Isaiah has spoken of the Messiah as the ‘Ebhed Jehovah,’ ‘servant of the Lord.’ St. Luke’s is, so to speak, the Isaiah-Gospel, presenting the Christ in His bearing on the history of God’s Kingdom and of the world — as God’s Elect Servant in Whom He delighted. In the Old Testament, to adopt a beautiful figure, ^{f158} the idea of the Servant of the Lord is set before us like a pyramid: at its base it is all Israel, at its central section Israel after the Spirit (the circumcised in heart), represented by David, the man after God’s own heart; while at its apex it is the ‘Elect’ Servant, the Messiah. ^{f159} And these three ideas, with their sequences, are presented in the third Gospel as centering in Jesus the Messiah. By the side of this pyramid is the other: the Son of Man, the Son of David, the Son of God. The Servant of the Lord of Isaiah and of Luke is the Enlightener, the Consoler, the victorious Deliverer; the Messiah or Anointed: the Prophet, the Priest, the King.

Yet another tendency — shall we say, want? — remained, so to speak, unmet and unsatisfied. That large world of latest and most promising Jewish thought, whose task it seemed to bridge over the chasm between heathenism and Judaism — the Western Jewish world, must have the Christ presented to them. For in every direction is He the Christ. And not only they, but that larger Greek world, so far as Jewish Hellenism could bring it to the threshold of the Church. This Hellenistic and Hellenic world now stood in waiting to enter it, though as it were by its northern porch, and to be baptized at its font. All this must have forced itself on the mind of St. John, residing in the midst of them at Ephesus, even as St. Paul’s Epistles contain almost as many allusions to Hellenism as to Rabbinism. ^{f160} And so the fourth Gospel became, not the supplement, but the complement, of the other three. ^{f161} There is no other Gospel more Palestinian than this in its modes of expression, allusions, and references. Yet we must all feel how thoroughly Hellenistic it also is in its cast, ^{f162} in what it reports and what it omits — in short, in its whole aim; how adapted to Hellenist wants its presentation of deep central truths; how suitably, in the report of His Discourses — even so far as their form is concerned, the promise was here fulfilled, of bringing all things to remembrance whatsoever He had said. {St. ~~John~~ John 14:26} It is the true Light which shineth, of which the full meridian-blaze lies on the Hellenist and Hellenic

world. There is Alexandrian form of thought not only in the whole conception, but in the Logos, ^{f163} and in His presentation as the Light, the Life, the Wellspring of the world. ^{f164} But these forms are filled in the fourth Gospel with quite other substance. God is not afar off, uncognizable by man, without properties, without name. He is the Father. Instead of a nebulous reflection of the Deity we have the Person of the Logos; not a Logos with the two potencies of goodness and power, but full of grace and truth. The Gospel of St. John also begins with a 'Bereshith', but it is the theological, not the cosmic Bereshith — when the Logos was with God and was God. Matter is not pre-existent; far less is it evil. St. John strikes the pen through Alexandrianism when he lays it down as the fundamental fact of New Testament history that 'the Logos was made flesh,' just as St. Paul does when he proclaims the great mystery of 'God manifest in the flesh.' Best of all, it is not by a long course of study, nor by wearing discipline, least of all by an inborn good disposition, that the soul attains the new life, but by a birth from above, by the Holy Ghost, and by simple faith which is brought within reach of the fallen and the lost. ^{f165}

Philo had no successor. In him Hellenism had completed its cycle. Its message and its mission were ended. Henceforth it needed, like Apollos, its great representative in the Christian Church, two things: the baptism of John to the knowledge of sin and need, and to have the way of God more perfectly expounded. { ~~Acts~~ Acts 18:24-28 } On the other hand, Eastern Judaism had entered with Hillel on a new stage. This direction led farther and farther away from that which the New Testament had taken in following up and unfolding the spiritual elements of the Old. That development was incapable of transformation or renovation. It must go on to its final completion, and be either true, or else be swept away and destroyed.

CHAPTER 5

ALEXANDRIA AND ROME — THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN THE CAPITALS OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION.

We have spoken of Alexandria as the capital of the Jewish world in the West. Antioch was, indeed, nearer to Palestine, and its Jewish population — including the floating part of it — as numerous as that of Alexandria.

But the wealth, the thought, and the influence of Western Judaism centered in the modern capital of the land of the Pharaohs. In those days Greece was the land of the past, to which the student might resort as the home of beauty and of art, the time-hallowed temple of thought and of poetry. But it was also the land of desolateness and of ruins, where fields of corn waved over the remains of classic antiquity. The ancient Greeks had in great measure sunk to a nation of traders, in keen competition with the Jews. Indeed, Roman sway had levelled the ancient world, and buried its national characteristics. It was otherwise in the far East; it was otherwise also in Egypt. Egypt was not a land to be largely inhabited, or to be 'civilized' in the then sense of the term: soil, climate, history, nature forbade it. Still, as now, and even more than now, was it the dream-land of untold attractions to the traveller. The ancient, mysterious Nile still rolled its healing waters out into the blue sea, where (so it was supposed) they changed its taste within a radius farther than the eye could reach. To be gently borne in bark or ship on its waters, to watch the strange vegetation and fauna of its banks; to gaze beyond, where they merged into the trackless desert; to wander under the shade of its gigantic monuments, or within the wide avenues of its colossal temples, to see the scroll of mysterious hieroglyphics; to note the sameness of manner and of people as of old, and to watch the unique rites of its ancient religion — this was indeed to be again in the old far-away world, and that amidst a dreaminess bewitching the senses, and a gorgeously dazzling the imagination. ^{f166}

We are still far out at sea, making for the port of Alexandria — the only safe shelter all along the coast of Asia and Africa. Quite thirty miles out the silver sheen of the lighthouse on the island of Pharos ^{f167} — connected by a mole with Alexandria — is burning like a star on the edge of the horizon. Now we catch sight of the palmgroves of Pharos; presently the anchor rattles and grates on the sand, and we are ashore. What crowd of vessels of all sizes, shapes and nationalities; what a multitude of busy people; what a very Babel of languages; what a commingling of old and new world civilization; and what a variety of wares piled up, loading or unloading!

Alexandria itself was not an old Egyptian, but a comparatively modern, city; in Egypt and yet not of Egypt. Everything was in character — the city, its inhabitants, public life, art, literature, study, amusements, the very aspect of the place. Nothing original anywhere, but combination of all that had been in the ancient world, or that was at the time — most fitting place therefore to be the capital of Jewish Hellenism.

As its name indicates, the city was founded by Alexander the Great. It was built in the form of an open fan, or rather, of the outspread cloak of a Macedonian horseman. Altogether, it measured (16,360 paces) 3,160 paces more than Rome; but its houses were neither so crowded nor so many-storied. It had been a large city when Rome was still inconsiderable, and to the last held the second place in the Empire. One of the five quarters into which the city was divided, and which were named according to the first letters of the alphabet, was wholly covered by the royal palaces, with their gardens, and similar buildings, including the royal mausoleum, where the body of Alexander the Great, preserved in honey, was kept in a glass coffin. But these, and its three miles of colonnades along the principal highway, were only some of the magnificent architectural adornments of a city full of palaces. The population amounted, probably, to nearly a million, drawn from the East and West by trade, the attractions of wealth, the facilities for study, or the amusements of a singularly frivolous city. A strange mixture of elements among the people, combining the quickness and versatility of the Greek with the gravity, the conservatism, the dream-grandeur, and the luxury of the Eastern.

Three worlds met in Alexandria: Europe, Asia, and Africa; and brought to it, or fetched from it, their treasures. Above all, it was a commercial city, furnished with an excellent harbor, or rather with five harbors. A special fleet carried, as tribute, from Alexandria to Italy, two-tenths of the corn produce of Egypt, which sufficed to feed the capital for four months of the year. A magnificent fleet it was, from the light quick sailer to those immense corn-ships which hoisted a special flag, and whose early arrival was awaited at Puteoli ^{f168} with more eagerness than that of any modern ocean-steamer. ^{f169} The commerce of India was in the hands of the Alexandrian shippers. ^{f170} Since the days of the Ptolemies the Indian trade alone had increased sixfold. ^{f171} Nor was the native industry inconsiderable. Linen goods, to suit the tastes or costumes of all countries; woollen stuffs of every hue, some curiously wrought with figures, and even scenes; glass of every shade and in every shape; paper from the thinnest sheet to the coarsest packing paper; essences, perfumeries, such were the native products. However idly or luxuriously inclined, still every one seemed busy, in a city where (as the Emperor Hadrian expressed it) ‘money was the people’s god;’ and every one seemed well-to-do in his own way, from the waif in the streets, who with little trouble to himself could pick up sufficient to go to the restaurant and enjoy a comfortable dinner of fresh or

smoked fish with garlic, and his pudding, washed down with the favorite Egyptian barley beer, up to the millionaire banker, who owned a palace in the city and a villa by the canal that connected Alexandria with Canobus. What a jostling crowd of all nations in the streets, in the market (where, according to the joke of a contemporary, anything might be got except snow), or by the harbors; what cool shades, delicious retreats, vast halls, magnificent libraries, where the savants of Alexandria assembled and taught every conceivable branch of learning, and its far-famed physicians prescribed for the poor consumptive patients sent thither from all parts of Italy! What bustle and noise among that ever excitable, chatty conceited, vain, pleasure-loving multitude, whose highest enjoyment was the theater and singers; what scenes on that long canal to Canobus, lined with luxurious inns, where barks full of pleasure-seekers reveled in the cool shade of the banks, or sped to Canobus, that scene of all dissipation and luxury, proverbial even in those days! And yet, close by, on the shores of Lake Mareotis, as if in grim contrast, were the chosen retreats of that sternly ascetic Jewish party, the Therapeutae, {On the existence of the Therapeutes comp. Art. *Philo* in Smith & Wace's Dict. of Chr. Biogr. vol. 4} whose views and practices in so many points were kindred to those of the Essenes in Palestine!

This sketch of Alexandria will help us to understand the surroundings of the large mass of Jews settled in the Egyptian capital. Altogether more than an eighth of the population of the country (one million in 7,800,000) was Jewish. Whether or not a Jewish colony had gone into Egypt at the time of Nebuchadnezzar, or even earlier, the great mass of its residents had been attracted by Alexander the Great, {*Mommsen* (Romans Gesch. 5 p. 489) ascribes this rather to Ptolemy I.} who had granted the Jews equally exceptional privileges with the Macedonians. The later troubles of Palestine under the Syrian kings greatly swelled their number, the more so that the Ptolemies, with one exception, favored them. Originally a special quarter had been assigned to the Jews in the city, the 'Delta' by the eastern harbor and the Canobus canal, probably alike to keep the community separate, and from its convenience for commercial purposes. The privileges which the Ptolemies had accorded to the Jews were confirmed, and even enlarged, by Julius Caesar. The export trade in grain was now in their hands, and the harbor and river police committed to their charge. Two quarters in the city are named as specially Jewish, not, however, in the sense of their being confined to them. Their Synagogues, surrounded by

shady trees, stood in all parts of the city. But the chief glory of the Jewish community in Egypt, of which even the Palestinians boasted, was the great central Synagogue, built in the shape of a basilica, with double colonnade, and so large that it needed a signal for those most distant to know the proper moment for the responses. The different trade guilds sat there together, so that a stranger would at once know where to find Jewish employers or fellow-workmen. {Sukk. 51 *b.*} In the choir of this Jewish cathedral stood seventy chairs of state, encrusted with precious stones, for the seventy elders who constituted the eldership of Alexandria, on the model of the great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem.

It is a strange, almost inexplicable fact, that the Egyptian Jews had actually built a schismatic Temple. During the terrible Syrian persecutions in Palestine Onias, the son of the murdered High-Priest Onias III., had sought safety in Egypt. Ptolemy Philometor not only received him kindly, but gave a disused heathen temple in the town of Leontopolis for a Jewish sanctuary. Here a new Aaronic priesthood ministered, their support being derived from the revenues of the district around. The new Temple, however, resembled not that of Jerusalem either in outward appearance nor in all its internal fittings.^{f172} At first the Egyptian Jews were very proud of their new sanctuary, and professed to see in it the fulfilment of the prediction, {~~2398~~ Isaiah 19:18.} that five cities in the land of Egypt should speak the language of Canaan, of which one was to be called Ir-ha-Heres, which the LXX. (in their original form, or by some later emendation) altered into 'the city of righteousness.' This temple continued from about 160 B.C. to shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem. It could scarcely be called a rival to that on Mount Moriah, since the Egyptian Jews also owned that of Jerusalem as their central sanctuary, to which they made pilgrimages and brought their contributions, {*Philo*, 2, 646, ed. Mangey.} while the priests at Leontopolis, before marrying, always consulted the official archives in Jerusalem to ascertain the purity of descent of their intended wives. {*Jos. Ag. Ap.* 1:7.} The Palestinians designated it contemptuously as 'the house of Chonyi' (Onias), and declared the priesthood of Leontopolis incapable of serving in Jerusalem, although on a par with those who were disqualified only by some bodily defect. Offerings brought in Leontopolis were considered null, unless in the case of vows to which the name of this Temple had been expressly attached. {*Men.* 13:10, and the Gemara, 109 *a* and *b.*} This qualified condemnation seems, however, strangely mild, except on the supposition that the statements we

have quoted only date from a time when both Temples had long passed away.

Nor were such feelings unreasonable. The Egyptian Jews had spread on all sides — southward to Abyssinia and Ethiopia, and westward to, and beyond, the province of Cyrene. In the city of that name they formed one of the four classes into which its inhabitants were divided. {Strabo in *Jos. Ant.* 14:7, 2.} A Jewish inscription at Berenice, apparently dating from the year 13 B.C., shows that the Cyrenian Jews formed a distinct community under nine ‘rulers’ of their own, who no doubt attended to the communal affairs — not always an easy matter, since the Cyrenian Jews were noted, if not for turbulence, yet for strong anti-Roman feeling, which more than once was cruelly quenched in blood. ^{f173} Other inscriptions prove, ^{f174} that in other places of their dispersion also the Jews had their own *Archontes* or ‘rulers,’ while the special direction of public worship was always entrusted to the *Archisynagogos*, or ‘chief ruler of the Synagogue,’ both titles occurring side by side. ^{f175} It is, to say the least, very doubtful, whether the High-Priest at Leontopolis was ever regarded as, in any real sense, the head of the Jewish community in Egypt. ^{f176} In Alexandria, the Jews were under the rule of a Jewish *Ethnarch*, ^{f177} whose authority was similar to that of ‘the Archon’ of independent cities. {Strabo in *Jos. Ant.* 14:7. 2} But his authority ^{f178} was transferred, by Augustus, to the whole ‘eldership.’ {Philo, in Flacc. ed. Mangey, 2:527} Another, probably Roman, office, though for obvious reasons often filled by Jews, was that of the *Alabarch*, or rather *Arabarch*, who was set over the Arab population. ^{f179} Among others, Alexander, the brother of Philo, held this post. If we may judge of the position of the wealthy Jewish families in Alexandria by that of this Alabarch, their influence must have been very great. The firm of Alexander was probably as rich as the great Jewish banking and shipping house of Saramalla in Antioch. {*Jos. Ant.* 14. 13. 5; *War.* 1:13, 5} Its chief was entrusted with the management of the affairs of Antonia, the much respected sister-in-law of the Emperor Tiberius. {*Ant.* 19:5. 1} It was a small thing for such a man to lend King Agrippa, when his fortunes were very low, a sum of about 7,000*l.* with which to resort to Italy, {*Ant.* 18:6.3} since he advanced it on the guarantee of Agrippa’s wife, whom he highly esteemed, and at the same time made provision that the money should not be all spent before the Prince met the Emperor. Besides, he had his own plans in the matter. Two of his sons married daughters of King Agrippa; while a third, at the price of apostasy, rose successively to the

posts of Procurator of Palestine, and finally of Governor of Egypt. {Ant. 19:5. 1; 20:5. 3} The Temple at Jerusalem bore evidence of the wealth and munificence of this Jewish millionaire. The gold and silver with which the nine massive gates were covered, which led into the Temple, were the gift of the great Alexandrian banker.

The possession of such wealth, coupled no doubt with pride and self-assertion, and openly spoken contempt of the superstitions around, ^{f180} would naturally excite the hatred of the Alexandria populace against the Jews. The greater number of those silly stories about the origin, early history, and religion of the Jews, which even the philosophers and historians of Rome record as genuine, originated in Egypt. A whole series of writers, beginning with Manetho, {Probably about 200 B.C} made it their business to give a kind of historical travesty of the events recorded in the books of Moses. The boldest of these scribblers was Apion, to whom Josephus replied — a world-famed charlatan and liar, who wrote or lectured, with equal presumption and falseness, on every conceivable object. He was just the man to suit the Alexandrians, on whom his unblushing assurance imposed. In Rome he soon found his level, and the Emperor Tiberius well characterized the irrepressible boastful talker as the ‘tinkling cymbal of the world.’ He had studied, seen, and heard everything, even, on three occasions, the mysterious sound on the Colossus of Memnon, as the sun rose upon it! At least, so he graved upon the Colossus itself, for the information of all generations. ^{f181} Such was the man on whom the Alexandrians conferred the freedom of their city, to whom they entrusted their most important affairs, and whom they extolled as the victorious, the laborious, the new Homer. ^{f182} There can be little doubt, that the popular favor was partly due to Apion’s virulent attacks upon the Jews. His grotesque accounts of their history and religion held them up to contempt. But his real object was to rouse the fanaticism of the populace against the Jews to get hold of some unfortunate Hellene, whom ill-chance might bring into their hands, to fatten him for the year, and then to sacrifice him, partaking of his entrails, and burying the body, while during these horrible rites they took a fearful oath of perpetual enmity to the Greeks. These were the people who battered on the wealth of Alexandria, who had usurped quarters of the city to which they had no right, and claimed exceptional privileges; a people who had proved traitors to, and the ruin of every one who had trusted them. ‘If the Jews,’ he exclaimed, ‘are citizens of Alexandria, why do they not worship the same gods as the

Alexandrians?’ And, if they wished to enjoy the protection of the Caesars, why did they not erect statues and pay divine honor to them? ^{F183} There is nothing strange in these appeals to the fanaticism of mankind. In one form or another, they have only too often been repeated in all lands and ages, and, alas! by the representatives of all creeds. Well might the Jews, as Philo mourns, {Leg. ad Caj. ed. Frcf.} wish no better for themselves than to be treated like other men!

We have already seen, that the ideas entertained in Rome about the Jews were chiefly derived from Alexandrian sources. But it is not easy to understand, how a Tacitus, Cicero, or Pliny could have credited such absurdities as that the Jews had come from Crete (Mount Ida — Idaei — Judaei), been expelled on account of leprosy from Egypt, and emigrated under an apostate priest, Moses; or that the Sabbath-rest originated in sores, which had obliged the wanderers to stop short on the seventh day; or that the Jews worshipped the head of an ass, or else Bacchus; that their abstinence from swine’s flesh was due to remembrance and fear of leprosy, or else to the worship of that animal — and other puerilities of the like kind. {Comp. *Tacitus*, Hist. 5:2-4; *Plut.* Sympos. 4:5} The educated Roman regarded the Jew with a mixture of contempt and anger, all the more keen that, according to his notions, the Jew had, since his subjection to Rome, no longer a right to his religion; and all the more bitter that, do what he might, that despised race confronted him everywhere, with a religion so uncompromising as to form a wall of separation, and with rites so exclusive as to make them not only strangers, but enemies. Such a phenomenon was nowhere else to be encountered. The Romans were intensely practical. In their view, political life and religion were not only intertwined, but the one formed part of the other. A religion apart from a political organization, or which offered not, as a *quid pro quo*, some direct return from the Deity to his votaries, seemed utterly inconceivable. Every country has its own religion, argued Cicero, in his appeal for Flaccus. So long as Jerusalem was unvanquished, Judaism might claim toleration; but had not the immortal gods shown what they thought of it, when the Jewish race was conquered? This was a kind of logic that appealed to the humblest in the crowd, which thronged to hear the great orator defending his client, among others, against the charge of preventing the transport from Asia to Jerusalem of the annual Temple-tribute. This was not a popular accusation to bring against a man in such an assembly. And as the Jews — who, to create a disturbance, had (we are told) distributed

themselves among the audience in such numbers, that Cicero somewhat rhetorically declared, he would fain have spoken with bated breath, so as to be only audible to the judges — listened to the great orator, they must have felt a keen pang shoot to their hearts while he held them up to the scorn of the heathen, and touched, with rough finger, their open sore, as he urged the ruin of their nation as the one unanswerable argument, which Materialism could bring against the religion of the Unseen.

And that religion, was it not, in the words of Cicero, a ‘barbarous superstition,’ and were not its adherents, as Pliny had it, {Hist. Nat. 13:4} ‘a race distinguished for its contempt of the gods’? To begin with their theology. The Roman philosopher would sympathise with disbelief of all spiritual realities, as, on the other hand, he could understand the popular modes of worship and superstition. But what was to be said for a worship of something quite unseen, an adoration, as it seemed to him, of the clouds and of the sky, without any visible symbol, conjoined with an utter rejection of every other form of religion — Asiatic, Egyptian, Greek, Roman — and the refusal even to pay the customary Divine honor to the Caesars, as the incarnation of Roman power? Next, as to their rites. Foremost among them was the initiatory rite of circumcision, a constant subject for coarse jests. What could be the meaning of it; or of what seemed like some ancestral veneration for the pig, or dread of it, since they made it a religious duty not to partake of its flesh? Their Sabbath-observance, however it had originated, was merely an indulgence in idleness. The fast young Roman literati would find their amusement in wandering on the Sabbath-eve through the tangled, narrow streets of the Ghetto, watching how the dim lamp within shed its unsavory light, while the inmates mumbled prayers ‘with blanched lips;’ {Persius 5:184} or they would, like Ovid, seek in the Synagogue occasion for their dissolute amusements. The Thursday fast was another target for their wit. In short, at the best, the Jew was a constant theme of popular merriment, and the theater would resound with laughter as his religion was lampooned, no matter how absurd the stories, or how poor the punning.^{f184}

And then, as the proud Roman passed on the Sabbath through the streets, Judaism would obtrude itself upon his notice, by the shops that were shut, and by the strange figures that idly moved about in holiday attire. They were strangers in a strange land, not only without sympathy with what passed around, but with marked contempt and abhorrence of it, while there was that about their whole bearing, which expressed the unspoken feeling,

that the time of Rome's fall, and of their own supremacy, was at hand. To put the general feeling in the words of Tacitus, the Jews kept close together, and were ever most liberal to one another; but they were filled with bitter hatred of all others. They would neither eat nor sleep with strangers; and the first thing which they taught their proselytes was to despise the gods, to renounce their own country, and to rend the bonds which had bound them to parents, children or kindred. To be sure, there was some ground of distorted truth in these charges. For, the Jew, as such, was only intended for Palestine. By a necessity, not of his own making, he was now, so to speak, the negative element in the heathen world; yet one which, do what he might, would always obtrude itself upon public notice. But the Roman satirists went further. They accused the Jews of such hatred of all other religionists, that they would not even show the way to any who worshipped otherwise, nor point out the cooling spring to the thirsty. {*Juv. Sat. 14:103, 104*} According to Tacitus, there was a political and religious reason for this. In order to keep the Jews separate from all other nations, Moses had given them rites, contrary to those of any other race, that they might regard as unholy what was sacred to others, and as lawful what they held in abomination. {*Hist. 5:13*} Such a people deserved neither consideration nor pity; and when the historian tells how thousands of their number had been banished by Tiberius to Sardinia, he dismisses the probability of their perishing in that severe climate with the cynical remark, that it entailed a 'poor loss' {*Ann. 2:85, Comp. Suet. Tib. 36*} (*vile damnum*).

Still, the Jew was there in the midst of them. It is impossible to fix the date when the first Jewish wanderers found their way to the capital of the world. We know, that in the wars under Pompey, Cassius, and Antonius, many were brought captive to Rome, and sold as slaves. In general, the Republican party was hostile, the Caesars were friendly, to the Jews. The Jewish slaves in Rome proved an unprofitable and troublesome acquisition. They clung so tenaciously to their ancestral customs, that it was impossible to make them conform to the ways of heathen households. {*Philo, Leg. ad Caj. ed. Frcf. p. 101*} How far they would carry their passive resistance, appears from a story told by Josephus, {*Life 3*} about some Jewish priests of his acquaintance, who, during their captivity in Rome, refused to eat anything but figs and nuts, so as to avoid the defilement of Gentile food.^{f185} Their Roman masters deemed it prudent to give their Jewish slaves their freedom, either at a small ransom, or even without it. These freedmen

(*liberti*) formed the nucleus of the Jewish community in Rome, and in great measure determined its social character. Of course they were, as always, industrious, sober, pushing. In course of time many of them acquired wealth. By-and-by Jewish immigrants of greater distinction swelled their number. Still their social position was inferior to that of their co-religionists in other lands. A Jewish population so large as 40,000 in the time of Augustus, and 60,000 in that of Tiberius, would naturally include all ranks, merchants, bankers, *literati*, even actors. ^{f186} In a city which offered such temptations, they would number among them those of every degree of religious profession; nay, some who would not only imitate the habits of those around, but try to outdo their gross licentiousness. ^{f187} Yet, even so, they would vainly endeavor to efface the hateful mark of being Jews.

Augustus had assigned to the Jews as their special quarter the 'fourteenth region' across the Tiber, which stretched from the slope of the Vatican onwards and across the Tiber-island, where the boats from Ostia were wont to unload. This seems to have been their poor quarter, chiefly inhabited by hawkers, sellers of matches, {Mart. 1:41; 12:57} glass, old clothes and second-hand wares. The Jewish burying-ground in that quarter ^{f188} gives evidence of their condition. The whole appointments and the graves are mean. There is neither marble nor any trace of painting, unless it be a rough representation of the seven-branched candlestick in red coloring. Another Jewish quarter was by the Porta Capena, where the Appian Way entered the city. Close by, the ancient sanctuary of Egeria was utilized at the time of Juvenal ^{f189} as a Jewish hawking place. But there must have been richer Jews also in that neighborhood, since the burying-place there discovered has paintings, some even of mythological figures, of which the meaning has not yet been ascertained. A third Jewish burying-ground was near the ancient Christian catacombs.

But indeed, the Jewish residents in Rome must have spread over every quarter of the city — even the best — to judge by the location of their Synagogues. From inscriptions, we have been made acquainted not only with the existence, but with the names, of not fewer than seven of these Synagogues. Three of them respectively bear the names of Augustus, Agrippa, and Volumnius, either as their patrons, or because the worshippers were chiefly their attendants and clients; while two of them derived their names from the *Campus Martius*, and the quarter *Subura* in which they stood. ^{f190} The '*Synagoge Elaias*' may have been so called from bearing on its front the device of an olive-tree, a favorite, and in Rome

specially significant, emblem of Israel, whose fruit, crushed beneath heavy weight, would yield the precious oil by which the Divine light would shed its brightness through the night of heathendom. ^{f191} Of course, there must have been other Synagogues besides those whose names have been discovered.

One other mode of tracking the footsteps of Israel's wanderings seems strangely significant. It is by tracing their records among the dead, reading them on broken tombstones, and in ruined monuments. They are rude, and the inscriptions — most of them in bad Greek, or still worse Latin, none in Hebrew — are like the stammering of strangers. Yet what a contrast between the simple faith and earnest hope which they express, and the grim proclamation of utter disbelief in any future to the soul, not unmixed with language of coarsest materialism, on the graves of so many of the polished Romans! Truly the pen of God in history has, as so often, ratified the sentence which a nation had pronounced upon itself. That civilization was doomed which could inscribe over its dead such words as: 'To eternal sleep;' 'To perpetual rest;' or more coarsely express it thus, 'I was not, and I became; I was, and am no more. Thus much is true; who says other, lies; for I shall not be,' adding, as it were by way of moral, 'And thou who livest, drink, play, come.' Not so did God teach His people; and, as we pick our way among these broken stones, we can understand how a religion, which proclaimed a hope so different, must have spoken to the hearts of many even at Rome, and much more, how that blessed assurance of life and immortality, which Christianity afterwards brought, could win its thousands, though it were at the cost of poverty, shame, torture, and the arena.

Wandering from graveyard to graveyard, and deciphering the records of the dead, we can almost read the history of Israel in the days of the Caesars, or when Paul the prisoner set foot on the soil of Italy. When St. Paul, on the journey of the 'Castor and Pollux,' touched at Syracuse, he would, during his stay of three days, find himself in the midst of a Jewish community, as we learn from an inscription. When he disembarked at Puteoli, he was in the oldest Jewish settlement next to that of Rome, {*Jos. Ant.* 17:12. 1; *War* 2:7. 1} where the loving hospitality of Christian Israelites constrained him to tarry over a Sabbath. As he 'went towards Rome,' and reached Capua, he would meet Jews there, as we infer from the tombstone of one 'Alfius Juda,' who had been 'Archon' of the Jews, and 'Archisynagogus' in Capua. As he neared the city, he found in Anxur

(Terracina) a Synagogue. ^{f192} In Rome itself the Jewish community was organized as in other places. {~~<HINT>~~ Acts 28:17} It sounds strange, as after these many centuries we again read the names of the Archons of their various Synagogues, all Roman, such as Claudius, Asteris, Julian (who was Archon alike of the Campesian and the Agrippesian Synagogue priest, the son of Julian the Archisynagogus, or chief of the eldership of the Augustesian Synagogue). And so in other places. On these tombstones we find names of Jewish Synagogue-dignitaries, in every center of population, in Pompeii, in Venusia, the birthplace of Horace; in Jewish catacombs; and similarly Jewish inscriptions in Africa, in Asia, in the islands of the Mediterranean, in Aegina, in Patrae, in Athens. Even where as yet records of their early settlements have not been discovered, we still infer their presence, as we remember the almost incredible extent of Roman commerce, which led to such large settlements in Britain, or as we discover among the tombstones those of 'Syrian' merchants, as in Spain (where St. Paul hoped to preach, no doubt, also to his own countrymen), throughout Gaul, and even in the remotest parts of Germany. ^{f193} Thus the statements of Josephus and of Philo, as to the dispersion of Israel throughout all lands of the known world, are fully borne out.

But the special importance of the Jewish community in Rome lay in its contiguity to the seat of the government of the world, where every movement could be watched and influenced, and where it could lend support to the wants and wishes of that compact body which, however widely scattered, was one in heart and feeling, in thought and purpose, in faith and practice, in suffering and in prosperity. ^{f194} Thus, when upon the death of Herod a deputation from Palestine appeared in the capital to seek the restoration of their Theocracy under a Roman protectorate, {*Jos. Ant.* 17:11. 1; *War.* 2:6. 1} no less than 8,000 of the Roman Jews joined it. And in case of need they could find powerful friends, not only among the Herodian princes, but among court favorites who were Jews, like the actor of whom Josephus speaks; {*Life* 3} among those who were inclined towards Judaism, like Poppaea, the dissolute wife of Nero, whose coffin as that of a Jewess was laid among the urns of the emperors; ^{f195} or among real proselytes, like those of all ranks who, from superstition or conviction, had identified themselves with the Synagogue. ^{f196}

In truth, there was no law to prevent the spread of Judaism. Excepting the brief period when Tiberius {19 A.D.} banished the Jews from Rome and sent 4,000 of their number to fight the banditti in Sardinia, the Jews

enjoyed not only perfect liberty, but exceptional privileges. In the reign of Caesar and of Augustus we have quite a series of edicts, which secured the full exercise of their religion and their communal rights. ^{f197} In virtue of these they were not to be disturbed in their religious ceremonies, nor in the observance of their sabbaths and feasts. The annual Temple-tribute was allowed to be transported to Jerusalem, and the alienation of these funds by the civil magistrates treated as sacrilege. As the Jews objected to bear arms, or march, on the Sabbath, they were freed from military service. On similar grounds, they were not obliged to appear in courts of law on their holy days. Augustus even ordered that, when the public distribution of corn or of money among the citizens fell on a Sabbath, the Jews were to receive their share on the following day. In a similar spirit the Roman authorities confirmed a decree by which the founder of Antioch, Seleucus I. (Nicator), {Ob.280 B.C.} had granted the Jews the right of citizenship in all the cities of Asia Minor and Syria which he had built, and the privilege of receiving, instead of the oil that was distributed, which their religion forbade them to use, {Ab. Sar 2:6} an equivalent in money. {Jos. Ant. 12:3. 1} These rights were maintained by Vespasian and Titus even after the last Jewish war, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of these cities. No wonder, that at the death of Caesar {44 B.C.} the Jews of Rome gathered for many nights, waking strange feelings of awe in the city, as they chanted in mournful melodies their Psalms around the pyre on which the body of their benefactor had been burnt, and raised their pathetic dirges. {Suet. Caes. 84} The measures of Sejanus, and ceased with his sway. Besides, they were the outcome of public feeling at the time against all foreign rites, which had been roused by the vile conduct of the priests of Isis towards a Roman matron, and was again provoked by a gross imposture upon Fulvia, a noble Roman proselyte, on the part of some vagabond Rabbis. But even so, there is no reason to believe that literally all Jews had left Rome. Many would find means to remain secretly behind. At any rate, twenty years afterwards Philo found a large community there, ready to support him in his mission on behalf of his Egyptian countrymen. Any temporary measures against the Jews can, therefore, scarcely be regarded as a serious interference with their privileges, or a cessation of the Imperial favor shown to them.

CHAPTER 6

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE JEWISH DISPERSION IN THE WEST — THEIR UNION IN THE GREAT HOPE OF THE COMING DELIVERER.

It was not only in the capital of the Empire that the Jews enjoyed the rights of Roman citizenship. Many in Asia Minor could boast of the same privilege. {*Jos. Ant.* 14:10, passim; ~~4025~~ Acts 22:25-29} The Seleucidic rulers of Syria had previously bestowed kindred privileges on the Jews in many places. Thus, they possessed in some cities twofold rights: the status of Roman and the privileges of Asiatic, citizenship. Those who enjoyed the former were entitled to a civil government of their own, under archons of their choosing, quite independent of the rule and tribunals of the cities in which they lived. As instances, we may mention the Jews of Sardis, Ephesus, Delos, and apparently also of Antioch. But, whether legally entitled to it or not, they probably everywhere claimed the right of self-government, and exercised it, except in times of persecution. But, as already stated, they also possessed, besides this, at least in many places, the privileges of Asiatic citizenship, to the same extent as their heathen fellow-citizens. This twofold status and jurisdiction might have led to serious complications, if the archons had not confined their authority to strictly communal interests, {Comp. ~~4194~~ Acts 19:14 9:2} without interfering with the ordinary administration of justice, and the Jews willingly submitted to the sentences pronounced by their own tribunals.

But, in truth, they enjoyed even more than religious liberty and communal privileges. It was quite in the spirit of the times, that potentates friendly to Israel bestowed largesses alike on the Temple in Jerusalem, and on the Synagogues in the provinces. The magnificent porch of the Temple was 'adorned' with many such 'dedicated gifts.' Thus, we read of repeated costly offerings by the Ptolemies, of a golden wreath which Sosius offered after he had taken Jerusalem in conjunction with Herod, and of rich flagons which Augustus and his wife had given to the Sanctuary. {*Jos. Ant.* 12:2. 5; 13:3. 4; Ag. Ap. 2:5; Ant. 14:16. 4; War 5:13} And, although this same Emperor praised his grandson for leaving Jerusalem unvisited on his journey from Egypt to Syria, yet he himself made provision for a daily sacrifice on his behalf, which only ceased when the last war against Rome

was proclaimed. {*Jos.* War 2:10. 4; 2:17.} Even the circumstance that there was a ‘Court of the Gentiles,’ with marble screen beautifully ornamented, bearing tablets which, in Latin and Greek, warned Gentiles not to proceed further, ^{f198} proves that the Sanctuary was largely attended by others than Jews, or, in the words of *Josephus*, that ‘it was held in reverence by nations from the ends of the earth.’ {War 4:4. 3; comp. War 2:17. 2-4}

In Syria also, where, according to *Josephus*, the largest number of Jews lived, ^{f199} they experienced special favor. In Antioch their rights and immunities were recorded on tables of brass. ^{f200}

But, indeed, the capital of Syria was one of their favorite resorts. It will be remembered what importance attached to it in the early history of the Christian Church. Antioch was the third city of the Empire, and lay just outside what the Rabbinites designated as ‘Syria’ and still regarded as holy ground. Thus it formed, so to speak, an advanced post between the Palestinian and the Gentile world. Its chief Synagogue was a magnificent building, to which the successors of Antiochus Epiphanes had given the spoils which that monarch had brought from the Temple. The connection between Jerusalem and Antioch was very close. All that occurred in that city was eagerly watched in the Jewish capital. The spread of Christianity there must have excited deep concern. Careful as the Talmud is not to afford unwelcome information, which might have led to further mischief, we know that three of the principal Rabbis went thither on a mission — we can scarcely doubt for the purpose of arresting the progress of Christianity. Again, we find at a later period a record of religious controversy in Antioch between Rabbis and Christians. ^{f201} Yet the Jews of Antioch were strictly Hellenistic, and on one occasion a great Rabbi was unable to find among them a copy of even the Book of Esther in Hebrew, which, accordingly, he had to write out from memory for his use in their Synagogue. A fit place this great border-city, crowded by Hellenists, in close connection with Jerusalem, to be the birthplace of the name ‘Christian,’ to send forth a Paul on his mission to the Gentile world, and to obtain for it a charter of citizenship far nobler than that of which the record was graven on tablets of brass.

But, whatever privileges Israel might enjoy, history records an almost continuous series of attempts, on the part of the communities among whom they lived, to deprive them not only of their immunities, but even of their

common rights. Foremost among the reasons of this antagonism we place the absolute contrariety between heathenism and the Synagogue, and the social isolation which Judaism rendered necessary. It was avowedly unlawful for the Jew even ‘to keep company, or come unto one of another nation.’ {~~408~~ Acts 10:28} To quarrel with this, was to find fault with the law and the religion which made him a Jew. But besides, there was that pride of descent, creed, enlightenment, and national privileges, which St. Paul so graphically sums up as ‘making boast of God and of the law.’ {Comp. ~~407~~ Romans 2:17-24} However differently they might have expressed it, Philo and Hillel would have been at one as to the absolute superiority of the Jew as such. Pretensions of this kind must have been the more provocative, that the populace at any rate envied the prosperity which Jewish industry, talent, and capital everywhere secured. Why should that close, foreign corporation possess every civic right, and yet be free from many of its burdens? Why should their meetings be excepted from the ‘*collegia illicita*’? why should they alone be allowed to export part of the national wealth, to dedicate it to their superstition in Jerusalem? The Jew could not well feign any real interest in what gave its greatness to Ephesus, its attractiveness to Corinth, its influence to Athens. He was ready to profit by it; but his inmost thought must have been contempt, and all he wanted was quietness and protection in his own pursuits. What concern had he with those petty squabbles, ambitions, or designs, which agitated the turbulent populace in those Grecian cities? what cared he for their popular meetings and noisy discussions? The recognition of the fact that, as Jews, they were strangers in a strange land, made them so loyal to the ruling powers, and procured them the protection of kings and Caesars. But it also roused the hatred of the populace.

That such should have been the case, and these widely scattered members have been united in one body, is a unique fact in history. Its only true explanation must be sought in a higher Divine impulse. The links which bound them together were: a common *creed*, a common *life*, a common *center*, and a common *hope*.

Wherever the Jew sojourned, or however he might differ from his brethren, Monotheism, the Divine mission of Moses, and the authority of the Old Testament, were equally to all unquestioned articles of belief. It may well have been that the Hellenistic Jew, living in the midst of a hostile, curious, and scurrilous population, did not care to exhibit over his house and doorposts, at the right of the entrance, the *Mezuzah*,^{f202} which enclosed

the folded parchment that, on twenty-two lines, bore the words from ~~<R04>~~Deuteronomy 4:4-9 and ~~<S113>~~11:13-21, or to call attention by their breadth to the *Tephillin*, ^{f203} or phylacteries on his left arm and forehead, or even to make observable the *Tsitsith*, ^{f204} or fringes on the borders of his garments. ^{f205} Perhaps, indeed, all these observances may at that time not have been deemed incumbent on every Jew. ^{f206} At any rate, we do not find mention of them in heathen writers. Similarly, they could easily keep out of view, or they may not have had conveniences for, their prescribed purifications. But in every place, as we have abundant evidence, where there were at least ten *Batlanim* — male householders who had leisure to give themselves to regular attendance — they had, from ancient times, ~~<H12>~~Acts 16:21, and, if possible, more Synagogues. ^{f207} Where there was no Synagogue there was at least a *Proseuche*, ~~<H13>~~Acts 16:13 ^{f208} or meeting-place, under the open sky, after the form of a theater, generally outside the town, near a river or the sea, for the sake of lustrations. These, as we know from classical writers, were well known to the heathen, and even frequented by them. Their Sabbath observance, their fasting on Thursdays, their Day of Atonement, their laws relating to food, and their pilgrimages to Jerusalem — all found sympathizers among Judaising Gentiles. ^{f209} They even watched to see, how the Sabbath lamp was kindled, and the solemn prayers spoken which marked the beginning of the Sabbath. ^{f210} But to the Jew the Synagogue was the bond of union throughout the world. There, on Sabbath and feast days they met to read, from the same Lectionary, the same Scripture-lessons which their brethren read throughout the world, and to say, in the words of the same liturgy, their common prayers, catching echoes of the gorgeous Temple-services in Jerusalem. The heathen must have been struck with awe as they listened, and watched in the gloom of the synagogue the mysterious light at the far curtained end, where the sacred oracles were reverently kept, wrapped in costly coverings. Here the stranger Jew also would find himself at home: the same arrangements as in his own land, and the well-known services and prayers. A hospitable welcome at the Sabbath-meal, and in many a home, would be pressed on him, and ready aid be proffered in work or trial.

For, deepest of all convictions was that of their common *center*; strongest of all feelings was the love which bound them to Palestine and to Jerusalem, the city of God, the joy of all the earth, the glory of His people Israel. 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning; let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.' Hellenist and Eastern

equally realized this. As the soil of his native land, the deeds of his people, or the graves of his fathers draw the far-off wanderer to the home of his childhood, or fill the mountaineer in his exile with irrepressible longing, so the sounds which the Jew heard in his Synagogue, and the observances which he kept. Nor was it with him merely matter of patriotism, or history, or of association. It was a religious principle, a spiritual hope. No truth more firmly rooted in the consciousness of all, than that in Jerusalem alone men could truly worship. {St. ~~Exod~~ John 4:20.} As Daniel of old had in his hour of worship turned towards the Holy City, so in the Synagogue and in his prayers every Jew turned towards Jerusalem; and anything that might imply want of reverence, when looking in that direction, was considered a grievous sin. From every Synagogue in the Diaspora the annual Temple-tribute went up to Jerusalem,^{f211} no doubt often accompanied by rich votive offerings. Few, who could undertake or afford the journey, but had at some time or other gone up to the Holy City to attend one of the great feasts.^{f212} Philo, who was held by the same spell as the most bigoted Rabbinist, had himself been one of those deputed by his fellow-citizens to offer prayers and sacrifices in the great Sanctuary.^{f213} Views and feelings of this kind help us to understand, how, on some great feast, as Josephus states on sufficient authority, the population of Jerusalem — within its *ecclesiastical* boundaries — could have swelled to the enormous number of nearly three millions. {War 6:9. 3; comp. 2:14. 3}

And still, there was an even stronger bond in their common *hope*. That hope pointed them all, wherever scattered, back to Palestine. To them the coming of the Messiah undoubtedly implied the restoration of Israel's kingdom, and, as a first part in it, the return of 'the dispersed.'^{f214} Indeed, every devout Jew prayed, day by day: 'Proclaim by thy loud trumpet our deliverance, and raise up a banner to gather our dispersed, and gather us together from the four ends of the earth. Blessed be thou, O Lord! Who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel.'^{f215} That prayer included in its generality also the lost ten tribes. So, for example, the prophecy {~~Amos~~ Hosea 11:11.} was rendered: 'They hasten hither, like a bird out of Egypt,' — referring to Israel of old; 'and like a dove out of the land of Assyria' — referring to the ten tribes.^{f216} {Midr. on ~~2015~~ Song of Solomon 1:15, ed. Warshau, p. 11b} And thus even these wanderers, so long lost, were to be reckoned in the field of the Good Shepherd.^{f217}

It is worth while to trace, how universally and warmly both Eastern and Western Judaism cherished this hope of all Israel's return to their own

land. The Targumim bear repeated reference to it; ^{f218} and although there may be question as to the exact date of these paraphrases, it cannot be doubted, that in this respect they represented the views of the Synagogue at the time of Jesus. For the same reason we may gather from the Talmud and earliest commentaries, what Israel's hope was in regard to the return of the 'dispersed.' ^{f219} It was a beautiful idea to liken Israel to the olive-tree, which is never stripped of its leaves. {Men. 53 b} The storm of trial that had swept over it was, indeed, sent in judgment, but not to destroy, only to purify. Even so, Israel's persecutions had served to keep them from becoming mixed with the Gentiles. Heaven and earth might be destroyed, but not Israel; and their final deliverance would far outstrip in marvellousness that from Egypt. The winds would blow to bring together the dispersed; nay, if there were a single Israelite in a land, however distant, he would be restored. With every honor would the nations bring them back. The patriarchs and all the just would rise to share in the joys of the new possession of their land; new hymns as well as the old ones would rise to the praise of God. Nay, the bounds of the land would be extended far beyond what they had ever been, and made as wide as originally promised to Abraham. Nor would that possession be ever taken from them, nor those joys be ever succeeded by sorrows. ^{f220} In view of such general expectations we cannot fail to mark with what wonderful sobriety the Apostles put the question to Jesus: 'Wilt Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' {~~4006~~ Acts 1:6}

Hopes and expectations such as these are expressed not only in Talmudical writings. We find them throughout that very interesting Apocalyptic class of literature, the Pseudepigrapha, to which reference has already been made. The two earliest of them, the Book of Enoch and the Sibylline Oracles, are equally emphatic on this subject. The seer in the Book of Enoch beholds Israel in the Messianic time as coming in carriages, and as borne on the wings of the wind from East, and West, and South. {Book of En. ch. 57; comp. 90.33} Fuller details of that happy event are furnished by the Jewish Sibyl. In her utterances these three events are connected together: the coming of the Messiah, the rebuilding of the Temple, {B. 3:286-294; comp. B. 5:414-433} and the restoration of the dispersed, {3:732-735} when all nations would bring their wealth to the House of God. ^{f221} {3:766-783} The latter trait specially reminds us of their Hellenistic origin. A century later the same joyous confidence, only perhaps more clearly worded, appears in the so-called 'Psalter of Solomon.' Thus

the seventeenth Psalm bursts into this strain: 'Blessed are they who shall live in those days — in the reunion of the tribes, which God brings about.' {Ps. of Solomon 17:50; comp. also ~~9100~~ Psalm 11.} And no wonder, since they are the days when 'the King, the Son of David,' {Ps. Sal. 18:23} having purged Jerusalem {v. 25} and destroyed the heathen by the word of His mouth, {v. 27} would gather together a holy people which He would rule with justice, and judge the tribes of His people, {v. 28} 'dividing them over the land according to tribes;' when 'no stranger would any longer dwell among them.' {e vv. 30, 31}

Another pause, and we reach the time when Jesus the Messiah appeared. Knowing the characteristics of that time, we scarcely wonder that the Book of Jubilees, which dates from that period, should have been Rabbinic in its cast rather than Apocalyptic. Yet even there the reference to the future glory is distinct. Thus we are told, that, though for its wickedness Israel had been scattered, God would 'gather them all from the midst of the heathen,' 'build among them His Sanctuary, and dwell with them.' That Sanctuary was to 'be for ever and ever, and God would appear to the eye of every one, and every one acknowledge that He was the God of Israel, and the Father of all the Children of Jacob, and King upon Mount Zion, from everlasting to everlasting. And Zion and Jerusalem shall be holy.' {Book of Jub. chapter 1.; comp. also chapter 23.} When listening to this language of, perhaps, a contemporary of Jesus, we can in some measure understand the popular indignation which such a charge would call forth, as that the Man of Nazareth had proposed to destroy the Temple, {St. ~~9100~~ John 2:19} or that he thought merely of the children of Jacob.

There is an ominous pause of a century before we come to the next work of this class, which bears the title of the Fourth Book of Esdras. That century had been decisive in the history of Israel. Jesus had lived and died; His Apostles had gone forth to bear the tidings of the new Kingdom of God; the Church had been founded and separated from the Synagogue; and the Temple had been destroyed, the Holy City laid waste, and Israel undergone sufferings, compared with which the former troubles might almost be forgotten. But already the new doctrine had struck its roots deep alike in Eastern and in Hellenistic soil. It were strange indeed if, in such circumstances, this book should not have been different from any that had preceded it; stranger still, if earnest Jewish minds and ardent Jewish hearts had remained wholly unaffected by the new teaching, even though the doctrine of the Cross still continued a stumbling-block, and the Gospel

announcement a rock of offence. But perhaps we could scarcely have been prepared to find, as in the Fourth Book of Esdras, doctrinal views which were wholly foreign to Judaism, and evidently derived from the New Testament, and which, in logical consistency, would seem to lead up to it.

^{f222} The greater part of the book may be described as restless tossing, the seer being agitated by the problem and the consequences of sin, which here for the first and only time is presented as in the New Testament; by the question, why there are so few who are saved; and especially by what to a Jew must have seemed the inscrutable, terrible mystery of Israel's sufferings and banishment. ^{f223} Yet, so far as we can see, no other way of salvation is indicated than that by works and personal righteousness. Throughout there is a tone of deep sadness and intense earnestness. It almost seems sometimes, as if one heard the wind of the new dispensation sweeping before it the withered leaves of Israel's autumn. Thus far for the principal portion of the book. The second, or Apocalyptic, part, endeavors to solve the mystery of Israel's state by foretelling their future. Here also there are echoes of New Testament utterances. What the end is to be, we are told in unmistakable language. His 'Son,' Whom the Highest has for a long time preserved, to deliver 'the creature' by Him, is suddenly to appear in the form of a Man. From His mouth shall proceed alike woe, fire, and storm, which are the tribulations of the last days. And as they shall gather for war against Him, He shall stand on Mount Zion, and the Holy City shall come down from heaven, prepared and ready, and He shall destroy all His enemies. But a peaceable multitude shall now be gathered to Him. These are the ten tribes, who, to separate themselves from the ways of the heathen, had wandered far away, miraculously helped, a journey of one and a half years, and who were now similarly restored by God to their own land. But as for the 'Son,' or those who accompanied him, no one on earth would be able to see or know them, till the day of His appearing. ^{f224} {Vis. 6 ch. 13:27-52}

It seems scarcely necessary to complete the series of testimony by referring in detail to a book, called 'The Prophecy and Assumption of Moses,' and to what is known as the Apocalypse of Branch, the servant of Jeremiah. Both date from probably a somewhat later period than the Fourth Book of Esdras, and both are fragmentary. The one distinctly anticipates the return of the ten tribes; {Prophet. et Ass. Mos. 4:7-14; 7:20} the other, in the letter to the nine and a half tribes, far beyond the Euphrates, {Ap. Bar. 27:22} with which the book closes, preserves an ominous silence on that

point, or rather alludes to it in language which so strongly reminds us of the adverse opinion expressed in the Talmud, that we cannot help suspecting some internal connection between the two. ^{f225}

The writings to which we have referred have all a decidedly Hellenistic tinge of thought. ^{f226} Still they are not the outcome of pure Hellenism. It is therefore with peculiar interest that we turn to Philo, the great representative of that direction, to see whether he would admit an idea so purely national and, as it might seem, exclusive. Nor are we here left in doubt. So universal was this belief, so deep-seated the conviction, not only in the mind, but in the heart of Israel, that we could scarcely find it more distinctly expressed than by the great Alexandrian. However low the condition of Israel might be, he tells us, {De Execrat. ed. Frcf. pp. 936, 937} or however scattered the people to the ends of the earth, the banished would, on a given sign, be set free in one day. In consistency with his system, he traces this wondrous event to their sudden conversion to virtue, which would make their masters ashamed to hold any longer in bondage those who were so much better than themselves. Then, gathering as by one impulse, the dispersed would return from Hellas, from the lands of the barbarians, from the isles, and from the continents, led by a Divine, superhuman apparition invisible to others, and visible only to themselves. On their arrival in Palestine the waste places and the wilderness would be inhabited, and the barren land transformed into fruitfulness.

Whatever shades of difference, then, we may note in the expression of these views, all anticipate the deliverance of Israel, their restoration, and future pre-eminent glory, and they all connect these events with the coming of the Messiah. This was 'the promise' unto which, in their 'instant service night and day, the twelve tribes,' however grievously oppressed, hoped to come. {~~ACTS~~ Acts 26:7} To this 'sure word of prophecy' 'the strangers scattered' throughout all lands would 'take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place,' until the day dawned, and the day-star rose in their hearts. {~~PETER~~ 2 Peter 1:19} It was this which gave meaning to their worship, filled them with patience in suffering, kept them separate from the nations around, and ever fixed their hearts and thoughts upon Jerusalem. For the 'Jerusalem' which was above was 'the mother' of them all. Yet a little while, and He that would come should come, and not tarry, and then all the blessing and glory would be theirs.

At any moment the gladsome tidings might burst upon them, that He had come, when their glory would shine out from one end of the heavens to the other. All the signs of His Advent had come to pass. Perhaps, indeed, the Messiah might even now be there, ready to manifest Himself, so soon as the voice of Israel's repentance called Him from His hiding. Any hour might that banner be planted on the top of the mountains; that glittering sword be unsheathed; that trumpet sound. Closer then, and still closer, must be their connection with Jerusalem, as their salvation drew nigh; more earnest their longing, and more eager their gaze, till the dawn of that long expected day tinged the Eastern sky with its brightness.

CHAPTER 7

IN PALESTINE — JEWS AND GENTILES IN ‘THE LAND’ — THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS AND FEELINGS — ‘THE WALL OF SEPARATION.’

The pilgrim who, leaving other countries, entered Palestine, must have felt as if he had crossed the threshold of another world. Manners, customs, institutions, law, life, nay — the very intercourse between man and man, were quite different. All was dominated by the one all-absorbing idea of religion. It penetrated every relation of life. Moreover, it was inseparably connected with the soil, as well as the people of Palestine, at least so long as the Temple stood. Nowhere else could the Shekhinah dwell or manifest itself; nor could, unless under exceptional circumstances, and for ‘the merit of the fathers,’ the spirit of prophecy be granted outside its bounds. To the orthodox Jew the mental and spiritual horizon was bounded by Palestine. It was ‘the land’; all the rest of the world, except Babylonia, was ‘outside the land.’ No need to designate it specially as ‘holy’; for all here bore the impress of sanctity, as he understood it. Not that the soil itself, irrespective of the people, was holy; it was Israel that made it such. For, had not God given so many commandments and ordinances, some of them apparently needless, simply to call forth the righteousness of Israel; {Mac. 23 *b*} did not Israel possess the merits of ‘the fathers,’ {Rosh haSh. 11 *a*} and specially that of Abraham, itself so valuable that, even if his descendants had, morally speaking, been as a dead body, his merit would have been imputed to them? {Ber. R. 44} More than that, God had created the world on account of Israel, {Yalkut 2} and for their merit, making preparation for them long before their appearance on the scene, just as a king who foresees the birth of his son; nay, Israel had been in God’s thoughts not only before anything had actually been created, but even before every other creative thought. {Ber. R. 1} If these distinctions seem excessive, they were, at least, not out of proportion to the estimate formed of Israel’s merits. In theory, the latter might be supposed to flow from ‘good works,’ of course, including the strict practice of legal piety, and from ‘study of the law.’ But in reality it was ‘study’ alone to which such supreme merit attached. Practice required knowledge for its direction; such as the *Am-ha-arets* (‘country people,’ plebeians, in the Jewish sense of being unlearned)

could not possess, {Comp. Ab 2:5} who had bartered away the highest crown for a spade with which to dig. And 'the school of Arum', the sages, the 'great ones of the world' had long settled it, that study was before works. {Jer. Chag. 1 hal. 7, towards the end; Jer. Pes. 3, 7} And how could it well be otherwise, since the studies, which engaged His chosen children on earth, equally occupied their Almighty Father in heaven? {Ab. Z. 3 b} Could anything, then, be higher than the peculiar calling of Israel, or better qualify them for being the sons of God?

It is necessary to transport oneself into this atmosphere to understand the views entertained at the time of Jesus, or to form any conception of their infinite contrast in spirit to the new doctrine. The abhorrence, not unmingled with contempt, of all Gentile ways, thoughts and associations; the worship of the letter of the Law; the self-righteousness, and pride of descent, and still more of knowledge, become thus intelligible to us, and, equally so, the absolute antagonism to the claims of a Messiah, so unlike themselves and their own ideal. His first announcement might, indeed, excite hope, soon felt to have been vain; and His miracles might startle for a time. But the boundary lines of the Kingdom which He traced were essentially different from those which they had fixed, and within which they had arranged everything, alike for the present and the future. Had He been content to step within them, to complete and realize what they had indicated, it might have been different. Nay, once admit their fundamental ideas, and there was much that was beautiful, true, and even grand in the details. But it was exactly in the former that the divergence lay. Nor was there any possibility of reform or progress here. The past, the present, and the future, alike as regarded the Gentile world and Israel, were irrevocably fixed; or rather, it might almost be said, there were not such, all continuing as they had been from the creation of the world, nay — long before it. The Torah had really existed 2,000 years before Creation; {Shir hashir. R. on ~~2811~~ Song of Solomon 5:11, ed War shau, p. 26 b} the patriarchs had had their Academies of study, and they had known and observed all the ordinances; and traditionalism had the same origin, both as to time and authority, as the Law itself. As for the heathen nations, the Law had been offered by God to them, but refused, and even their after repentance would prove hypocritical, as all their excuses would be shown to be futile. But as for Israel, even though their good deeds should be few, yet, by cumulating them from among all the people, they would appear great in the end, and God would exact payment for their sins as a man does from his friends,

taking little sums at a time. It was in this sense, that the Rabbis employed that sublime figure, representing the Church as one body, of which all the members suffered and joyed together, which St. Paul adopted and applied in a vastly different and spiritual sense. {~~4046~~ Ephesians 4:16}

If, on the one hand, the pre-eminence of Israel depended on the Land, and, on the other, that of the Land on the presence of Israel in it, the Rabbinical complaint was, indeed, well grounded, that its 'boundaries were becoming narrow.' We can scarcely expect any accurate demarcation of them, since the question, what belonged to it, was determined by ritual and theological, not by geographical considerations. Not only the immediate neighborhood (as in the case of Ascalon), but the very wall of a city (as of Acco and of Caesarea) might be Palestinian, and yet the city itself be regarded as 'outside' the sacred limits. All depended on who had originally possessed, and now held a place, and hence what ritual obligations lay upon it. Ideally, as we may say, 'the land of promise' included all which God had covenanted to give to Israel, although never yet actually possessed by them. Then, in a more restricted sense, the 'land' comprised what 'they who came up from Egypt took possession of, from Chezib and unto the river, and unto Amanah.' This included, of course, the conquests made by David in the most prosperous times of the Jewish commonwealth, supposed to have extended over Mesopotamia, Syria, Zobah, Achlah, etc. To all these districts the general name of *Soria*, or Syria, was afterwards given. This formed, at the time of which we write, a sort of inner band around 'the land,' in its narrowest and only real sense; just as the countries in which Israel was specially interested, such as Egypt, Babylon, Ammon, and Moab, formed an outer band. These lands were heathen, and yet not quite heathen, since the dedication of the so-called *Terumoth*, or first-fruits in a prepared state, was expected from them, while *Soria* shared almost all the obligations of Palestine, except those of the 'second tithes,' and the fourth year's product of plants. {~~4092~~ Leviticus 19:24.} But the wavesheaf at the Paschal Feast, and the two loaves at Pentecost, could only be brought from what had grown on the holy soil itself. This latter was roughly defined, as 'all which they who came up from Babylon took possession of, in the land of Israel, and unto Chezib.' Viewed in this light, there was a special significance in the fact that Antioch, where the name 'Christian' first marked the new 'Sect' which had sprung up in Palestine, {~~44126~~ Acts 11:26.} and where the first Gentile Church was formed, {~~44127~~ Acts 11:20, 21} lay just outside the northern boundary of 'the land.' Similarly, we

understand, why those Jewish zealots who would fain have imposed on the new Church the yoke of the Law, { ~~<4150>~~ Acts 15:1 } concentrated their first efforts on that *Soria* which was regarded as a kind of outer Palestine.

But, even so, there was a gradation of sanctity in the Holy Land itself, in accordance with ritual distinctions. Ten degrees are here enumerated, beginning with the bare soil of Palestine, and culminating in the Most Holy Place in the Temple, each implying some ritual distinction, which did not attach to a lower degree. And yet, although the very dust of heathen soil was supposed to carry defilement, like corruption or the grave, the spots most sacred were everywhere surrounded by heathenism; nay, its traces were visible in Jerusalem itself. The reasons of this are to be sought in the political circumstances of Palestine, and in the persistent endeavor of its rulers, with the exception of a very brief period under the Maccabees, to Grecianise the country, so as to eradicate that Jewish particularism which must always be antagonistic to every foreign element. In general, Palestine might be divided into the strictly Jewish territory, and the so-called Hellenic cities.

The latter had been built at different periods, and were politically constituted after the model of the Greek cities, having their own senates (generally consisting of several hundred persons) and magistrates, each city with its adjoining territory forming a sort of commonwealth of its own. But it must not be imagined, that these districts were inhabited exclusively, or even chiefly, by Greeks. One of these groups, that towards Peraea, was really Syrian, and formed part of *Syria Decapolis*; ^{f227} while the other, along the coast of the Mediterranean, was Phoenician. Thus 'the land' was hemmed in, east and west, within its own borders, while south and north stretched heathen or semi-heathen districts. The strictly Jewish territory consisted of Judaea proper, to which Galilee, Samaria and Peraea were joined as Toparchies. These Toparchies consisted of a group of townships, under a Metropolis. The villages and townships themselves had neither magistrates of their own, nor civic constitution, nor lawful popular assemblies. Such civil administration as they required devolved on 'Scribes' (the so-called **κομογραμματεῖς** or **τοπογραμματεῖς**). Thus Jerusalem was really, as well as nominally, the capital of the whole land. Judaea itself was arranged into eleven, or rather, more exactly, into nine Toparchies, of which Jerusalem was the chief. While, therefore, the Hellenic cities were each independent of the other, the whole Jewish territory formed only one

‘*Civitas*.’ Rule, government, tribute — in short, political life — centered in Jerusalem.

But this is not all. From motives similar to those which led to the founding of other Hellenic cities, Herod the Great and his immediate successors built a number of towns, which were inhabited chiefly by Gentiles, and had independent constitutions, like those of the Hellenic cities. Thus, Herod himself built Sebaste (Samaria), in the center of the country; Caesarea in the west, commanding the sea-coast; Gaba in Galilee, close to the great plain of Esdraelon; and Esbonitis in Peraea.^{f228} Similarly, Philip the Tetrarch built Caesarea Philippi and Julias (Bethsaida-Julias, on the western shore of the lake); and Herod Antipas another Julias, and Tiberias.^{f229} The object of these cities was twofold. As Herod, well knowing his unpopularity, surrounded himself by foreign mercenaries, and reared fortresses around his palace and the Temple which he built, so he erected these fortified posts, which he populated with strangers, as so many outworks, to surround and command Jerusalem and the Jews on all sides. Again, as, despite his profession of Judaism, he reared magnificent heathen temples in honor of Augustus at Sebaste and Caesarca, so those cities were really intended to form centers of Grecian influence within the sacred territory itself. At the same time, the Herodian cities enjoyed not the same amount of liberty as the ‘Hellenic,’ which, with the exception of certain imposts, were entirely self-governed, while in the former there were representatives of the Herodian rulers.^{f230}

Although each of these towns and districts had its special deities and rites, some being determined by local traditions, their prevailing character may be described as a mixture of Greek and Syrian worship, the former preponderating, as might be expected.^{f231} On the other hand, Herod and his successors encouraged the worship of the Emperor and of Rome, which, characteristically, was chiefly practiced in the East.^{f232} Thus, in the temple which Herod built to Augustus in Caesarea, there were statues of the Emperor as Olympian Zeus, and of Rome as Hera. {*Jos. Ant.* 15:9. 6; *War* 1:21. 5-8.} He was wont to excuse this conformity to heathenism before his own people on the ground of political necessity. Yet, even if his religious inclinations had not been in that direction, he would have earnestly striven to Grecianise the people.

Not only in Caesarea, but even in Jerusalem, he built a theater and amphitheater, where at great expense games were held every four years in

honor of Augustus. ^{f233} Nay, he placed over the great gate of Temple at Jerusalem a massive golden eagle, the symbol of Roman dominion, as a sort of counterpart to that gigantic golden vine, the symbol of Israel, which hung above the entrance to the Holy Place. These measures, indeed, led to popular indignation, and even to conspiracies and tumults, {Ant. 15:8. 1-4; 17:6. 2} though not of the same general and intense character, as when, at a later period, Pilate sought to introduce into Jerusalem images of the Emperor, or when the statue of Caligula was to be placed in the Temple. In connection with this, it is curious to notice that the Talmud, while on the whole disapproving of attendance at theaters and amphitheaters — chiefly on the ground that it implies ‘sitting in the seat of scorners,’ and might involve contributions to the maintenance of idol-worship — does *not* expressly prohibit it, nor indeed speak very decidedly on the subject. {So at least in a Boraitha. Comp. the discussion and the very curious arguments in favor of attendance in Ab. Zar. 18 *b*, and following.}

The views of the Rabbis in regard to pictorial representations are still more interesting, as illustrating their abhorrence of all contact with idolatry. We mark here differences at two, if not at three periods, according to the outward circumstances of the people. The earliest and strictest opinions {Mechilta on ~~Exodus~~ Exodus 20:4 ed. Weiss, p. 75 *a*.} absolutely forbade any representation of things in heaven, on earth, or in the waters. But the Mishnah {Ab. Zar. 3.} seems to relax these prohibitions by subtle distinctions, which are still further carried out in the Talmud. ^{f234}

To those who held such stringent views, it must have been peculiarly galling to see their most sacred feelings openly outraged by their own rulers. Thus, the Asmonean princess, Alexandra, the mother-in-law of Herod, could so far forget the traditions of her house, as to send portraits of her son and daughter to Mark Antony for infamous purposes, in hope of thereby winning him for her ambitious plans. {Jos. Ant. 15:2. 5 and 6} One would be curious to know who painted these pictures, for, when the statue of Caligula was to be made for the Temple at Jerusalem, no native artist could be found, and the work was entrusted to Phoenicians. It must have been these foreigners also who made the ‘figures,’ with which Herod adorned his palace at Jerusalem, and ‘the brazen statues’ in the gardens ‘through which the water ran out,’ {Jos. War 5. 4. 4} as well as the colossal statues at Caesarea, and those of the three daughters of Agrippa, which after his death {~~Acts~~ Acts 12:23} were so shamefully abused by the soldiery at Sebaste and Caesarea.

This abhorrence of all connected with idolatry, and the contempt entertained for all that was non-Jewish, will in great measure explain the code of legislation intended to keep the Jew and Gentile apart. If Judaea had to submit to the power of Rome, it could at least avenge itself in the Academies of its sages. Almost innumerable stories are told in which Jewish sages, always easily, confute Roman and Greek philosophers; and others, in which even a certain Emperor (Antoninus) is represented as constantly in the most menial relation of self-abasement before a Rabbi. ^{f235} Rome, which was the fourth beast of Daniel, {~~2073~~ Daniel 7:23.} would in the age to come, ^{f236} when Jerusalem would be the metropolis of all lands, {Midr. R. on Exodus Par. 23.} be the first to excuse herself on false though vain pleas for her wrongs to Israel. {Ab. Z. 2 b} But on worldly grounds also, Rome was contemptible, having derived her language and writing from the Greeks, and not possessing even a hereditary succession in her empire. {Ab. Z. 10 a; Gitt. 80 a.} If such was the estimate of dreaded Rome, it may be imagined in what contempt other nations were held. Well might 'the earth tremble,' for, if Israel had not accepted the Law at Sinai, the whole world would have been destroyed, while it once more 'was still' when that {Shabb. 88 a.} happy event took place, although God in a manner forced Israel to it. And so Israel was purified at Mount Sinai from the impurity which clung to our race in consequence of the unclean union between Eve and the serpent, and which still adhered to all other nations! ^{f237}

To begin with, every Gentile child, so soon as born, was to be regarded as unclean. Those who actually worshipped mountains, hills, bushes, etc., — in short, gross idolaters — should be cut down with the sword. But as it was impossible to exterminate heathenism, Rabbinic legislation kept certain definite objects in view, which may be thus summarized: To prevent Jews from being inadvertently led into idolatry; to avoid all participation in idolatry; not to do anything which might aid the heathen in their worship; and, beyond all this, not to give pleasure, nor even help, to heathens. The latter involved a most dangerous principle, capable of almost indefinite application by fanaticism. Even the Mishnah goes so far {Ab. Z. 2:1} as to forbid aid to another in the hour of her need, or nourishment to her babe, in order not to bring up a child for idolatry! ^{f238} But this is not all. Heathens were, indeed, not to be precipitated into danger, but yet not to be delivered from it. Indeed, an isolated teacher ventures even upon this statement: 'The best among the Gentiles, kill; the best among serpents, crush its head.'

{Mechilta, ed. Weiss, p. 33 *b*, line 8 from top} Still more terrible was the fanaticism which directed, that heretics, traitors, and those who had left the Jewish faith should be thrown into actual danger, and, if they were in it, all means for their escape removed. No intercourse of any kind was to be had with such, not even to invoke their medical aid in case of danger to life, ^{f239} since it was deemed, that he who had to do with heretics was imminent peril of becoming one himself, ^{f240} and that, if a heretic returned to the true faith, he should die at once, partly, probably, to expiate his guilt, and partly from fear of relapse. Terrible as all this sounds, it was probably not worse than the fanaticism displayed in what are called more enlightened times. Impartial history must chronicle it, however painful, to show the circumstances in which teaching so far different was propounded by Christ. ^{f241} In truth, the bitter hatred which the Jew bore to the Gentile can only be explained from the estimate entertained of his character. The most vile, and even unnatural, crimes were imputed to them. It was not safe to leave cattle in their charge, to allow their women to nurse infants, or their physicians to attend the sick, nor to walk in their company, without taking precautions against sudden and unprovoked attacks. They should, so far as possible, be altogether avoided, except in cases of necessity or for the sake of business. They and theirs were defiled; their houses unclean, as containing idols or things dedicated to them; their feasts, their joyous occasions, their very contact, was polluted by idolatry; and there was no security, if a heathen were left alone in a room, that he might not, in wantonness or by carelessness, defile the wine or meat on the table, or the oil and wheat in the store. Under such circumstances, therefore, everything must be regarded as having been rendered unclean. Three days before a heathen festival (according to some, also three days after) every business transaction with them was prohibited, for fear of giving either help or pleasure. Jews were to avoid passing through a city where there was an idolatrous feast, nay — they were not even to sit down within the shadow of a tree dedicated to idol-worship. Its wood was polluted; if used in baking, the bread was unclean; if a shuttle had been made of it, not only was all cloth woven on it forbidden, but if such had been inadvertently mixed with other pieces of cloth, or a garment made from it placed with other garments, the whole became unclean. Jewish workmen were not to assist in building basilicas, nor stadia, nor places where judicial sentences were pronounced by the heathen. Of course, it was not lawful to let houses or fields, nor to sell cattle to them. Milk drawn by a heathen, if a Jew had not been present to watch it, {Ab. Zar. 35 *b*.} bread and oil prepared by

them, were unlawful. Their wine was wholly interdicted ^{f242} — the mere touch of a heathen polluted a whole cask; nay, even to put one's nose to heathen wine was strictly prohibited!

Painful as these details are, they might be multiplied. And yet the bigotry of these Rabbis was, perhaps, not worse than that of other sectaries. It was a painful logical necessity of their system, against which their heart, no doubt, often rebelled; and, it must be truthfully added, it was in measure accounted for by the terrible history of Israel.

CHAPTER 8

TRADITIONALISM, ITS ORIGIN, CHARACTER, AND LITERATURE, THE MISHNAH AND TALMUD, THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST, THE DAWN OF A NEW DAY.

In trying to picture to ourselves New Testament scenes, the figure most prominent, next to those of the chief actors, is that of the *Scribe* (ῥῥῡῡῡῡ γραμματεὺς *literatus*). He seems ubiquitous; we meet him in Jerusalem, in Judaea, and even in Galilee. {St. ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Luke 5:17.} Indeed, he is indispensable, not only in Babylon, which may have been the birthplace of his order, but among the ‘dispersion’ also. {*Jos. Ant.* 18:3. 5 20:11. 2} Everywhere he appears as the mouthpiece and representative of the people; he pushes to the front, the crowd respectfully giving way, and eagerly hanging on his utterances, as those of a recognized authority. He has been solemnly ordained by the laying on of hands; and is the *Rabbi*, ^{f243} ‘my great one,’ Master, *amplitudo*. He puts questions; he urges objections; he expects full explanations and respectful demeanor. Indeed, his hyper-ingenuity in questioning has become a proverb. There is not measure of his dignity, nor yet limit to his importance. He is the ‘lawyer,’ {the legis Divinae peritus, St. ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Matthew 22:35; St. ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Luke 7:30; 10:25; 11:45; 14:3.} the well-plastered pit,’ filled with the water of knowledge’ out of which not a drop can escape,’ {*Ab.* 2:8.} in opposition to the weeds of untilled soil’ ῡῡῡῡῡῡ of ignorance. {*Ber.* 45 *b* ^{f244}; *Ab.* 2:5; *Bemid. R.* 3.} He is the Divine aristocrat, among the vulgar herd of rude and profane ‘country-people,’ who ‘know not the Law’ and are ‘cursed.’ More than that, his order constitutes the ultimate authority on all questions of faith and practice; he is ‘the Exegete of the Laws,’ {*Jos. Ant.* 17:6 2.} the ‘teacher of the Law,’ {St. ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Luke 5:17; ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Acts 5:34; comp. also ⲥⲟⲓⲃⲓⲧ 1 Timothy 1:7.} and along with ‘the chief priests’ and ‘elders’ a judge in the ecclesiastical tribunals, whether of the capital or in the provinces. {St. ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Matthew 2:4; ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ 20:18; ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ 21:15; 26:57; ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ 27:41; St. ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Mark 14:1, 43; ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ 15:1; St. ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Luke 22:2, 66; ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ 23:10; ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲧ Acts 4:5.} Although generally appearing in company with ‘the Pharisees,’ he is not necessarily one of them, for they represent a religious party, while he has a status, and holds an office. ^{f245} In short, he is the *Talmid* or learned student, the *Chakham* or sage, whose honor is to be great in the future world. Each

Scribe outweighed all the common people, who must accordingly pay him every honor. Nay, they were honored of God Himself, and their praises proclaimed by the angels; and in heaven also, each of them would hold the same rank and distinction as on earth. {*Siphre* or Numbers p 25 *b.*} Such was to be the respect paid to their sayings, that they were to be absolutely believed, even if they were to declare that to be at the right hand which was at the left, or *vice versa*. {*Siphre* on Deuteronomy p. 105 *a.*}

An institution which had attained such proportions, and wielded such power, could not have been of recent growth. In point of fact, its rise was very gradual, and stretched back to the time of Nehemiah, if not beyond it. Although from the utter confusion of historical notices in Rabbinic writings and their constant practice of antedating events, it is impossible to furnish satisfactory details, the general development of the institution can be traced with sufficient precision. If Ezra is described in Holy Writ {^{<1306>}Ezra 7:6, 10, 11, 12.} as 'a ready (*expertus*) Scribe,' who had 'set his heart to seek (seek out the full meaning of) the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel,' this might indicate to his successors, the *Sopherim* (Scribes), the threefold direction which their studies afterwards took: the *Midrash*, the *Halakhah*, and the *Haggadah*, {Nedar. 4:8.} ^{f246} of which the one pointed to Scriptural investigation, the other to what was to be observed, and the third to oral teaching in the widest sense. But Ezra left his work uncompleted. On Nehemiah's second arrival in Palestine, he found matters again in a state of utmost confusion. {Nehemiah 13.} He must have felt the need of establishing some permanent authority to watch over religious affairs. This we take to have been 'the Great Assembly,' or, as it is commonly called, the 'Great Synagogue.' It is impossible with certainty to determine, ^{f247} either who composed this assembly, or of how many members it consisted. ^{f248} Probably it comprised the leading men in Church and State, the chief priests, elders, and 'judges', the latter two classes including 'the Scribes,' if, indeed, that order was already separately organized. {^{<1304>}Ezra 10:14; ^{<1617>}Nehemiah 5:7.} Probably also the term 'Great Assembly' refers rather to a succession of men than to one Synod; the ingenuity of later times filling such parts of the historical canvas as had been left blank with fictitious notices. In the nature of things such an assembly could not exercise permanent sway in a sparsely populated country, without a strong central authority. Nor could they have wielded real power during the political difficulties and troubles of foreign domination. The oldest tradition {Ab. 1:1.} sums up the result of their

activity in this sentence ascribed to them: 'Be careful in judgment, set up many Talmidim, and make a hedge about the *Torah* (Law).'

In the course of time this rope of sand dissolved. The High-Priest, *Simon the Just*, {In the beginning of the third century B.C.} is already designated as 'of the remnants of the Great Assembly.' But even this expression does not necessarily imply that he actually belonged to it. In the troublous times which followed his Pontificate, the sacred study seems to have been left to solitary individuals. The Mishnic tractate Aboth, which records 'the sayings of the Fathers,' here gives us only the name of Antigonus of Socho. It is significant, that for the first time we now meet a Greek name among Rabbinic authorities, together with an indistinct allusion to his disciples. {Ab. 1:3, 4} ^{f249} The long interval between Simon the Just and Antigonus and his disciples, brings us to the terrible time of Antiochus Epiphanes and the great Syrian persecution. The very sayings attributed to these two sound like an echo of the political state of the country. On three things, Simon was wont to say, the permanency of the (Jewish?) world depends: on the Torah (faithfulness to the Law and its pursuit), on worship (the non-participation in Grecianism), and on works of righteousness. {Ab. 1:2.} They were dark times, when God's persecuted people were tempted to think, that it might be vain to serve Him, in which Antigonus had it: 'Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of reward, but be like servants who serve their lord without a view to the getting of reward, and let the fear of heaven be upon you.' {Ab. 1:3.} After these two names come those of the so-called five Zugoth, or 'couples,' of whom Hillel and Shammai are the last. Later tradition has represented these successive couples as, respectively, the Nasi (president), and Ab-beth-din (vice-president, of the *Sanhedrin*). Of the first three of these 'couples' it may be said that, except significant allusions to the circumstances and dangers of their times, their recorded utterances clearly point to the development of purely *Sopheric* teaching, that is, to the Rabbinistic part of their functions. From the fourth 'couple,' which consists of Simon ben Shetach, who figured so largely in the political history of the later Maccabees ^{f250} (as *Ab-beth-din*), and his superior in learning and judgment, Jehudah ben Tabbaï (as *Nasi*), we have again utterances which show, in harmony with the political history of the time, that judicial functions had been once more restored to the Rabbis. The last of five couples brings us to the time of Herod and of Christ.

We have seen that, during the period of severe domestic troubles, beginning with the persecutions under the Seleucidae, which marked the mortal struggle between Judaism and Grecianism, the 'Great Assembly' had disappeared from the scene. The *Sopherim* had ceased to be a party in power. They had become the *Zezenim*, 'Elders,' whose task was purely ecclesiastical — the perservation of their religion, such as the dogmatic labors of their predecessors had made it. Yet another period opened with the advent of the Maccabees. These had been raised into power by the enthusiasm of the *Chasidim*, or 'pious ones,' who formed the nationalist party in the land, and who had gathered around the liberators of their faith and country. But the later bearing of the Maccabees had alienated the nationalists. Henceforth they sink out of view, or, rather, the extreme section of them merged in the extreme section of the Pharisees, till fresh national calamities awakened a new nationalist party. Instead of the *Chasidim*, we see now two religious parties within the Synagogue — the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The latter originally represented a reaction from the Pharisees — the modern men, who sympathized with the later tendencies of the Maccabees. Josephus places the origin of these two schools in the time of Jonathan, the successor of Judas Maccabee, {160-143 B.C.} and with this other Jewish notices agree. Jonathan accepted from the foreigner (the Syrian) the High-Priestly dignity, and combined with it that of secular ruler. But this is not all. The earlier Maccabees surrounded themselves with a governing eldership. {The Γερουσία, 1 Macc. 12:6; 13:36; 14:28; *Jos. Ant.* 13:4. 9; 5. 8} ^{f251} On the coins of their reigns this is designated as the *Chebher*, or eldership (association) of the Jews. Thus, theirs was what Josephus designates as an aristocratic government, {*Ant.* 11:4. 8} and of which he somewhat vaguely says, that it lasted 'from the Captivity until the descendants of the Asmoneans set up kingly government.' In this aristocratic government the High-Priest would rather be the chief of a representative ecclesiastical body of rulers. This state of things continued until the great breach between Hyrcanus, the fourth from Judas Maccabee, and the Pharisaical party, ^{f252} which is equally recorded by Josephus {*Ant.* 13:10. 5. 6} and the Talmud, {*Kidd.* 66 *a*} with only variations of names and details. The dispute apparently arose from the desire of the Pharisees, that Hyrcanus should be content with the secular power, and resign the Pontificate. But it ended in the persecution, and removal from power, of the Pharisees. Very significantly, Jewish tradition introduces again at this time those purely ecclesiastical authorities which are designated as 'the couples.' {*Jer. Maas Shen* 5 end, p. 56 *d* *Jer. Sot.* 9

p. 24 a} In accordance with this altered state of things, the name ‘Chebher’ now disappears from the coins of the Maccabees, and Rabbinical celebrities (‘the couples’ or *Zugoth*) are only teachers of traditionalism, and ecclesiastical authorities. The ‘eldership,’ { *γερουσσια* *tyb l cwnyr* *myagwmch* } which under the earlier Maccabees was called ‘the tribunal of the Asmoneans.’ { *γερουσσια* *yr tyb* Sanh 82 a; Ab. Z. 36 b. } ^{f253} now passed into the *Sanhedrin*. ^{f254} { *συνέδριον* *yr tyb* in the N.T also once ~~412b~~ Acts 5:21 and twice St. ~~426~~ Luke 22:66; ~~412b~~ Acts 12:5. } Thus we place the origin of this institution about the time of Hyrcanus. With this Jewish tradition fully agrees. ^{f255} The power of the Sanhedrin would, of course, vary with political circumstances, being at times almost absolute, as in the reign of the Pharisaic devotee-Queen, Alexandra, while at others it was shorn of all but ecclesiastical authority. But as the Sanhedrin was in full force at the time of Jesus, its organization will claim our attention in the sequel.

After this brief outline of the origin and development of an institution which exerted such decisive influence on the future of Israel, it seems necessary similarly to trace the growth of the ‘traditions of the Elders,’ ‘so as to understand what, alas! so effectually, opposed the new doctrine of the Kingdom. The first place must here be assigned to those legal determinations, which traditionalism declared absolutely binding on all — not only of equal, but even greater obligation than Scripture itself. ^{f256} And this not illogically, since tradition was equally of Divine origin with Holy Scripture, and authoritatively explained its meaning; supplemented it; gave it application to cases not expressly provided for, perhaps not even foreseen in Biblical times; and generally guarded its sanctity by extending and adding to its provisions, drawing ‘a hedge,’ around its ‘garden enclosed.’ Thus, in new and dangerous circumstances, would the full meaning of God’s Law, to its every tittle and iota, be elicited and obeyed. Thus also would their feet be arrested, who might stray from within, or break in from without. Accordingly, so important was tradition, that the greatest merit a Rabbi could claim was the strictest adherence to the traditions, which he had received from his teacher. Nor might one Sanhedrin annul, or set aside, the decrees of its predecessors. To such length did they go in this worship of the letter, that the great Hillel was actually wont to mispronounce a word, because his teacher before him had done so. { Eduy. 1:3. See the comment of Maimonides. }

These traditional ordinances, as already stated, bear the general name of the *Halakhah*, as indicating alike the way in which the fathers had walked, and that which their children were bound to follow. ^{f257} These *Halakhoth* were either simply the laws laid down in Scripture; or else derived from, or traced to it by some ingenious and artificial method of exegesis; or added to it, by way of amplification and for safety's sake; or, finally, legalized customs. They provided for every possible and impossible case, entered into every detail of private, family, and public life; and with iron logic, unbending rigor, and most minute analysis pursued and dominated man, turn whither he might, laying on him a yoke which was truly unbearable. The return which it offered was the pleasure and distinction of knowledge, the acquisition of righteousness, and the final attainment of rewards; one of its chief advantages over our modern traditionalism, that it was expressly forbidden to draw inferences from these traditions, which should have the force of fresh legal determinations. ^{f258}

In describing the historical growth of the *Halakhah*, ^{f259} we may dismiss in a few sentences the legends of Jewish tradition about patriarchal times. They assure us, that there was an Academy and a Rabbinic tribunal of Shem, and they speak of traditions delivered by that Patriarch to Jacob; of diligent attendance by the latter on the Rabbinic College; of a tractate (in 400 sections) on idolatry by Abraham, and of his observance of the whole traditional law; of the introduction of the three daily times of prayer, successively by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; of the three benedictions in the customary 'grace at meat,' as propounded by Moses, Joshua, and David and Solomon; of the Mosaic introduction of the practice of reading lessons from the law on Sabbaths, New Moons, and Feast Days, and even on the Mondays and Thursdays; and of that, by the same authority, of preaching on the three great festivals about those feasts. Further, they ascribe to Moses the arrangement of the priesthood into eight courses (that into sixteen to Samuel, and that into twenty-four to David), as also, the duration of the time for marriage festivities, and for mourning. But evidently these are vague statements, with the object of tracing traditionalism and its observances to primeval times, even as legend had it, that Adam was born circumcised, {Midr. Shochar Tobh on ~~Psalm~~ ^{Psalm} 9:6. ed. Warshau, p. 14 *b*; Abde R. Nath. 2.} and later writers that he had kept all the ordinances.

But other principles apply to the traditions, from Moses downwards. According to the Jewish view, God had given Moses on Mount Sinai alike

the oral and the written Law, that is, the Law with all its interpretations and applications. From ^{<2018>}Exodus 20:1, it was inferred, that God had communicated to Moses the Bible, the Mishnah, and Talmud, and the Haggadah, even to that which scholars would in latest times propound. ^{f260} In answer to the somewhat natural objection, why the Bible alone had been written, it was said that Moses had proposed to write down *all* the teaching entrusted to him, but the Almighty had refused, on account of the future subjection of Israel to the nations, who would take from them the written Law. Then the unwritten traditions would remain to separate between Israel and the Gentiles. Popular exegesis found this indicated even in the language of prophecy. {^{<2082>}Hosea 8:12; comp. Shem. R. 47.} But traditionalism went further, and placed the oral actually above the written Law. The expression, {^{<2347>}Exodus 34:27.} ‘After the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel,’ was explained as meaning, that God’s covenant was founded on the spoken, in opposition to the written words. {Jer. Chag. p. 76 d.} If the written was thus placed below the oral Law, we can scarcely wonder that the reading of the Hagiographa was actually prohibited to the people on the Sabbath, from fear that it might divert attention from the learned discourses of the Rabbis. The study of them on that day was only allowed for the purpose of learned investigation and discussions. {Tos. Shabb. 14.} ^{f261} But if traditionalism was not to be committed to writing by Moses, measures had been taken to prevent oblivion or inaccuracy. Moses had always repeated a traditional law successively to Aaron, to his sons, and to the elders of the people, and they again in turn to each other, in such wise, that Aaron heard the Mishnah four times, his sons three times, the Elders twice, and the people once. But even this was not all, for by successive repetitions of Aaron, his sons, and the Elders) the people also heard it four times. {Erub. 54b.} And, before his death, Moses had summoned any one to come forward, if he had forgotten aught of what he had heard and learned. {^{<2005>}Deuteronomy 1:5.} But these ‘Halakhoth of Moses from Sinai’ do not make up the whole of traditionalism. According to Maimonides, it consists of five, but more critically of three classes. ^{f262} The *first* of these comprises both such ordinances as are found in the Bible itself, and the so-called *Halakhoth of Moses from Sinai* — that is, such laws and usages as prevailed from time immemorial, and which, according to the Jewish view, had been orally delivered to, but not written down by Moses. *For these, therefore, no proof was to be sought in Scripture* — at most support, or confirmatory allusion (*Asmakhtu*). ^{f263} Nor were these open to discussion. The *second*

class formed the ‘oral law,’ **hrwt hp l [bc** or the ‘traditional teaching’ **yrbd hl bq** in the stricter sense. To this class belonged all that was supposed to be implied in, or that could be deduced from, the Law of Moses.^{f264} The latter contained, indeed, in substance or germ, everything; but it had not been brought out, till circumstances successfully evolved what from the first had been provided in principle. *For this class of ordinances reference to, and proof from, Scripture was required.* Not so for the third class of ordinances, which were ‘the hedge’ drawn by the Rabbis around the Law, to prevent any breach of the Law or customs, to ensure their exact observance, or to meet peculiar circumstances and dangers. These ordinances constituted ‘the sayings of the Scribes’ or ‘of the Rabbis’^{f265} — and were either *positive* in their character (*Teqqanoth*), or else *negative* (*Gezeroth* from *gazar* to cut off”). Perhaps the distinction of these two cannot always be strictly carried out. But it was probably to this third class especially, confessedly unsupported by Scripture, that these words of Christ referred: {St. ^{412B}Matthew 23:3, 4.} ‘All therefore whatsoever they tell you, that do and observe; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men’s shoulders; but with their finger they will not move them away (set in motion).’^{f266} This view has two-fold confirmation. For, this third class of Halakhic ordinances was the only one open to the discussion of the learned, the ultimate decision being according to the majority. Yet it possessed practically (though not theoretically) the same authority as the other two classes. In further confirmation of our view the following may be quoted: ‘A *Gezerah* (*i.e.* this third class of ordinances) is not to be laid on the congregation, unless the majority of the congregation is able to bear it’ {B. Kam. 79.} — words which read like a commentary on those of Jesus, and show that these burdens could be laid on, or moved away, according to the varying judgment or severity of a Rabbinic College.^{f267}

This body of traditional ordinances forms the subject of the *Mishnah*, or second, repeated law. We have here to place on one side the Law of Moses as recorded in the Pentateuch, as standing by itself. All else, even the teaching of the Prophets and of the Hagiographa, as well as the oral traditions, bore the general name of *Qabbalah*, ‘that which has been received.’ The sacred study, or *Midrash*, in the original application of the term, concerned either the *Halakhah*, traditional *ordinance*, which was always ‘that which had been heard’ (*Shematha*), or else the *Haggadah*,

‘that which was said’ upon the authority of individuals, not as legal ordinance. It was illustration, commentary, anecdote, clever or learned saying, etc. At first the *Halakhah* remained unwritten, probably owing to the disputes between Pharisees and Sadducees. But the necessity of fixedness and order led in course of time to more or less complete collections of the *Halakhoth*.^{f268} The oldest of these is ascribed to R. Akiba, in the time of the Emperor Hadrian. { 132-135 A.D. }^{f269} But the authoritative collection in the so-called *Mishnah* is the work of Jehudah the Holy, who died about the end of the second century of our era.

Altogether, the *Mishnah* comprises six ‘Orders’ (*Sedarim*), each devoted to a special class of subjects.^{f270} These ‘Orders’ are divided into tractates (*Massikhtoth*, *Massekhtiyoth*, ‘textures, webs’), of which there are sixty-three (or else sixty-two) in all. These tractates are again subdivided into chapters (*Peraqim*) — in all 525, which severally consist of a certain number of verses, or *Mishnahs* (*Mishnayoth*, in all 4,187). Considering the variety and complexity of the subjects treated, the *Mishnah* is arranged with remarkable logical perspicuity. The language is Hebrew, though of course not that of the Old Testament. The words rendered necessary by the new circumstances are chiefly derived from the Greek, the Syriac, and the Latin, with Hebrew terminations.^{f271} But all connected with social intercourse, or ordinary life (such as contracts), is written, not in Hebrew, but in Aramaean, as the language of the people.

But the traditional law embodied other materials than the *Halakhoth* collected in the *Mishnah*. Some that had not been recorded there, found a place in the works of certain Rabbis, or were derived from their schools. These are called *Boraithas* — that is, traditions *external* to the *Mishnah*. Finally, there were ‘additions’ (or *Tosephtoth*), dating after the completion of the *Mishnah*, but probably not later than the third century of our era. Such there are to not fewer than fifty-two out of the sixty-three Mishnic tractates. When speaking of the *Halakhah* as distinguished from the *Haggadah*, we must not, however, suppose that the latter could be entirely separated from it. In point of fact, one whole tractate in the *Mishnah* (Aboth: The Sayings of the ‘Fathers’) is entirely *Haggadah*; a second (*Middoth*: the ‘Measurements of the Temple’) has *Halakhah* in only fourteen places; while in the rest of the tractates *Haggadah* occurs in not fewer than 207 places.^{f272} Only thirteen out of the sixty-three tractates of the *Mishnah* are entirely free from *Haggadah*.

Hitherto we have only spoken of the Mishnah. But this comprises only a very small part of traditionalism. In course of time the discussions, illustrations, explanations, and additions to which the Mishnah gave rise, whether in its application, or in the Academies of the Rabbis, were authoritatively collected and edited in what are known as the two *Talmuds* or *Gemaras*.^{f273} If we imagine something combining law reports, a Rabbinical ‘Hansard,’ and notes of a theological debating club, all thoroughly Oriental, full of digressions, anecdotes, quaint sayings, fancies, legends, and too often of what, from its profanity, superstition, and even obscenity, could scarcely be quoted, we may form some general idea of what the Talmud is. The oldest of these two Talmuds dates from about the close of the fourth century of our era. It is the product of the Palestinian Academies, and hence called the *Jerusalem Talmud*. The second is about a century younger, and the outcome of the Babylonian schools, hence called the *Babylon* (afterwards also ‘our’) Talmud. We do not possess either of these works complete.^{f274} The most defective is the Jerusalem Talmud, which is also much briefer, and contains far fewer discussions than that of Babylon. The Babylon Talmud, which in its present form extends over thirty-six out of the sixty-three tractates of the Mishnah, is about ten or eleven times the size of the latter, and more than four times that of the Jerusalem Talmud. It occupies (in our editions), with marginal commentations, 2,947 folio leaves (pages *a* and *b*). Both Talmuds are written in Aramaean; the one in its western, the other in its eastern dialect, and in both the Mishnah is discussed *seriatim*, and clause by clause. Of the character of these discussions it would be impossible to convey an adequate idea. When we bear in mind the many sparkling, beautiful, and occasionally almost sublime passages in the Talmud, but especially that its forms of thought and expression so often recall those of the New Testament, only prejudice and hatred could indulge in indiscriminate vituperation. On the other hand, it seems unaccountable how any one who has read a Talmudic tractate, or even part of one, could compare the Talmud with the New Testament, or find in the one the origin of the other.

To complete our brief survey, it should be added that our editions of the Babylon Talmud contain (at the close of vol. 9 and after the fourth ‘Order’) certain Boraithas. Of these there were originally nine, but two of the smaller tractates (on ‘the memorial fringes,’ and on ‘non-Israelites’) have not been preserved. The first of these Boraithas is entitled *Abhoth de Rabbi Nathan*, and partially corresponds with a tractate of a similar name

in the Mishnah.^{f275} Next follow six minor tractates. These are respectively entitled *Sopherim* (Scribes),^{f276} detailing the ordinances about copying the Scriptures, the ritual of the Lectionary, and festive prayers; *Ebhel Rabbathi* or *Semakthoth*,^{f277} containing Halakhah and Haggadah about funeral and mourning observances; *Kallah*,^{f278} on the married relationship; *Derekh Erets*,^{f279} embodying moral directions and the rules and customs of social intercourse; *Derekh Erets Zuta*,^{f280} treating of similar subjects, but as regards learned students; and, lastly, the *Pereq ha Shalom*,^{f281} which is a eulogy on peace. All these tractates date, at least in their present form, later than the Talmudic period.^{f282}

But when the *Halakhah*, however varied in its application, was something fixed and stable, the utmost latitude was claimed and given in the *Haggadah*. It is sadly characteristic, that, practically, the main body of Jewish dogmatic and moral theology is really only *Haggadah*, and hence of no absolute authority. The *Halakhah* indicated with the most minute and painful punctiliousness every legal ordinance as to outward observances, and it explained every bearing of the Law of Moses. But beyond this it left the inner man, the spring of actions, untouched. What he was to believe and what to feel, was chiefly matter of the Haggadah. Of course the laws of morality, and religion, as laid down in the Pentateuch, were fixed principles, but there was the greatest divergence and latitude in the explanation and application of many of them. A man might hold or propound almost any views, so long as he contravened not the Law of Moses, as it was understood, and adhered in teaching and practice to the traditional ordinances. In principle it was the same liberty which the Romish Church accords to its professing members, only with much wider application, since the debatable ground embraced so many matters of faith, and the liberty given was not only that of private opinion but of public utterance. We emphasize this, because the absence of authoritative direction and the latitude in matters of faith and inner feeling stand side by side, and in such sharp contrast, with the most minute punctiliousness in all matters of outward observance. And here we may mark the fundamental distinction between the teaching of Jesus and Rabbinism. He left the *Halakhah* untouched, putting it, as it were, on one side, as something quite secondary, while He insisted as primary on that which to them was chiefly matter of Haggadah. And this rightly so, for, in His own words, 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth,' since 'those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth

from the heart, and they defile the man.’ {St. ^{f281}Matthew 15:11, 18.} The difference was one of fundamental principle, and not merely of development, form, or detail. The one developed the Law in its outward direction as ordinances and commandments; the other in its inward direction as life and liberty. Thus Rabbinism occupied one pole — and the outcome of its tendency to pure externalism was the Halakhah, all that was internal and higher being merely Haggadic. The teaching of Jesus occupied the opposite pole. Its starting-point was the inner sanctuary in which God was known and worshipped, and it might well leave the Rabbinic Halakhoth aside, as not worth controversy, to be in the meantime ‘done and observed,’ in the firm assurance that, in the course of its development, the spirit would create its own appropriate forms, or, to use a New Testament figure, the new wine burst the old bottles. And, lastly, as closely connected with all this, and marking the climax of contrariety: Rabbinism started with demand of outward obedience and righteousness, and pointed to sonship as its goal; the Gospel started with the free gift of forgiveness through faith and of sonship, and pointed to obedience and righteousness as its goal.

In truth, Rabbinism, as such, had no system of theology; only what ideas, conjectures, or fancies the Haggadah yielded concerning God, Angels, demons, man, his future destiny and present position, and Israel, with its past history and coming glory. Accordingly, by the side of what is noble and pure, what a terrible mass of utter incongruities, of conflicting statements and too often debasing superstitions, the outcome of ignorance and narrow nationalism; of legendary coloring of Biblical narratives and scenes, profane, coarse, and degrading to them; the Almighty Himself and His Angels taking part in the conversations of Rabbis, and the discussions of Academies; nay, forming a kind of heavenly Sanhedrin, which occasionally requires the aid of an earthly Rabbi. ^{f283} The miraculous merges into the ridiculous, and even the revolting. Miraculous cures, miraculous supplies, miraculous help, all for the glory of great Rabbis, ^{f284} who by a look or word can kill, and restore to life. At their bidding the eyes of a rival fall out, and are again inserted. Nay, such was the veneration due to Rabbis, that R. Joshua used to kiss the stone on which R. Eliezer had sat and lectured, saying: ‘This stone is like Mount Sinai, and he who sat on it like the Ark.’ Modern ingenuity has, indeed, striven to suggest deeper symbolical meaning for such stories. It should own the terrible contrast existing side by side: Hebrewism and Judaism, the Old Testament

and traditionalism; and it should recognize its deeper cause in the absence of that element of spiritual and inner life which Christ has brought. Thus as between the two — the old and the new — it may be fearlessly asserted that, as regards their substance and spirit, there is not a difference, but a total divergence, of fundamental principle between Rabbinism and the New Testament, so that comparison between them is not possible. Here there is absolute contrariety.

The painful fact just referred to is only too clearly illustrated by the relation in which traditionalism places itself to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, even though it acknowledges their inspiration and authority. The Talmud has it, {Baba Mets. 33 a} that he who busies himself with Scripture only (*i.e.* without either the *Mishnah* or *Gemara*) has merit, and yet no merit.

^{f285} Even the comparative paucity of references to the Bible in the Mishnah ^{f286} is significant. Israel had made void the Law by its traditions. Under a load of outward ordinances and observances its spirit had been crushed. The religion as well as the grand hope of the Old Testament had become externalized. And so alike Heathenism and Judaism — for it was no longer the pure religion of the Old Testament — each following its own direction, had reached its goal. All was prepared and waiting. The very porch had been built, through which the new, and yet old, religion was to pass into the ancient world, and the ancient world into the new religion. Only one thing was needed: the Coming of the Christ. As yet darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness lay upon the people. But far away the golden light of the new day was already tingeing the edge of the horizon. Presently would the Lord arise upon Zion, and His glory be seen upon her. Presently would the Voice from out the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord; presently would it herald the Coming of His Christ to Jew and Gentile, and that Kingdom of heaven, which, established upon earth, is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. ^{f287}

BOOK 2

FROM THE MANGER IN BETHLEHEM TO THE BAPTISM IN JORDAN

*‘Fortitudo infirmateur
Parva fit immensitas
Liberator alligatu
Nascitur aeternitas
Q quam mira perpetrast
Jesu propter hominem
Tam ardentem quem amasti.
Paradiso exulem*

— *Ancient Latin Hymn*

CHAPTER 1

IN JERUSALEM WHEN HEROD REIGNED.

IF the dust of ten centuries could have been wiped from the eyelids of those sleepers, and one of them who thronged Jerusalem in the highday of its glory, during the reign of King Solomon, had returned to its streets, he would scarcely have recognized the once familiar city. Then, as now, a Jewish king reigned, who bore undivided rule over the whole land; then, as now, the city was filled with riches and adorned with palaces and architectural monuments; then, as now, Jerusalem was crowded with strangers from all lands. Solomon and Herod were each the last Jewish king over the Land of Promise; ^{f288} Solomon and Herod, each, built the Temple. But with the son of David began, and with the Idumaeen ended, 'the kingdom'; or rather, having fulfilled its mission, it gave place to the spiritual world-kingdom of 'David's greater Son.' The sceptre departed from Judah to where the nations were to gather under its sway. And the Temple which Solomon built was the first. In it the Shekhinah dwelt visibly. The Temple which Herod reared was the last. The ruins of its burning, which the torch of the Romans had kindled, were never to be restored. Herod was not the antitype, he was the Barabbas, of David's Royal Son.

In other respects, also, the difference was almost equally great. The four 'companion-like' hills on which the city was built, {~~Psalm~~ Psalm 122} the deep clefts by which it was surrounded, the Mount of Olives rising in the east, were the same as a thousand years ago. There, as of old were the Pool of Siloam and the royal gardens — nay, the very wall that had then surrounded the city. And yet all was so altered as to be scarcely recognizable. The ancient Jebusite fort, the City of David, Mount Zion, ^{f289} was now the priests' quarter, Ophel, and the old royal palace and stables had been thrown into the Temple area, now completely levelled, where they formed the magnificent treble colonnade, known as the Royal Porch. Passing through it, and out by the Western Gate of the Temple, we stand on the immense bridge which spans the 'Valley of the Cheesemongers,' or the Tyropoeon, and connects the Eastern with the Western hills of the city. It is perhaps here that we can best mark the outstanding features, and note the changes. On the right, as we look northward, are (on the Eastern hill)

Ophel, the Priest-quarter, and the Temple — oh, how wondrously beautiful and enlarged, and rising terrace upon terrace, surrounded by massive walls: a palace, a fortress, a Sanctuary of shining marble and glittering gold. And beyond it frowns the old fortress of Baris, rebuilt by Herod, and named after his patron, Antonia. This is the Hill of Zion. Right below us is the cleft of the Tyropoeon, and here creeps up northwards the ‘Lower City’ or Acra, in the form of a crescent, widening into an almost square ‘suburb.’ Across the Tyropoeon, westward, rises the ‘Upper City.’ If the Lower City and suburb form the business-quarter with its markets, bazaars, and streets of trades and guilds, the ‘Upper City’ is that of palaces. Here, at the other end of the great bridge which connects the Temple with the ‘Upper City,’ is the palace of the Maccabees; beyond it, the Xystos, or vast colonnaded enclosure, where popular assemblies are held; then the Palace of Ananias the High-Priest, and nearest to the Temple, ‘the Council Chamber’ and public Archives. Behind it, westwards, rise, terrace upon terrace, the stately mansions of the Upper City, till, quite in the north-west corner of the old city, we reach the Palace which Herod had built for himself — almost a city and fortress, flanked by three high towers, and enclosing spacious gardens. Beyond it again, and outside the city walls, both of the first and the second, stretches all north of the city the new suburb of Bezetha. Here on every side are gardens and villas; here passes the great northern road; out there must they have laid hold on Simon the Cyrenian, and here must have led the way to the place of the Crucifixion.

Changes that marked the chequered course of Israel’s history had come even over the city walls. The first and oldest — that of David and Solomon — ran round the west side of the Upper City, then crossed south to the Pool of Siloam, and ran up east, round Ophel, till it reached the eastern enclosure of the Temple, whence it passed in a straight line to the point from which it had started, forming the northern boundary of the ancient city. But although this wall still existed, there was now a marked addition to it. When the Maccabee Jonathan finally cleared Jerusalem of the Syrian garrison that lay in Fort Acra, {1 Macc. 1:33, and often; but the precise situation of this ‘fort’ is in dispute} he built a wall right ‘through the middle of the city,’ so as to shut out the foe. {1 Macc. 12:36; *Jos. Ant.* 13:5. 11; comp. with it 14:16. 2; War 6:7. 2; 8. 1} This wall probably ran from the western angle of the Temple southwards, to near the pool of Siloam, following the winding course of the Tyropoeon, but on the other side of it, where the declivity of the Upper City merged in the valley.

Another monument of the Syrian Wars, of the Maccabees, and of Herod, was the fortress Antonia. Part of it had, probably, been formerly occupied by what was known as Fort Acra, of such unhappy prominence in the wars that preceded and marked the early Maccabean period. It had passed from the Ptolemies to the Syrians, and always formed the central spot round which the fight for the city turned. Judas Maccabee had not been able to take it. Jonathan had laid siege to it, and built the wall, to which reference has just been made, so as to isolate its garrison. It was at last taken by Simon, the brother and successor of Jonathan, and levelled with the ground. {141 B.C.} Fort Baris, which was constructed by his successor Hyrcanus I., {135-106 B.C.} covered a much wider space. It lay on the northwestern angle of the Temple, slightly jutting beyond it in the west, but not covering the whole northern area of the Temple. The rock on which it stood was higher than the Temple, ^{f290} although lower than the hill up which the new suburb Bezetha crept, which, accordingly, was cut off by a deep ditch, for the safety of the fortress. Herod greatly enlarged and strengthened it. Within encircling walls the fort rose to a height of sixty feet, and was flanked by four towers, of which three had a height of seventy, the fourth (S.E.), which jutted into the Temple area, of 105 feet, so as to command the sacred enclosure. A subterranean passage led into the Temple itself, {Ant. 15:11. 7} which was also connected with it by colonnades and stairs. Herod had adorned as well as strengthened and enlarged, this fort (now Antonia), and made it a palace, an armed camp, and almost a city. {Jos. War 5:5. 8}

Hitherto we have only spoken of the first, or old wall, which was fortified by sixty towers. The second wall, which had only fourteen towers, began at some point in the northern wall at the Gate Gennath, whence it ran north, and then east, so as to enclose Acra and the Suburb. It terminated at Fort Antonia. Beyond, and all around this second wall stretched, as already noticed, the new, as yet un-enclosed suburb Bezetha, rising towards the north-east. But these changes were as nothing compared with those within the city itself. First and foremost was the great transformation in the Temple itself, ^{f291} which, from a small building, little larger than an ordinary church, in the time of Solomon, ^{f292} had become that great and glorious House which excited the admiration of the foreigner, and kindled the enthusiasm of every son of Israel. At the time of Christ it had been already forty-six years in building, and workmen were still, and for a long time, engaged on it. ^{f293} But what a heterogeneous crowd thronged its porches

and courts! Hellenists; scattered wanderers from the most distant parts of the earth — east, west, north, and south; Galileans, quick of temper and uncouth of Jewish speech; Judaeans and Jerusalemites; white-robed Priests and Levites; Temple officials; broad-phyllacteried, wide-fringed Pharisees, and courtly, ironical Sadducees; and, in the outer court, curious Gentiles! Some had come to worship; others to pay vows, or bring offerings, or to seek purification; some to meet friends, and discourse on religious subjects in those colonnaded porches, which ran round the Sanctuary; or else to have their questions answered, or their causes heard and decided, by the smaller Sanhedrin of twenty-three, that sat in the entering of the gate or by the Great Sanhedrin. The latter no longer occupied the Hall of Hewn Stones, Gazith, but met in some chamber attached to those ‘shops,’ or booths, on the Temple Mount, which belonged to the High-Priestly family of Ananias, and where such profitable trade was driven by those who, in their cupidity and covetousness, were worthy successors of the sons of Eli. In the Court of the Gentiles (or in its porches) sat the official money-changers, who for a fixed discount changed all foreign coins into those of the Sanctuary. Here also was that great mart for sacrificial animals, and all that was requisite for offerings. How the simple, earnest country people, who came to pay vows, or bring offerings for purifying, must have wondered, and felt oppressed in that atmosphere of strangely blended religious rigorism and utter worldliness; and how they must have been taxed, imposed upon, and treated with utmost curtness, nay — rudeness, by those who laughed at their boorishness, and despized them as cursed, ignorant country people, little better than heathens, or, for that matter, than brute beasts. Here also there lay about a crows of noisy beggars, unsightly from disease, and clamorous for help. And close by passed the luxurious scion of the High-Priestly families; the proud, intensely self-conscious Teacher of the Law, respectfully followed by his disciples; and the quick-witted, subtle Scribe. These were men who, on Sabbaths and feast-days, would come out on the Temple-terrace to teach the people, or condescend to answer their questions; who in the Synagogues would hold their puzzled hearers spell-bound by their traditional lore and subtle argumentation, or tickle the fancy of the entranced multitude, that thronged every available space, by their ingenious frivolities, their marvellous legends, or their clever sayings; but who would, if occasion required, quell an opponent by well-posed questions, or crush him beneath the sheer weight of authority. Yet others were there who, despite the utterly lowering influence which the frivolities of the prevalent religion, and the elaborate trifling of its endless

observances, must have exercised on the moral and religious feelings of all — perhaps, because of them — turned aside, and looked back with loving gaze to the spiritual promises of the past, and forward with longing expectancy to the near ‘consolation of Israel,’ waiting for it in prayerful fellowship, and with bright, heaven-granted gleams of its dawning light amidst the encircling gloom.

Descending from the Temple into the city, there was more than enlargement, due to the increased population. Altogether, Jerusalem covered, at its greatest, about 300 acres.^{f294} As of old there were still the same narrow streets in the business quarters; but in close contiguity to bazaars and shops rose stately mansions of wealthy merchants, and palaces of princes.^{f295} And what a change in the aspect of these streets, in the character of those shops, and, above all, in the appearance of the restless Eastern crowd that surged to and fro! Outside their shops in the streets, or at least in sight of the passers, and within reach of their talk, was the shoemaker hammering his sandals, the tailor plying his needle, the carpenter, or the worker in iron and brass. Those who were less busy, or more enterprising, passed along, wearing some emblem of their trade: the dyer, variously colored threads; the carpenter, a rule: the writer, a reed behind his ear; the tailor, with a needle prominently stuck in his dress. In the side streets the less attractive occupations of the butcher, the wool-comber, or the flaxspinner were pursued: the elegant workmanship of the goldsmith and jeweler; the various *articles de luxe*, that adorned the houses of the rich; the work of the designer, the molder, or the artificer in iron or brass. In these streets and lanes everything might be purchased: the production of Palestine, or imported from foreign lands — nay, the rarest articles from the remotest parts. Exquisitely shaped, curiously designed and jeweled cups, rings and other workmanship of precious metals; glass, silks, fine linen, woolen stuffs, purple, and costly hangings; essences, ointments, and perfumes, as precious as gold; articles of food and drink from foreign lands — in short, what India, Persia, Arabia, Media, Egypt, Italy, Greece, and even the far-off lands of the Gentiles yielded, might be had in these bazaars.

Ancient Jewish writings enable us to identify no fewer than 118 different articles of import from foreign lands, covering more than even modern luxury has devised. Articles of luxury, especially from abroad, fetched indeed enormous prices; and a lady might spend 36*l.* on a cloak; {Baba B. 9:7.} silk would be paid by its weight in gold; purple wool at 3*l.* 5*s.* the

pound, or, if double-dyed, at almost ten times that amount; while the price of the best balsam and nard was most exorbitant. On the other hand, the cost of common living was very low. In the bazaars you might get a complete suit for your slave for eighteen or nineteen shillings, {Arakh. 6:5.} and a tolerable outfit for yourself from 3*l.* to 6*l.* For the same sum you might purchase an ass, {Baba K. 10:4.} an ox, {Men. 13:8; or a cow, {Tos. Sheq. 2; Tos. Ar. 4.} and , for little more, a horse. A calf might be had for less than fifteen shillings, a goat for five or six. {Men. 13:8.} Sheep were dearer, and fetched from four to fifteen or sixteen shillings, while a lamb might sometimes be had as low as two pence. No wonder living and labor were so cheap. Corn of all kinds, fruit, wine, and oil, cost very little. Meat was about a penny a pound; a man might get himself a small, of course unfurnished, lodging for about sixpence a week. {Tos. Baba Mets. 4.} A day laborer was paid about 7 1/2*d.* a day, though skilled labor would fetch a good deal more. Indeed, the great Hillel was popularly supposed to have supported his family on less than twopence a day, {Yoma 35 *b.*} while property to the amount of about 6*l.*, or trade with 2*l.* or 3*l.* of goods, was supposed to exclude a person from charity, or a claim on what was left in the corners of fields and the gleaners. {Peah 8:8, 9.}

To these many like details might be added. ^{f296} Sufficient has been said to show the two ends of society: the exceeding dearness of luxuries, and the corresponding cheapness of necessities. Such extremes would meet especially at Jerusalem. Its population, computed at from 200,000 to 250,000, ^{f297} was enormously swelled by travellers, and by pilgrims during the great festivals. ^{f298} The great Palace was the residence of King and Court, with all their following and luxury; in Antonia lay afterwards the Roman garrison. The Temple called thousands of priests, many of them with their families, to Jerusalem; while the learned Academies were filled with hundreds, though it may have been mostly poor, scholars and students. In Jerusalem must have been many of the large warehouses for the near commercial harbor of Joppa; and thence, as from the industrial centers of busy Galilee, would the peddler go forth to carry his wares over the land. More especially would the markets of Jerusalem, held, however, in bazaars and streets rather than in squares, be thronged with noisy sellers and bargaining buyers. Thither would Galilee send not only its manufactures, but its provisions: fish (fresh or salted), fruit {Maaser. 2:3.} known for its lusciousness, oil, grape-syrup, and wine. There were special inspectors for these markets — the *Agardemis* or *Agronimos*, — who

tested weights and measures, and officially stamped them, {Baba B. 89 *a.*} tried the soundness of food or drink, {Jer. Ab. Z 44 *b*; Ab. Z. 58 *a.*} and occasionally fixed or lowered the market-prices, enforcing their decision, {Jer. Dem 22 *c.*} if need were, even with the stick. {Yoma 9 *a.*} ^{f299} Not only was there an upper and a lower market in Jerusalem, {Sanh. 89 *a.*} but we read of at least seven special markets: those for cattle, {Erub. 10:9.} wool, iron-ware, {Jos. War 5:8. 1.} clothes, wood, {Ibid. 2:19. 4.} bread, and fruit and vegetables. The original market-days were Monday and Tuesday, afterwards Friday. {Tos. Baba Mets. 3.} The large fairs (*Yeridin*) were naturally confined to the centers of import and export, the borders of Egypt (Gaza), the ancient Phoenician maritime towns (Tyro and Acco), and the Emporium across the Jordan (Botnah). ^{f300} Besides, every caravansary, or khan (*qatlis*, *atlis* κατάλυσις), was a sort of mart, where goods were unloaded, and *especially cattle set out* {Kerith. 3:7;} for sale, and purchases made. But in Jerusalem one may suppose the sellers to have been every day in the market; and the magazines, in which greengrocery and all kinds of meat were sold (the *Beth hashevaqim*), {Makhsh. 6:2} must have been always open. Besides, there were the many shops (*Chanuyoth*) either fronting the streets, or in courtyards, or else movable wooden booths in the streets. Strangely enough, occasionally Jewish women were employed in selling. {Kethub. 9:4} Business was also done in the restaurants and wineshops, of which there were many; where you might be served with some dish: fresh or salted fish, fried locusts, a mess of vegetables, a dish of soup, pastry, sweetmeats, or a piece of a fruit-cake, to be washed down with Judaeen or Galilean wine, Idumaeen vinegar, or foreign beer.

If from these busy scenes we turn to the more aristocratic quarters of the Upper City, ^{f301} we still see the same narrow streets, but tenanted by another class. First, we pass the High-Priest's palace on the slope of the hill, with a lower story under the principal apartments, and a porch in front. Here, on the night of the Betrayal, Peter was 'beneath in the Palace.' {St. ⁴¹⁴⁶Mark 14:66.} Next, we come to Xystos, and then pause for a moment at the Palace of the Maccabees. It lies higher up the hill, and westward from the Xytos. From its halls you can look into the city, and even into the Temple. We know not which of the Maccabees had built this palace. But it was occupied, not by the actually reigning prince, who always resided in the fortress (Baris, afterwards Antonia), but by some other member of the family. From them it passed into the possession of Herod. There Herod

Antipas was when, on that terrible Passover, Pilate sent Jesus from the old palace of Herod to be examined by the Ruler of Galilee. {St. ^{<276}Luke 23:6,7} If these buildings pointed to the difference between the past and present, two structures of Herod's were, perhaps, more eloquent than any words in their accusations of the Idumaean. One of these, at least, would come in sight in passing along the slopes of the Upper City. The Maccabean rule had been preceded by that of corrupt High-Priests, who had prostituted their office to the vilest purposes. One of them, who had changed his Jewish name of Joshua into Jason, had gone so far, in his attempts to Grecianise the people, as to build a Hippodrome and Gymnasium for heathen games. We infer, it stood where the Western hill sloped into the Tyropoeon, to the south-west of the Temple. {Jos. War 2:3. 1} It was probably this which Herod afterwards enlarged and beautified, and turned into a theater. No expense was spared on the great games held there. The theater itself was magnificently adorned with gold, silver, precious stones, and trophies of arms and records of the victories of Augustus. But to the Jews this essentially heathen place, over against their Temple, was cause of deep indignation and plots. {Ant. 15:8. 1} Besides this theater, Herod also built an immense amphitheater, which we must locate somewhere in the north-west, and outside the second city wall. {Ant. 17:10. 2; War 2:3. 1, 2}

All this was Jerusalem above ground. But there was an under ground Jerusalem also, which burrowed everywhere under the city — under the Upper City, under the Temple, beyond the city walls. Its extent may be gathered from the circumstance that, after the capture of the city, besides the living who had sought shelter there, no fewer than 2,000 dead bodies were found in those subterranean streets.

Close by the tracks of heathenism in Jerusalem, and in sharp contrast, was what gave to Jerusalem its intensely Jewish character. It was not only the Temple, nor the festive pilgrims to its feasts and services. But there were hundreds of Synagogues, ^{f302} some for different nationalities, such as the Alexandrians, or the Cyrenians; some for, or perhaps founded by, certain trade-guilds. If possible, the Jewish schools were even more numerous than the Synagogues. Then there were the many Rabbinic Academies; and, besides, you might also see in Jerusalem that mysterious sect, the Essenes, of which the members were easily recognized by their white dress. Essenes, Pharisees, stranger Jews of all hues, and of many dresses and languages! One could have imagined himself almost in another world, a sort of

enchanted land, in this Jewish metropolis, and metropolis of Judaism. When the silver trumpets of the Priests woke the city to prayer, or the strain of Levite music swept over it, or the smoke of the sacrifices hung like another Shekhinah over the Temple, against the green background of Olivet; or when in every street, court, and housetop rose the booths at the Feast of Tabernacles, and at night the sheen of the Temple illumination threw long fantastic shadows over the city; or when, at the Passover, tens of thousands crowded up the Mount with their Paschal lambs, and hundreds of thousands sat down to the Paschal supper, it would be almost difficult to believe, that heathenism was so near, that the Roman was virtually, and would soon be really, master of the land, or that a Herod occupied the Jewish throne.

Yet there he was; in the pride of his power, and the reckless cruelty of his ever-watchful tyranny. Everywhere was his mark. Temples to the gods and to Caesar, magnificent, and magnificently adorned, outside Palestine and in its non-Jewish cities; towns rebuilt or built: *Sebaste* for the ancient Samaria, the splendid city and harbor of *Coesarea* in the west, *Antipatris* (after his father) in the north, *Kypros* and *Phasaelis* (after his mother and brother), and *Agrippeion*; unconquerable fortresses, such as *Essebonitis* and *Machoerus* in Peraea, *Alexandreion*, *Herodeion*, *Hyrkania*, and *Masada* in Judaea — proclaimed his name and sway. But in Jerusalem it seemed as if he had gathered up all his strength. The theater and amphitheater spoke of his Grecianism; Antonia was the representative fortress; for his religion he had built that glorious Temple, and for his residence the noblest of palaces, at the north-western angle of the Upper City, close by where Milo had been in the days of David. It seems almost incredible, that a Herod should have reared the Temple, and yet we can understand his motives. Jewish tradition had it, that a Rabbi (Baba ben Buta) had advised him in this manner to conciliate the people, {Baba B. 3 b} or else thereby to expiate the slaughter of so many Rabbis. {Bemid. R. 14.} ^{f303} Probably a desire to gain popularity, and superstition, may alike have contributed, as also the wish to gratify his love for splendor and building. At the same time, he may have wished to show himself a better Jew than that rabble of Pharisees and Rabbis, who perpetually would cast it in his teeth, that he was an Idumaean. Whatever his origin, he was a true king of the Jews, as great, nay greater, than Solomon himself. Certainly, neither labor nor money had been spared on the Temple.

A thousand vehicles carried up the stone; 10,000 workmen, under the guidance of 1,000 priests, wrought all the costly material gathered into that house, of which Jewish tradition could say, 'He that has not seen the temple of Herod, has never known what beauty is.' {Baba B. 4a.} And yet Israel despized and abhorred the builder! Nor could his apparent work for the God of Israel have deceived the most credulous. In youth he had browbeaten the venerable Sanhedrin, and threatened the city with slaughter and destruction; again and again had he murdered her venerable sages; he had shed like water the blood of her Asmonean princes, and of every one who dared to be free; had stifled every national aspiration in the groans of the torture, and quenched it in the gore of his victims. Not once, nor twice, but six times did he change the High-Priesthood, to bestow it at last on one who bears no good name in Jewish theology, a foreigner in Judaea, an Alexandrian. And yet the power of that Idumaeen was but of yesterday, and of mushroom growth!

CHAPTER 2

THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF HEROD — THE TWO WORLDS IN JERUSALEM.

It is an intensely painful history, ^{f304} in the course of which Herod made his way to the throne. We look back nearly two and a half centuries to where, with the empire of Alexander, Palestine fell to his successors. For nearly a century and a half it continued the battle-field of the Egyptian and Syrian kings (the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae). At last it was a corrupt High-Priesthood, with which virtually the government of the land had all along lain, that betrayed Israel's precious trust. The great-grandson of so noble a figure in Jewish history as Simon the Just (compare ~~2000~~ Ecclesiastes 1.) bought from the Syrians the High-Priestly office of his brother, adopted the heathen name Jason, and sought to Grecianise the people. The sacred office fell, if possible, even lower when, through bribery, it was transferred to his brother Menelaus. Then followed the brief period of the terrible persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, when Judaism was all but exterminated in Palestine. The glorious uprising of the Maccabees called forth all the national elements left in Israel, and kindled afresh the smoldering religious feeling. It seemed like a revival of Old Testament times. And when Judas the Maccabee, with a band so inferior in numbers and discipline, defeated the best of the Syrian soldiery, led by its ablest generals, and, on the anniversary of its desecration by heathen rites, set up again the great altar of burnt-offering, it appeared as if a new Theocracy were to be inaugurated. The ceremonial of that feast of the new 'dedication of the Temple,' when each night the number of lights grew larger in the winter's darkness, seemed symbolic of what was before Israel. But the Maccabees were not the Messiah; nor yet the kingdom, which their sword would have restored — that of Heaven, with its blessings and peace. If ever, Israel might then have learned what Savior to look for.

The period even of promise was more brief than might have been expected. The fervor and purity of the movement ceased almost with its success. It was certainly never the golden age of Israel — not even among those who remained faithful to its God — which those seem to imagine who, forgetful of its history and contests, would trace to it so much that is most precious and spiritual in the Old Testament. It may have been the pressure of

circumstances, but it was anything but a pious, or even a ‘happy’ thought^{f305} of Judas the Maccabee, to seek the alliance of the Romans. From their entrance on the scene dates the decline of Israel’s national cause. For a time, indeed — though after varying fortunes of war — all seemed prosperous. The Maccabees became both High-Priests and Kings. But party-strife and worldliness, ambition and corruption, and Grecianism on the throne, soon brought their sequel in the decline of morale and vigor, and led to the decay and decadence of the Maccabean house. It is a story as old as the Old Testament, and as wide as the history of the world. Contention for the throne among the Maccabees led to the interference of the foreigner. When, after capturing Jerusalem, and violating the sanctity of the Temple, although not plundering its treasures, Pompey placed Hyrcanus II. in the possession of the High-Priesthood, the last of the Maccabean rulers^{f306} was virtually shorn of power. The country was now tributary to Rome, and subject to the Governor of Syria. Even the shadow of political power passed from the feeble hands of Hyrcanus when, shortly afterwards, Gabinius (one of the Roman governors) divided the land into five districts, independent of each other.

But already a person had appeared on the stage of Jewish affairs, who was to give them their last decisive turn. About fifty years before this, the district of Idumaea had been conquered by the Maccabean King Hyrcanus I., and its inhabitants forced to adopt Judaism. By this Idumaea we are not, however, to understand the ancient or Eastern Edom, which was now in the hands of the Nabataeans, but parts of Southern Palestine which the Edomites had occupied since the Babylonian Exile, and especially a small district on the northern and eastern boundary of Judaea, and below Samaria. {Comp. 1 Macc. 6:31} After it became Judaeian, its administration was entrusted to a governor. In the reign of the last of the Maccabees this office devolved on one Antipater, a man of equal cunning and determination. He successfully interfered in the unhappy dispute for the crown, which was at last decided by the sword of Pompey. Antipater took the part of the utterly weak Hyrcanus in that contest with his energetic brother Aristobulus. He soon became the virtual ruler, and Hyrcanus II. only a puppet in his hands. From the accession of Judas Maccabaeus, in 166 B.C., to the year 63 B.C., when Jerusalem was taken by Pompey, only about a century had elapsed. Other twenty-four years, and the last of the Maccabees had given place to the son of Antipater: Herod, surnamed the Great.

The settlement of Pompey did not prove lasting. Aristobulus, the brother and defeated rival of Hyrcanus, was still alive, and his sons were even more energetic than he. The risings attempted by them, the interference of the Parthians on behalf of those who were hostile to Rome, and, lastly, the contentions for supremacy in Rome itself, made this period one of confusion, turmoil, and constant warfare in Palestine. When Pompey was finally defeated by Caesar, the prospects of Antipater and Hyrcanus seemed dark. But they quickly changed sides; and timely help given to Caesar in Egypt brought to Antipater the title of Procurator of Judaea, while Hyrcanus was left in the High-Priesthood, and, at least, nominal head of the people. The two sons of Antipater were now made governors: the elder, Phasaelus, of Jerusalem; the younger, Herod, only twenty-five years old, of Galilee. Here he displayed the energy and determination which were his characteristics, in crushing a guerrilla warfare, of which the deeper springs were probably nationalist. The execution of its leader brought Herod a summons to appear before the Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, for having arrogated to himself the power of life and death. He came, but arrayed in purple, surrounded by a body-guard, and supported by the express direction of the Roman Governor to Hyrcanus, that he was to be acquitted. Even so he would have fallen a victim to the apprehensions of the Sanhedrin, only too well grounded, had he not been persuaded to withdrawn from the city. He returned at the head of an army, and was with difficulty persuaded by his father to spare Jerusalem. Meantime Caesar had named him Governor of Coelesyria.

On the murder of Caesar, and the possession of Syria by Cassius, Antipater and Herod again changed sides. But they rendered such substantial service as to secure favor, and Herod was continued in the position conferred on him by Caesar. Antipater was, indeed, poisoned by a rival, but his sons Herod and Phasaelus repressed and extinguished all opposition. When the battle of Philippi placed the Roman world in the hands of Antony and Octavius, the former obtained Asia. Once more the Idumaeans knew how to gain the new ruler, and Phasaelus and Herod were named Tetrarchs of Judaea. Afterwards, when Antony was held in the toils of Cleopatra, matters seemed, indeed, to assume a different aspect. The Parthians entered the land, in support of the rival Maccabean prince Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus. By treachery, Phasaelus and Hyrcanus were induced to go to the Parthian camp, and made captives. Phasaelus shortly afterwards destroyed himself in his prison,^{f307} while Hyrcanus was deprived of his

ears, to unfit him for the High-Priestly office. And so Antigonus for a short time succeeded both to the High-Priesthood and royalty in Jerusalem. Meantime Herod, who had in vain warned his brother and Hyrcanus against the Parthian, had been able to make his escape from Jerusalem. His family he left to the defence of his brother *Joseph*, in the inaccessible fortress of Masada; himself fled into Arabia, and finally made his way to Rome. There he succeeded, not only with Antony, but obtained the consent of Octavius, and was proclaimed by the Senate King of Judaea. A sacrifice on the Capitol, and a banquet by Antony, celebrated the accession of the new successor of David.

But he had yet to conquer his kingdom. At first he made way by the help of the Romans. Such success, however, as he had gained, was more than lost during his brief absence on a visit to Antony. Joseph, the brother of Herod, was defeated and slain, and Galilee, which had been subdued, revolted again. But the aid which the Romans rendered, after Herod's return from Antony, was much more hearty, and his losses were more than retrieved. Soon all Palestine, with the exception of Jerusalem, was in his hands. While laying siege to it, he went to Samaria, there to wed the beautiful Maccabean princess Mariamme, who had been betrothed to him five years before.^{f308} That ill-fated Queen, and her elder brother Aristobulus, united in themselves the two rival branches of the Maccabean family. Their father was Alexander, the eldest son of Aristobulus, and brother of that Antigonus whom Herod now besieged in Jerusalem; and their mother, Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus II. The uncle of Mariamme was not long able to hold out against the combined forces of Rome and Herod. The carnage was terrible. When Herod, by rich presents, at length induced the Romans to leave Jerusalem, they took Antigonus with them. By desire of Herod he was executed.

This was the first of the Maccabees who fell victim to his jealousy and cruelty. The history which now follows is one of sickening carnage. The next to experience his vengeance were the principal adherents in Jerusalem of his rival Antigonus. Forty-five of the noblest and richest were executed. His next step was to appoint an obscure Babylonian to the High-Priesthood. This awakened the active hostility of Alexandra, the mother of Mariamme, Herod's wife. The Maccabean princess claimed the High-Priesthood for her son Aristobulus. Her intrigues with Cleopatra — and through her with Antony — and the entreaties of Mariamme, the only being whom Herod loved, though in his own mad way, prevailed. At the

age of seventeen Aristobulus was made High-Priest. But Herod, who well knew the hatred and contempt of the Maccabean members of his family, had his mother-in-law watched, a precaution increased after the vain attempt of Alexandra to have herself and her son removed in coffins from Jerusalem, to flee to Cleopatra. Soon the jealousy and suspicions of Herod were raised to murderous madness, by the acclamations which greeted the young Aristobulus at the Feast of Tabernacles. So dangerous a Maccabean rival must be got rid of; and, by secret order of Herod, Aristobulus was drowned while bathing. His mother denounced the murderer, and her influence with Cleopatra, who also hated Herod, led to his being summoned before Antony. Once more bribery, indeed, prevailed; but other troubles awaited Herod.

When obeying the summons of Antony, Herod had committed the government to his uncle Joseph, who was also his brother-in-law, having wedded Salome, the sister of Herod. His mad jealousy had prompted him to direct that, in case of his condemnation, Mariamme was to be killed, that she might not become the wife of another. Unfortunately, Joseph told this to Mariamme, to show how much she was loved. But on the return of Herod, the infamous Salome accused her old husband of impropriety with Mariamme. When it appeared that Joseph had told the Queen of his commission, Herod, regarding it as confirming his sister's charge, ordered him to be executed, without even a hearing. External complications of the gravest kind now supervened. Herod had to cede to Cleopatra the districts of Phoenice and Philistia, and that of Jericho with its rich balsam plantations. Then the dissensions between Antony and Octavius involved him, in the cause of the former, in a war with Arabia, whose king had failed to pay tribute to Cleopatra. Herod was victorious; but he had now to reckon with another master. The battle of Actium {31 B.C.} decided the fate on Antony, and Herod had to make his peace with Octavius. Happily, he was able to do good service to the new cause, ere presenting himself before Augustus. But, in order to be secure from all possible rivals, he had the aged Hyrcanus II. executed, on pretence of intrigues with the Arabs. Herod was successful with Augustus; and when, in the following summer, he furnished him supplies on his march to Egypt, he was rewarded by a substantial addition of territory.

When about to appear before Augustus, Herod had entrusted to one Soemus the charge of Mariamme, with the same fatal directions as formerly to Joseph. Again Mariamme learnt the secret; again the old

calumnies were raised — this time not only by Salome, but also by Kypros, Herod's mother; and again Herod imagined he had found corroborative evidence. Soemus was slain without a hearing, and the beautiful Mariamme executed after a mock trial. The most fearful paroxysm of remorse, passion, and longing for his murdered wife now seized the tyrant, and brought him to the brink of the grave. Alexandra, the mother of Mariamme, deemed the moment favorable for her plots — but she was discovered, and executed. Of the Maccabean race there now remained only distant members, the sons of Babas, who had found an asylum with Costobarus, the Governor of Idumaea, who had wedded Salome after the death of her first husband. Tired of him, as she had been of Joseph, Salome denounced her second husband; and Costobarus, as well as the sons of Babas, fell victims to Herod. Thus perished the family of the Maccabees.

The hand of the maddened tyrant was next turned against his own family. Of his ten wives, we mention only those whose children occupy a place in this history. The son of Doris was Antipater; those of the Maccabean Mariamme, Alexander and Aristobulus; another Mariamme, whose father Herod had made High-Priest, bore him a son named Herod (a name which other of the sons shared); Malthake, a Samaritan, was the mother of Archelaus and Herod Antipas; and, lastly, Cleopatra of Jerusalem bore Philip. The sons of the Maccabean princess, as heirs presumptive, were sent to Rome for their education. On this occasion Herod received, as reward for many services, the country east of the Jordan, and was allowed to appoint his still remaining brother, Pheroras, Tetrarch of Peraea. On their return from Rome the young princes were married: Alexander to a daughter of the King of Cappadocia, and Aristobulus to his cousin Berenice, the daughter of Salome. But neither kinship, nor the yet nearer relation in which Aristobulus now stood to her, could extinguish the hatred of Salome towards the dead Maccabean princess or her children. Nor did the young princes, in their pride of descent, disguise their feelings towards the house of their father. At first, Herod gave not heed to the denunciations of his sister. Presently he yielded to vague apprehensions. As a first step, Antipater, the son of Doris, was recalled from exile, and sent to Rome for education. So the breach became open; and Herod took his sons to Italy, to lay formal accusation against them before Augustus. The wise counsels of the Emperor restored peace for a time. But Antipater now returned to Palestine, and joined his calumnies to those of Salome. Once more the King of Cappadocia succeeded in reconciling Herod and his sons. But in

the end the intrigues of Salome, Antipater, and of an infamous foreigner who had made his way at Court, prevailed. Alexander and Aristobulus were imprisoned, and an accusation of high treason laid against them before the Emperor. Augustus gave Herod full powers, but advised the convocation of a mixed tribunal of Jews and Romans to try the case. As might have been expected, the two princes were condemned to death, and when some old soldiers ventured to intercede for them, 300 of the supposed adherents of the cause were cut down, and the two princes strangled in prison. This happened in Samaria, where, thirty years before, Herod had wedded their ill-fated mother.

Antipater was now the heir presumptive. But, impatient of the throne, he plotted with Herod's brother, Pheroras, against his father. Again Salome denounced her nephew and her brother. Antipater withdrew to Rome; but when, after the death of Pheraras, Herod obtained indubitable evidence that his son had plotted against his life, he lured Antipater to Palestine, where on his arrival he was cast into prison. All that was needed was the permission of Augustus for his execution. It arrived, and was carried out only five days before the death of Herod himself. So ended a reign almost unparalleled for reckless cruelty and bloodshed, in which the murder of the Innocents in Bethlehem formed but so trifling an episode among the many deeds of blood, as to have seemed not deserving of record on the page of the Jewish historian.

But we can understand the feelings of the people towards such a King. They hated the Idumaean; they detested his semi-heathen reign; they abhorred his deeds of cruelty. The King had surrounded himself with foreign councilors, and was protected by foreign mercenaries from Thracia, Germany, and Gaul. {*Jos. Ant.* 17:8. 3} So long as he lived, no woman's honor was safe, no man's life secure. An army of all-powerful spies pervaded Jerusalem, nay — the King himself was said to stoop to that office. {*Ant.* 15:10. 4} If pique or private enmity led to denunciation, the torture would extract any confession from the most innocent. What his relation to Judaism had been, may easily be inferred. He would be a Jew, even build the Temple, advocate the cause of the Jews in other lands, and, in a certain sense, conform to the Law of Judaism. In building the Temple, he was so anxious to conciliate national prejudice, that the Sanctuary itself was entrusted to the workmanship of priests only.

Nor did he ever intrude into the Holy Place, nor interfere with any functions of the priesthood. None of his coins bear devices which could have shocked popular feeling, nor did any of the buildings he erected in Jerusalem exhibit any forbidden emblems. The Sanhedrin did exist during his reign,^{f309} though it must have been shorn of all real power, and its activity confined to ecclesiastical, or semi-ecclesiastical, causes. Strangest of all, he seems to have had at least the passive support of two of the greatest Rabbis, the Pollio and Sameas of Josephus {Ant. 14:9. 4; 15:1 1 10. 4.}, supposed to represent those great figures in Jewish tradition, Abtalion and Shemajah. {Ab. 1:10, 11}^{f310} We can but conjecture, that they preferred even his rule to what had preceded; and hoped it might lead to a Roman Protectorate, which would leave Judea practically independent, or rather under Rabbinic rule.

It was also under the government of Herod, that Hillel and Shammai lived and taught in Jerusalem:^{f311} the two, whom tradition designates as ‘the fathers of old.’ {Eduj. 1. 4} Both gave their names to ‘schools,’ whose direction was generally different, not unfrequently, it seems, chiefly for the sake of opposition. But it is not correct to describe the former as consistently the more liberal and mild.^{f312} The teaching of both was supposed to have been declared by the ‘Voice from Heaven’ (*the Bath-Qol*) as ‘the words of the living God;’ yet the Law was to be henceforth according to the teaching of Hillel. {Jer. Ber. 3 *b*, lines 3 and 2 from bottom}. But to us Hillel is so intensely interesting, not merely as the mild and gentle, nor only as the earnest student who came from Babylon to learn in the Academies of Jerusalem; who would support his family on a third of his scanty wages as a day laborer, that he might pay for entrance into the schools; and whose zeal and merits were only discovered when, after a severe night, in which, from poverty, he had been unable to gain admittance into the Academy, his benumbed form was taken down from the window-sill, to which he had crept up not to lose aught of the precious instruction. And for his sake did they gladly break on that Sabbath the sacred rest. Nor do we think of him, as tradition fables him, the descendant of David, {Ber. R. 98} possessed of every great quality of body, mind, and heart; nor yet as the second Ezra, whose learning placed him at the head of the Sanhedrin, who laid down the principles afterwards applied and developed by Rabbinism, and who was the real founder of traditionalism. Still less do we think of him, as he is falsely represented by some: as he whose principles closely resemble the teaching of Jesus, or, according to

certain writers, were its source. By the side of Jesus we think of him otherwise than this. We remember that, in his extreme old age and near his end, he may have presided over that meeting of Sanhedrin which, in answer to Herod's inquiry, pointed to Bethlehem as the birthplace of the Messiah. {St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 2:4.} ^{f313} We think of him also as the grandfather of that Gamaliel, at whose feet Saul of Tarsus sat. And to us he is the representative Jewish reformer, in the spirit of those times, and in the sense of restoring rather than removing; while we think of Jesus as the Messiah of Israel, in the sense of bringing the Kingdom of God to all men, and opening it to all believers.

And so there were two worlds in Jerusalem, side by side. On the one hand, was Grecianism with its theater and amphitheater; foreigners filling the Court, and crowding the city; foreign tendencies and ways, from the foreign King downwards. On the other hand, was the old Jewish world, becoming now set and ossified in the Schools of Hillel and Shammai, and overshadowed by Temple and Synagogue. And each was pursuing its course, by the side of the other. If Herod had everywhere his spies, the Jewish law provided its two police magistrates in Jerusalem, the only judges who received remuneration. {Jer, Kethub. 35 c; Kethub. 104 b} ^{f314} If Herod judged cruelly and despotically, the Sanhedrin weighed most deliberately, the balance always inclining to mercy. If Greek was the language of the court and camp, and indeed must have been understood and spoken by most in the land, the language of the people, spoken also by Christ and His Apostles, was a dialect of the ancient Hebrew, the Western or Palestinian Aramaic. ^{f315} It seems strange, that this could ever have been doubted. ^{f316} A Jewish Messiah Who would urge His claim upon Israel in Greek, seems almost a contradiction in terms. We know, that the language of the Temple and the Synagogue was Hebrew, and that the addresses of the Rabbis had to be 'targumed' into the vernacular Aramaean — and can we believe that, in a Hebrew service, the Messiah could have risen to address the people in Greek, or that He would have argued with the Pharisees and Scribes in that tongue, especially remembering that its study was actually forbidden by the Rabbis? ^{f317}

Indeed, it was a peculiar mixture of two worlds in Jerusalem: not only of the Grecian and the Jewish, but of piety and frivolity also. The devotion of the people and the liberality of the rich were unbounded. Fortunes were lavished on the support of Jewish learning, the promotion of piety, or the advance of the national cause. Thousands of votive offerings, and the

costly gifts in the Temple, bore evidence of this. priestly avarice had artificially raised the price of sacrificial animals, a rich man would bring into the Temple at his own cost the number requisite for the poor. Charity was not only open-handed, but most delicate, and one who had been in good circumstances would actually be enabled to live according to his former station. ^{f318} Then these Jerusalemites — townspeople, as they called themselves — were so polished, so witty, so pleasant. There was a tact in their social intercourse, and a considerateness and delicacy in their public arrangements and provisions, nowhere else to be found. Their very language was different. There was a Jerusalem dialect, {Bemid. R. 14; ed. Warsh. p. 59a.} quicker, shorter, ‘lighter’ (*Lishna Qalila*). {Baba K.} And their hospitality, especially at festive seasons, was unlimited. No one considered his house his own, and no stranger or pilgrim but found reception. And how much there was to be seen and heard in those luxuriously furnished houses, and at those sumptuous entertainments! In the women’s apartments, friends from the country would see every novelty in dress, adornment, and jewelry, and have the benefit of examining themselves in looking-glasses. To be sure, as being womanish vanity, their use was interdicted to men, except it were to the members of the family of the President of the Sanhedrin, on account of their intercourse with those in authority, just as for the same reason they were allowed to learn Greek. {Jer. Shabb. 7 d} Nor might even women look in the glass on the Sabbath. {Shabb. 149 a} But that could only apply to those carried in the hand, since one might be tempted, on the holy day, to do such servile work as to pull out a grey hair with the pincers attached to the end of the glass; but not to a glass fixed in the lid of a basket; {Kel. 14:6} nor to such as hung on the wall. {Tos. Shabb. 13. ed. Zuckerm. p. 130} And then the lady-visitor might get anything in Jerusalem; from a false tooth to an Arabian veil, a Persian shawl, or an Indian dress!

While the women so learned Jerusalem manners in the inner apartments, the men would converse on the news of the day, or on politics. For the Jerusalemites had friends and correspondents in the most distant parts of the world, and letters were carried by special messengers, {Shabb. 10:4} in a kind of post-bag. Nay, there seem to have been some sort of receiving-offices in towns, {Shabb. 19a} and even something resembling our parcel-post. {Rosh haSh. 9 b} And, strange as it may sound, even a species of newspapers, or broadsheets, appears to have been circulating

(*Mikhtabhin*), not allowed, however, on the Sabbath, unless they treated of public affairs. {Tos. Shabb. 18}

Of course, it is difficult accurately to determine which of these things were in use in the earliest times, or else introduced at a later period. Perhaps, however, it was safer to bring them into a picture of Jewish society. Undoubted, and, alas, too painful evidence comes to us of the luxuriousness of Jerusalem at that time, and of the moral corruption to which it led. It seems only too clear, that such commentations as the Talmud {Shabb. 62 b} gives of ²⁸¹⁶Isaiah 3:16-24, in regard to the manners and modes of attraction practiced by a certain class of the female population in Jerusalem, applied to a far later period than that of the prophet. With this agrees only too well the recorded covert lascivious expressions used by the men, which gives a lamentable picture of the state of morals of many in the city, {Comp. Shabb. 62 b, last line and first of 63 a} and the notices of the indecent dress worn not only by women, {Kel. 24:16; 28:9} but even by corrupt High-Priestly youths. Nor do the exaggerated descriptions of what the Midrash on Lamentations {On ch. 4:2} describes as the dignity of the Jerusalemites; of the wealth which they lavished on their marriages; of the ceremony which insisted on repeated invitations to the guests to a banquet, and that men inferior in rank should not be bidden to it; of the dress in which they appeared; the manner in which the dishes were served, the wine in white crystal vases; and the punishment of the cook who had failed in his duty, and which was to be commensurate to the dignity of the party, give a better impression of the great world in Jerusalem.

And yet it was the City of God, over whose destruction not only the Patriarch and Moses, but the Angelic hosts — nay, the Almighty Himself and His Shekhinah — had made bitterest lamentation. ^{f319} The City of the Prophets, also, since each of them whose birthplace had not been mentioned, must be regarded as having sprung from it. {Meg. 15 a} Equally, even more, marked, but now for joy and triumph, would be the hour of Jerusalem's uprising, when it would welcome its Messiah. Oh, when would He come? In the feverish excitement of expectancy they were only too ready to listen to the voice of any pretender, however coarse and clumsy the imposture. Yet He was at hand, even now coming: only quite other than the Messiah of their dreams. 'He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become children of God, even to them that believe on His Name.'

CHAPTER 3

THE ANNUNCIATION OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST (ST. ~~LUKE~~^{LUKE} 1:5-25.)

It was the time of the Morning Sacrifice.^{f320} As the massive Temple gates slowly swung on their hinges, a three-fold blast from the silver trumpets of the Priests seemed to waken the City, as with the Voice of God, to the life of another day. As its echoes came in the still air across the cleft of the Tyroppoeon, up the slopes of the Upper City, down the busy quarters below, or away to the new suburb beyond, they must, if but for a moment, have brought holier thoughts to all. For, did it not seem to link the present to the past and the future, as with the golden chain of promises that bound the Holy City to the Jerusalem that was above, which in type had already, and in reality would soon descend from heaven? Patriot, saint or stranger, he could not have heard it unmoved, as thrice the summons from within the Temple-gates rose and fell.

It had not come too soon. The Levites on ministry, and those of the laity, whose 'course' it was to act as the representatives of Israel, whether in Palestine or far away, in a sacrifice provided by, and offered for, all Israel, hastened to their duties.^{f321} For already the blush of dawn, for which the Priest on the highest pinnacle of the Temple had watched, to give the signal for beginning the services of the day, had shot its brightness far away to Hebron and beyond. Within the Courts below all had long been busy. At some time previously, unknown to those who waited for the morning, whether at cockcrow, or a little earlier or later, {Tamid 1:2} the superintending Priest had summoned to their sacred functions those who had 'washed,' according to the ordinance. There must have been each day about fifty priests on duty.^{f322} Such of them as were ready now divided into two parties, to make inspection of the Temple courts by torchlight. Presently they met, and trooped to the well-known Hall of Hewn Polished Stones, {Yoma 25 a} where formerly the Sanhedrin had been wont to sit. The ministry for the day was there apportioned. To prevent the disputes of carnal zeal, the 'lot' was to assign to each his function. Four times was it resorted to: twice before, and twice after the Temple-gates were opened. The first act of their ministry had to be done in the grey dawn, by the fitful red light that glowed on the altar of burnt offering, ere the priests had

stirred it into fresh flame. It was scarcely daybreak, when a second time they met for the ‘lot,’ which designated those who were to take part in the sacrifice itself, and who were to trim the golden candlestick, and make ready the altar of incense within the Holy Place. And now morn had broken, and nothing remained before the admission of worshippers but to bring out the lamb, once again to make sure of its fitness for sacrifice, to water it from a golden bowl, and then to lay it in mystic fashion — as tradition described the binding of Isaac — on the north side of the altar, with its face to the west.

All, priests and laity, were present as the Priest, standing on the east side of the altar, from a golden bowl sprinkled with sacrificial blood two sides of the altar, below the red line which marked the difference between ordinary sacrifices and those that were to be wholly consumed. While the sacrifice was prepared for the altar, the priests, whose lot it was, had made ready all within the Holy Place, where the most solemn part of the day’s service was to take place, that of offering the incense, which symbolized Israel’s accepted prayers. Again was the lot (the third) cast to indicate him, who was to be honored with this highest mediatorial act. Only once in a lifetime might any one enjoy that privilege. {Tamid 5:2} Henceforth he was called ‘rich,’ ^{f323} and must leave to his brethren the hope of the distinction which had been granted him. It was fitting that, as the custom was, such lot should be preceded by prayer and confession of their faith ^{f324} on the part of the assembled priests.

It was the first week in October 748 A.U.C., ^{f325} that is, in the sixth year before our present era, when ‘the course of Abia’ ^{f326} — the eighth in the original arrangement of the weekly service — was on duty in the Temple. True this, as indeed most of the twenty-four ‘courses’ into which the Priesthood had been arranged, could not claim identity, only continuity, with those whose names they bore. For only three, or at most four, of the ancient ‘courses’ had returned from Babylon. But the original arrangement had been preserved, the names of the missing courses being retained, and their number filled up by lot from among those who had come back to Palestine. In our ignorance of the number of ‘houses of their father,’ or families,’ which constituted the ‘course of Abia,’ it is impossible to determine, how the services of that week had been apportioned among them. But this is of comparatively small importance, since there is no doubt about the central figure in the scene.

In the group ranged that autumn morning around the superintending Priest was one, on whom the snows of at least sixty winters had fallen. ^{f327} But never during these many years had he been honored with the office of incensing, and it was perhaps well he should have learned, that this distinction came direct from God. Yet the venerable figure of Zacharias must have been well known in the Temple. For, each course was twice a year on ministry, and, unlike the Levites, the priests were not disqualified by age, but only by infirmity. In many respects he seemed different from those around. His home was not in either of the great priest-centers — the Ophel-quarter in Jerusalem, nor in Jericho ^{f328} — but in some small town in those uplands, south of Jerusalem: the historic ‘hill-country of Judea.’ And yet he might have claimed distinction. To be a priest, and married to the daughter of a priest, was supposed to convey twofold honor. ^{f329} That he was surrounded by relatives and friends, and that he was well known and respected throughout his district, appears incidentally from the narrative.

^{f330} It would, indeed, have been strange had it been otherwise. There was much in the popular habits of thought, as well as in the office and privileges of the Priesthood, if worthily represented, to invest it with a veneration which the aggressive claims of Rabbinism could not wholly monopolize. And in this instance Zacharias and Elisabeth, his wife, were truly ‘righteous,’ ^{f330} in the sense of walking, so far as man could judge, ‘blamelessly,’ alike in those commandments which were specially binding on Israel, and in those statutes that were of universal bearing on mankind. ^{f331} No doubt their piety assumed in some measure the form of the time, being, if we must use the expression, Pharisaic, though in the good, not the evil sense of it.

There is much about those earlier Rabbis — Hillel, Gamaliel, and others — to attract us, and their spirit oftentimes sharply contrasts with the narrow bigotry, the self-glory, and the unspiritual externalism of their successors. We may not unreasonably infer, that the *Tsaddiq* in the quiet home of the hill-country was quite other than the self-asserting Rabbi, whose dress and gait, voice and manner, words and even prayers, were those of the religious *parvenu*, pushing his claims to distinction before angels and men. Such a household as that of Zacharias and Elisabeth would have all that was beautiful in the religion of the time: devotion towards God; a home of affection and purity; reverence towards all that was sacred in things Divine and human; ungrudging, self-denying, loving charity to the poor; the tenderest regard for the feelings of others, so as not to raise a blush, nor to

wound their hearts; ^{f332} above all, intense faith and hope in the higher and better future of Israel. Of such, indeed, there must have been not a few in the land — the quiet, the prayerful, the pious, who, though certainly not Sadducees nor Essenes, but reckoned with the Pharisaic party, waited for the consolation of Israel, and received it with joy when manifested. Nor could aught more certainly have marked the difference between the one and the other section than on a matter, which must almost daily, and most painfully have forced itself on Zacharias and Elisabeth. There were among the Rabbis those who, remembering the words of the prophet, {~~3023~~ Malachi 2:13 16} spoke in most pathetic language of the wrong of parting from the wife of youth, {Gitt. 90 *b*} and there were those to whom the bare fact of childlessness rendered separation a religious duty. {Yeb. 64 *a*} Elisabeth was childless. For many a year this must have been the burden of Zacharias' prayer; the burden also of reproach, which Elisabeth seemed always to carry with her. They had waited together these many years, till in the evening of life the flower of hope had closed its fragrant cup; and still the two sat together in the twilight, content to wait in loneliness, till night would close around them.

But on that bright autumn morning in the Temple no such thoughts would come to Zacharias. For the first, and for the last time in life the lot had marked him for incensing, and every thought must have centered on what was before him. Even outwardly, all attention would be requisite for the proper performance of his office. First, he had to choose two of his special friends or relatives, to assist in his sacred service. Their duties were comparatively simple. One reverently removed what had been left on the altar from the previous evening's service; then, worshipping, retired backwards. The second assistant now advanced, and, having spread to the utmost verge of the golden altar the live coals taken from that of burnt-offering, worshipped and retired. Meanwhile the sound of the 'organ' (the Magrephah), heard to the most distant parts of the Temple, and, according to tradition, far beyond its precincts, had summoned priests, Levites, and people to prepare for whatever service or duty was before them. For, this was the innermost part of the worship of the day. But the celebrant Priest, bearing the golden censer, stood alone within the Holy Place, lit by the sheen of the seven-branched candlestick. Before him, somewhat farther away, towards the heavy Veil that hung before the Holy of Holies, was the golden altar of incense, on which the red coals glowed. To his right (the left of the altar, that is, on the north side) was the table of shewbread; to

his left, on the right or south side of the altar, was the golden candlestick. And still he waited, as instructed to do, till a special signal indicated, that the moment had come to spread the incense on the altar, as near as possible to the Holy of Holies. Priests and people had reverently withdrawn from the neighborhood of the altar, and were prostrate before the Lord, offering unspoken worship, in which record of past deliverance, longing for mercies promised in the future, and entreaty for present blessing and peace, ^{f333} seemed the ingredients of the incense, that rose in a fragrant cloud of praise and prayer. Deep silence had fallen on the worshippers, as if they watched to heaven the prayers of Israel, ascending in the cloud of ‘odors’ that rose from the golden altar in the Holy Place. {~~Exod~~ Revelation 5:8; ~~Exod~~ 8:1, 3, 4} Zacharias waited, until he saw the incense kindling. Then he also would have ‘bowed down in worship,’ and reverently withdrawn, {Tamid 6:3} had not a wondrous sight arrested his steps.

On the right (or south) side of the altar, between it and the golden candlestick, stood what he could not but recognize as an Angelic form. ^{f334} Never, indeed, had even tradition reported such a vision to an ordinary Priest in the act of incensing. The two super-natural apparitions recorded — one of an Angel each year of the Pontificate of Simon the Just; the other in that blasphemous account of the vision of the Almighty by Ishmael, the son of Elisha, and of the conversation which then ensued {Ber. 7 a} ^{f335} — had both been vouchsafed to High-Priests, and on the Day of Atonement. Still, there was always uneasiness among the people as any mortal approached the immediate Presence of God, and every delay in his return seemed ominous. {Jer. Yoma 42 c} No wonder, then, that Zacharias ‘was troubled, and fear fell on him,’ as of a sudden — probably just after he had spread the incense on the altar, and was about to offer his parting prayer — he beheld what afterwards he knew to be the Angel Gabriel (‘the might of God’). Apart from higher considerations, there could perhaps be no better evidence of the truth of this narrative than its accord with psychological facts. An Apocryphal narrative would probably have painted the scene in agreement with what, in the view of such a writer, should have been the feelings of Zacharias, and the language of the Angel. ^{f336} The Angel would have commenced by referring to Zacharias’ prayers for the coming of a Messiah, and Zacharias would have been represented in a highly enthusiastic state. Instead of the strangely prosaic objection which he offered to the Angelic announcement, there would have been a burst of spiritual sentiment, or what passed for such. But all this would have been

psychologically untrue. There are moments of moral faintness, so to speak, when the vital powers of the spiritual heart are depressed, and, as in the case of the Disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration and in the Garden of Gethsemane, the physical part of our being and all that is weakest in us assert their power.

It was true to this state of semi-consciousness, that the Angel first awakened within Zacharias the remembrance of life-long prayers and hopes, which had now passed into the background of his being, and then suddenly startled him by the promise of their realization. But that Child of so many prayers, who was to bear the significant name of John (Jehochanan, or Jochanan), ‘the Lord is gracious,’ was to be the source of joy and gladness to a far wider circle than that of the family. This might be called the first rung of the ladder by which the Angel would take the priest upwards. Nor was even this followed by an immediate disclosure of what, in such a place, and from such a messenger, must have carried to a believing heart the thrill of almost unspeakable emotion. Rather was Zacharias led upwards, step by step. The Child was to be great before the Lord; not only an ordinary, but a life-Nazarite, ^{f337} as Samson and Samuel of old had been. Like them, he was not to consecrate himself, but from the inception of life wholly to belong to God, for His work. And, greater than either of these representatives of the symbolical import of Nazarism, he would combine the twofold meaning of their mission — outward and inward might in God, only in a higher and more spiritual sense. For this life-work he would be filled with the Holy Ghost, from the moment life woke within him. Then, as another Samson, would he, in the strength of God, lift the axe to each tree to be felled, and, like another Samuel, turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God. Nay, combining these two missions, as did Elijah on Mount Carmel, he should, in accordance with prophecy, { ^{<300E>}Malachi 3:1 } precede the Messianic manifestation, and, not indeed in the person or form, but in the spirit and power of Elijah, accomplish the typical meaning of his mission, as on that day of decision it had risen as the burden of his prayer { ^{<11857>}1 Kings 18:37 } , that is, in the words of prophecy, { ^{<300E>}Malachi 4:5, 6 } ‘turn the heart of the fathers to the children,’ which, in view of the coming dispensation, would be ‘the disobedient (*to walk*) in the wisdom of the just.’ {St. ^{<0017>}Luke 1:17; comp. St. ^{<0119>}Matthew 11:19} Thus would this new Elijah ‘make ready for the Lord a people prepared.’

If the apparition of the Angel, in that place, and at that time, had overwhelmed the aged priest, the words which he heard must have filled him with such bewilderment, that for the moment he scarcely realized their meaning. One idea alone, which had struck its roots so long in his consciousness, stood out: A son — while, as it were in the dim distance beyond, stretched, as covered with a mist of glory, all those marvellous things that were to be connected with him. So, when age or strong feeling renders us almost insensible to the present, it is ever that which connects itself with the past, rather than with the present, which emerges first and strongest in our consciousness. And so it was the obvious doubt, that would suggest itself, which fell from his lips — almost unconscious of what he said. Yet there was in his words an element of faith also, or at least of hope, as he asked for some pledge or confirmation of what he had heard.

It is this demand of some visible sign, by which to ‘know’ all that the Angel had promised, which distinguishes the doubt of Zacharias from that of Abraham, { <0171>Genesis 17:17, 18 } or of Manoah and his wife, { <0182>Judges 8:21 } under somewhat similar circumstances — although, otherwise also, even a cursory reading must convey the impression of most marked differences. Nor ought we perhaps to forget, that we are on the threshold of a dispensation, to which faith is the only entrance. This door Zacharias was now to hold ajar, a dumb messenger. He that would not speak the praises of God, but asked a sign, received it. His dumbness was a sign — though the sign, as it were the dumb child of the prayer of unbelief, was its punishment also. And yet, when rightly applied, a sign in another sense also — a sign to the waiting multitude in the Temple; a sign to Elisabeth; to all who knew Zacharias in the hill-country; and to the priest himself, during those nine months of retirement and inward solitude; a sign also that would kindle into flame in the day when God would loosen his tongue.

A period of unusual length had passed, since the signal for incensing had been given. The prayers of the people had been offered, and their anxious gaze was directed towards the Holy Place. At last Zacharias emerged to take his stand on the top of the steps which led from the Porch to the Court of the Priests, waiting to lead in the priestly benediction, { <0183>Numbers 6:24-26 } that preceded the daily meat-offering and the chant of the Psalms of praise, accompanied with joyous sound of music, as the drink-offering was poured out. But already the sign of Zacharias was to be a sign to all the people. The pieces of the sacrifices had been ranged in due

order on the altar of burnt-offering; the priests stood on the steps to the porch, and the people were in waiting. Zacharias essayed to speak the words of benediction, unconscious that the stroke had fallen. But the people knew it by his silence, that he had seen a vision in the Temple. Yet as he stood helpless, trying by signs to indicate it to the awestruck assembly, he remained dumb.

Wondering, they had dispersed — people and priests. The day's service over, another family of ministrants took the place of those among whom Zacharias had been; and again, at the close of the week's service, another 'course' that of Abia. They returned to their homes — some to Ophel, some to Jericho, some to their quiet dwellings in the country. But God fulfilled the word which He had spoken by His Angel.

Before leaving this subject, it may be well to inquire into the relation between the events just described, and the customs and expectations of the time. The scene in the Temple, and all the surroundings, are in strictest accordance with what we know of the services of the Sanctuary. In a narrative that lays hold on some details of a very complex service, such entire accuracy conveys the impression of general truthfulness. Similarly, the sketch of Zacharias and Elisabeth is true to the history of the time, though Zacharias could not have been one of the 'learned,' nor to the Rabbinites, a model priest. They would have described him as an 'idiot,' ^{f338} or common, and as an *Amha-arets*, a 'rustic' priest, and treated him with benevolent contempt. ^{f339} The Angelic apparition, which he saw, was wholly unprecedented, and could therefore not have lain within range of common expectation; though the possibility, or rather the fear, of some contact with the Divine was always present to the popular mind. But it is difficult to conceive how, if not true, the invention of such a vision in such circumstances could have suggested itself. This difficulty is enhanced by the obvious difference between the Evangelic narrative, and the popular ideas of the time. Far too much importance has here been attached by a certain class of writers to a Rabbinic saying, {Jer. haSh. 56 *d*, line 10 from bottom} that the names of the Angels were brought from Babylon. For, not only was this saying (of Ben Lakish) only a clever Scriptural deduction (as the context shows), and not even an actual tradition, but no competent critic would venture to lay down the principle, that isolated Rabbinic sayings in the Talmud are to be regarded as sufficient foundation for historical facts. On the other hand, Rabbinic tradition does lay it down, that the names of the Angels were derived from their mission, and might be

changed with it. Thus the reply of the Angel to the inquiry of Manoah {~~<7138>~~Judges 13:18} is explained as implying, that he knew not what other name might be given him in the future. In the Book of Daniel, to which the son of Lakish refers, the only two Angelic names mentioned are Gabriel {~~<7102>~~Daniel 9:21} and Michael, {~~<7102>~~10:21} while the appeal to the Book of Daniel, as evidence of the Babylonish origin of Jewish Angelology, comes with strange inconsistency from writers who date it in Maccabean times.

^{f340} But the question of Angelic nomenclature is quite secondary. The real point at issue is, whether or not the Angelology and Demonology of the New Testament was derived from contemporary Judaism. The opinion, that such was the case, has been so dogmatically asserted, as to have almost passed among a certain class as a settled fact. That nevertheless such was *not* the case, is capable of the most ample proof. Here also, with similarity of form, slighter than usually, there is absolutely contrast of substance. ^{f341}

Admitting that the names of Gabriel and Michael must have been familiar to the mind of Zacharias, some not unimportant differences must be kept in view. Thus, Gabriel was regarded in tradition as inferior to Michael; and, though both were connected with Israel, Gabriel was represented as chiefly the minister of justice, and Michael of mercy; while, thirdly, Gabriel was supposed to stand on the left, and not (as in the Evangelic narrative) on the right, side of the throne of glory. Small as these divergences may seem, they are all-important, when derivation of one set of opinions from another is in question. Finally, as regarded the coming of Elijah as forerunner of the Messiah, it is to be observed that, according to Jewish notions, he was to appear *personally*, and not merely 'in spirit and power.' In fact, tradition represents his ministry and appearances as almost continuous — not only immediately before the coming of Messiah, but at all times. Rabbinic writings introduce him on the scene, not only frequently, but on the most incongruous occasions, and for the most diverse purposes. In this sense it is said of him, that he always liveth. {Moed k. 26a} Sometimes, indeed, he is blamed, as for the closing words in his prayer about the turning of the heart of the people, {~~<11837>~~1 Kings 18:37 (in Hebrew without 'that' and 'again'); see Ber. 31 b, last two lines} and even his sacrifice on Carmel was only excused on the ground of express command. {Bemidbar R. 14. Another view in Par. 13} But his great activity as precursor of the Messiah is to resolve doubts of all kinds; to reintroduce those who had been violently and improperly extruded from the congregation of Israel, and

vice-versa; to make peace; while, finally, he was connected with the raising of the dead. {This in Shir hash R. 1 ed. Warshau, p. 3 a.} ^{f342} But nowhere is he prominently designated as intended 'to make ready for the Lord a people prepared.' ^{f343}

Thus, from whatever source the narrative may be supposed to have been derived, its details certainly differ, in almost all particulars, from the theological notions current at the time. And the more Zacharias meditated on this in the long solitude of his enforced silence, the more fully must new spiritual thoughts have come to him. As for Elisabeth, those tender feelings of woman, which ever shrink from the disclosure of the dearest secret of motherhood, were intensely deepened and sanctified in the knowledge of all that had passed. Little as she might understand the full meaning of the future, it must have been to her, as if she also now stood in the Holy Place, gazing towards the Veil which concealed the innermost Presence. Meantime she was content with, nay — felt the need of, absolute retirement from other fellowship than that of God and her own heart. Like her husband, she too would be silent and alone — till another voice called her forth. Whatever the future might bring, sufficient for the present, that thus the Lord had done to her, in days in which He looked down to remove her reproach among men. The removal of that burden, its manner, its meaning, its end, were all from God, and with God; and it was fitting to be quite alone and silent, till God's voice would again wake the echoes within. And so five months passed in absolute retirement.

CHAPTER 4

THE ANNUNCIATION OF JESUS THE MESSIAH, AND THE BIRTH OF HIS FORERUNNER.

(St. ~~400b~~ Matthew 1.; St. ~~402b~~ Luke 1:26-80.)

From the Temple to Nazareth! It seems indeed most fitting that the Evangelic story should have taken its beginning within the Sanctuary, and at the time of sacrifice. Despite its outward veneration for them, the Temple, its services, and specially its sacrifices, were, by an inward logical necessity, fast becoming a superfluity for Rabbinism. But the new development, passing over the intruded elements, which were, after all, of rationalistic origin, connected its beginning directly with the Old Testament dispensation, its sacrifices, priesthood, and promises. In the Sanctuary, in connection with sacrifice, and through the priesthood, such was significantly the beginning of the era of fulfillment. And so the great religious reformation of Israel under Samuel had also begun in the Tabernacle, which had so long been in the background. But if, even in this Temple-beginning, and in the communication to, and selection of an idiot ‘priest,’ there was marked divergence from the Rabbinic ideal, that difference widens into the sharpest contrast, as we pass from the Forerunner to the Messiah, from the Temple to Galilee, from the ‘idiot’ priest to the humble, unlettered family of Nazareth. It is necessary here to recall our general impression of Rabbinism: its conception of God,^{f344} and of the highest good and ultimate object of all things, as concentrated in learned study, pursued in Academies; and then to think of the unmitigated contempt with which they were wont to speak of Galilee, and of the Galileans, whose very patois was an offence; of the utter abhorrence with which they regarded the unlettered country-people, in order to realize, how such an household as that of Joseph and Mary would be regarded by the leaders of Israel. A Messianic announcement, not the result of learned investigation, nor connected with the Academies, but in the Sanctuary, to a ‘rustic’ priest; an Elijah unable to untie the intellectual or ecclesiastical knots, of whose mission, indeed, this formed no part at all; and a Messiah, the offspring of a Virgin in Galilee betrothed to a humble workman — assuredly, such a picture of the fulfillment of Israel’s hope could never have been conceived by contemporary Judaism. There was in such a

Messiah absolutely nothing — past, present, or possible; intellectually, religiously, or even nationally — to attract, but all to repel. And so we can, at the very outset of this history, understand the infinite contrast which it embodied — with all the difficulties to its reception, even to those who became disciples, as at almost every step of its progress they were, with ever fresh surprise, recalled from all that they had formerly thought, to that which was so entirely new and strange.

And yet, just as Zacharias may be described as the representative of the good and the true in the Priesthood at that time, so the family of Nazareth as a typical Israelitish household. We feel, that the scantiness of particulars here supplied by the Gospels, was intended to prevent the human interest from overshadowing the grand central Fact, to which alone attention was to be directed. For, the design of the Gospels was manifestly not to furnish a biography of Jesus the Messiah,^{f345} but, in organic connection with the Old Testament, to tell the history of the long-promised establishment of the Kingdom of God upon earth. Yet what scanty details we possess of the ‘Holy Family’ and its surroundings may here find a place.

The highlands which form the central portion of Palestine are broken by the wide, rich plain of Jezreel, which severs Galilee from the rest of the land. This was always the great battle-field of Israel. Appropriately, it is shut in as between mountain-walls. That along the north of the plain is formed by the mountains of Lower Galilee, cleft about the middle by a valley that widens, till, after an hour’s journey, we stand within an enclosure which seems almost one of Nature’s own sanctuaries. As in an amphitheater, fifteen hill-tops rise around. That to the west is the highest, about 500 feet. On its lower slopes nestles a little town, its narrow streets ranged like terraces. This is Nazareth, probably the ancient Sarid (or En-Sarid), which, in the time of *Joshua*, marked the northern boundary of Zebulun.
{ ~~(6990)~~ Joshua 19:10,11 }^{f346}

Climbing this steep hill, fragrant with aromatic plants, and bright with rich-colored flowers, a view almost unsurpassed opens before us. For, the Galilee of the time of Jesus was not only of the richest fertility, cultivated to the utmost, and thickly covered with populous towns and villages, but the center of every known industry, and the busy road of the world’s commerce. Northward the eye would sweep over a rich plain; rest here and there on white towns, glittering in the sunlight; then quickly travel over the romantic hills and glens which form the scenes of Solomon’s Song, till,

passing beyond Safed (the Tsephath of the Rabbis — the ‘city set on a hill’), the view is bounded by that giant of the far-off mountain-chain, snow-tipped Hermon. Westward stretched a like scene of beauty and wealth — a land not lonely, but wedded; not desolate, but teeming with life; while, on the edge of the horizon, lay purple Carmel; beyond it a fringe of silver sand, and then the dazzling sheen of the Great Sea. In the farthest distance, white sails, like wings outspread towards the ends of the world; nearer, busy ports; then, centers of industry; and close by, travelled roads, all bright in the pure Eastern air and rich glow of the sun. But if you turned eastwards, the eye would soon be arrested by the wooded height of Tabor, yet not before attention had been riveted by the long, narrow string of fantastic caravans, and curiosity roused by the motley figures, of all nationalities and in all costumes, busy binding the East to the West by that line of commerce that passed along the route winding around Tabor. And when, weary with the gaze, you looked once more down on little Nazareth nestling on the breast of the mountain, the eye would rest on a scene of tranquil, homely beauty. Just outside the town, in the north-west, bubbled the spring or well, the trysting-spot of townspeople, and welcome resting-place of travellers. Beyond it stretched lines of houses, each with its flat roof standing out distinctly against the clear sky; watered, terraced gardens, gnarled wide-spreading figtrees, graceful feathery palms, scented oranges, silvery olive-trees, thick hedges, rich pasture-land, then the bounding hills to the south; and beyond, the seemingly unbounded expanse of the wide plain of Esdraelon!

And yet, withdrawn from the world as, in its enclosure of mountains, Nazareth might seem, we must not think of it as a lonely village which only faint echoes reached of what roused the land beyond. With reverence be it said: such a place might have suited the training of the contemplative hermit, not the upbringing of Him Whose sympathies were to be with every clime and race. Nor would such an abode have furnished what (with all due acknowledgment of the supernatural) we mark as a constant, because a rationally necessary, element in Scripture history: that of inward preparedness in which the higher and the Divine afterwards find their ready points of contact.

Nor was it otherwise in Nazareth. The two great interests which stirred the land, the two great factors in the religious future of Israel, constantly met in the retirement of Nazareth. The great caravan-route which led from Acco on the sea to Damascus divided at its commencement into three

roads: the most northern passing through Caesarea Philippi; the Upper Galilean; and the Lower Galilean. The latter, the ancient *Via Maris* led through Nazareth, and thence either by Cana, or else along the northern shoulder of Mount Tabor, to the Lake of Gennesaret, each of these roads soon uniting with the Upper Galilean.^{f347} Hence, although the stream of commerce between Acco and the East was divided into three channels, yet, as one of these passed through Nazareth, the quiet little town was not a stagnant pool of rustic seclusion. Men of all nations, busy with another life than that of Israel, would appear in the streets of Nazareth; and through them thoughts, associations, and hopes connected with the great outside world be stirred. But, on the other hand, Nazareth was also one of the great centers of Jewish Temple-life. It has already been indicated that the Priesthood was divided into twenty-four ‘course’ which, in turn, ministered in the Temple. The Priests of the ‘course’ which was to be on duty always gathered in certain towns, whence they went up in company to Jerusalem, while those of their number who were unable to go spent the week in fasting and prayer. Now Nazareth was one of these Priest-centers,^{f348} and although it may well have been, that comparatively few in distant Galilee conformed to the Priestly regulations — some must have assembled there in preparation for the sacred functions, or appeared in its Synagogue. Even the fact, so well known to all, of this living connection between Nazareth and the Temple, must have wakened peculiar feelings. Thus, to take the wider view, a double symbolic significance attached to Nazareth, since through it passed alike those who carried on the traffic of the world, and those who ministered in the Temple.^{f349}

We may take it, that the people of Nazareth were like those of other little towns similarly circumstanced:^{f350} with all the peculiarities of the impulsive, straight-spoken, hot-blooded, brave, intensely national Galileans;^{f351} with the deeper feelings and almost instinctive habits of thought and life, which were the outcome of long centuries of Old Testament training; but also with the petty interest and jealousies of such places, and with all the ceremonialism and punctilious self-assertion of Orientals. The cast of Judaism prevalent in Nazareth would, of course, be the same as in Galilee generally. We know, that there were marked divergences from the observances in that stronghold of Rabbinism,^{f352} Judaea — indicating greater simplicity and freedom from the constant intrusion of traditional ordinances. The home-life would be all the purer, that the veil of wedded life was not so coarsely lifted as in Judaea, nor its

sacred secrecy interfered with by an Argus-eyed legislation.^{f353} The purity of betrothal in Galilee was less likely to be sullied, {Keth. 12 a} and weddings were more simple than in Judaea — without the dubious institution of groomsmen, {Keth. 12 a, and often} ^{f354} or ‘friends of the bridegroom,’ {St. ~~John~~ John 3:29.} whose office must not unfrequently have degenerated into utter coarseness. The bride was chosen, not as in Judaea, where money was too often the motive, but as in Jerusalem, with chief regard to ‘a fair degree;’ and widows were (as in Jerusalem) more tenderly cared for, as we gather even from the fact, that they had a life-right of residence in their husband’s house.

Such a home was that to which Joseph was about to bring the maiden, to whom he had been betrothed. Whatever view may be taken of the genealogies in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke, whether they be regarded as those of Joseph and of Mary, ^{f355} or, which seems the more likely, ^{f356} as those of Joseph only, marking his natural and his legal descent ^{f357} from David, or vice versa ^{f358}, there can be no question, that both Joseph and Mary were of the royal lineage of David. ^{f359} Most probably the two were nearly related, ^{f360} while Mary could also claim kinship with the Priesthood, being, no doubt on her mother’s side, a ‘blood-relative’ of Elisabeth, the Priest-wife of Zacharias. {St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 1:36.} ^{f361} Even this seems to imply, that Mary’s family must shortly before have held higher rank, for only with such did custom sanction any alliance on the part of Priests. ^{f362} But at the time of their betrothal, alike Joseph and Mary were extremely poor, as appears — not indeed from his being a carpenter, since a trade was regarded as almost a religious duty — but from the offering at the presentation of Jesus in the Temple. {St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 2:24.} Accordingly, their betrothal must have been of the simplest, and the dowry settled the smallest possible. ^{f363} Whichever of the two modes of betrothal ^{f364} may have been adopted: in the presence of witnesses — either by solemn word of mouth, in due prescribed formality, with the added pledge of a piece of money, however small, or of money’s worth for use; or else by writing (the so-called *Shitre Erusin*) — there would be no sumptuous feast to follow; and the ceremony would conclude with some such benediction as that afterwards in use: ‘Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the World, Who hath sanctified us by His Commandments, and enjoined us about incest, and forbidden the betrothed, but allowed us those wedded by *Chuppah* (the marriage-baldachino) and betrothal. Blessed art Thou, Who sanctifiest Israel by Chuppah and betrothal’ — the whole being

perhaps concluded by a benediction over the statutory cup of wine, which was tasted in turn by the betrothed. From that moment Mary was the betrothed wife of Joseph; their relationship as sacred, as if they had already been wedded. Any breach of it would be treated as adultery; nor could the band be dissolved except, as after marriage, by regular divorce. Yet months might intervene between the betrothal and marriage. ^{f365}

Five months of Elisabeth's sacred retirement had passed, when a strange messenger brought its first tidings to her kinswoman in far-off Galilee. It was not in the solemn grandeur of the Temple, between the golden altar of incense and the seven-branched candlesticks that the Angel Gabriel now appeared, but in the privacy of a humble home at Nazareth. The greatest honor bestowed on man was to come amidst circumstances of deepest human lowliness, as if the more clearly to mark the exclusively Divine character of what was to happen. And, although the awe of the Supernatural must unconsciously have fallen upon her, it was not so much the sudden appearance of the mysterious stranger in her retirement that startled the maiden, as the words of his greeting, implying unthought blessing. The 'Peace to thee' ^{f366} was, indeed, the well-known salutation, while the words, 'The Lord is with thee' might waken the remembrance of the Angelic call, to great deliverance in the past. {~~ORIG~~ Judges 6:12.} But this designation of 'highly favored' ^{f367} came upon her with bewildering surprise, perhaps not so much from its contrast to the humbleness of her estate, as from the self-conscious humility of her heart. And it was intended so, for of all feelings this would now most become her. Accordingly, it is this story of special 'favor' or grace, which the Angel traces in rapid outline, from the conception of the Virgin-Mother to the distinctive, Divinely-given Name, symbolic of the meaning of His coming; His absolute greatness; His acknowledgment as the Son of God; and the fulfillment in Him of the great Davidic hope, with its never-ceasing royalty, ^{f368} and its never-ending, boundless Kingdom. ^{f369}

In all this, however marvellous, there could be nothing strange to those who cherished in their hearts Israel's great hope, not merely as an article of abstract belief, but as matter of certain fact — least of all to the maiden of the lineage of David, betrothed to him of the house and lineage of David. So long as the hand of prophetic blessing rested on the house of David, and before its finger had pointed to the individual who 'found favor' in the highest sense, the consciousness of possibilities, which scarce dared shape themselves into definite thoughts, must at times have stirred nameless

feelings — perhaps the more often in circumstances of outward depression and humility, such as those of the ‘Holy Family.’ Nor was there anything strange even in the naming of the yet unconceived Child. It sounds like a saying current among the people of old, this of the Rabbis, {Pirque’ de R. El. 32, at the beginning} concerning the six whose names were given before their birth: Isaac, Ishmael, Moses, Solomon, Josiah, and ‘the Name of the Messiah, Whom may the Holy One, blessed be His Name, bring quickly in our days!’ ^{f370} But as for the deeper meaning of the name Jesus, {St. ⁴⁰⁰²Matthew 1:21} which, like an unopened bud, enclosed the flower of His Passion, that was mercifully yet the unthought-of secret of that sword, which should pierce the soul of the Virgin-Mother, and which only His future history would lay open to her and to others.

Thus, on the supposition of the readiness of her believing heart, and her entire self-unconsciousness, it would have been only the glorious announcement of the impending event, which would absorb her thinking — with nothing strange about it, or that needed further light, than the *how* of her own connection with it. ^{f371} And the words, which she spake, were not of trembling doubt, that required to lean on the staff of a ‘sign,’ but rather those of enquiry, for the further guidance of a willing self-surrender. The Angel had pointed her opened eyes to the shining path: that was not strange; only, that *She* should walk in it, seemed so. And now the Angel still further unfolded it in words which, however little she may have understood their full meaning, had again nothing strange about them, save once more that *she* should be thus ‘favored’; words which, even to her understanding, must have carried yet further thoughts of Divine *favor*, and so deepened her humility. For, the idea of the activity of the Holy Ghost in all great events was quite familiar to Israel at the time, ^{f372} even though the Individuation of the Holy Ghost may not have been fully apprehended. Only, that they expected such influences to rest exclusively upon those who were either mighty, or rich, or wise. {Nedar. 38 a} And of this twofold manifestation of miraculous ‘favor’ — that she, and as a Virgin, should be its subject — Gabriel, ‘the might of God,’ gave this unasked sign, in what had happened to her kinswoman Elisabeth.

The sign was at the same time a direction. The first, but also the ever-deepening desire in the heart of Mary, when the Angel left her, must have been to be away from Nazareth, and for the relief of opening her heart to a woman, in all things like-minded, who perhaps might speak blessed words to her. And to such an one the Angel himself seemed to have directed her.

It is only what we would have expected, that ‘with haste’ she should have resorted to her kinswoman, without loss of time, and before she would speak to her betrothed of what even in wedded life is the first secret whispered. ^{f373}

It could have been no ordinary welcome that would greet the Virgin-Mother, on entering the house of her kinswoman. Elisabeth must have learnt from her husband the destiny of their son, and hence the near Advent of the Messiah. But she could not have known either *when*, or of *whom* He would be born. When, by a sign not quite strange to Jewish expectancy, ^{f374} she recognized in her near kinswoman the Mother of her Lord, her salutation was that of a mother to a mother — the mother of the ‘preparer’ to the mother of Him for Whom he would prepare. To be more precise: the words which, filled with the Holy Ghost, she spake, were the mother’s utterance, to the mother, of the homage which her unborn babe offered to his Lord; while the answering hymn of Mary was the offering of that homage unto God. It was the antiphonal morning-psalmody of the Messianic day as it broke, of which the words were still all of the old dispensation, ^{f375} but their music of the new; the keynote being that of ‘favor,’ ‘grace,’ struck by the Angel in his first salutation: ‘favor’ to the Virgin; {1st stanza vv. 46-49} ‘favor,’ eternal ‘favor’ to all His humble and poor ones; {2nd stanza, vv. 50-53} and ‘favor’ to Israel, stretching in golden line from the calling of Abraham to the glorious future that now opened. {3rd stanza, vv. 54-55} Not one of these fundamental ideas but lay strictly within the range of the Old Testament; and yet all of them now lay beyond it, bathed in the golden light of the new day. Miraculous it all is, and professes to be; not indeed in the connection of these events, which succeed each other with psychological truthfulness; nor yet in their language, which is of the times and the circumstances; but in the underlying facts. ^{f376} And for these there can be no other evidence than the Life, the Death, and the Resurrection of Jesus the Messiah. If He was such, and if He really rose from the dead, then, with all soberness and solemnity, such inception of His appearance seems almost a logical necessity. But of this whole narrative it may be said, that such inception of the Messianic appearance, such announcement of it, and such manner of His Coming, could never have been invented by contemporary Judaism; indeed, ran directly counter to all its preconceptions. ^{f377}

Three months had passed since the Virgin-Mother entered the home of her kinswoman. And now she must return to Nazareth. Soon Elisabeth’s

neighbors and kinsfolk would gather with sympathetic joy around a home which, as they thought, had experienced unexpected mercy — little thinking, how wide-reaching its consequences would be. But the Virgin-Mother must not be exposed to the publicity of such meetings. However conscious of what had led to her condition, it must have been as the first sharp pang of the sword which was to pierce her soul, when she told it all to her betrothed. For, however deep his trust in her whom he had chosen for wife, only a direct Divine communication could have chased all questioning from his heart, and given him that assurance, which was needful in the future history of the Messiah. Brief as, with exquisite delicacy, the narrative is, we can read in the ‘thoughts’ of *Joseph* the anxious contending of feelings, the scarcely established, and yet delayed, resolve to ‘put her away,’ which could only be done by regular divorce; this one determination only standing out clearly, that, if it must be, her letter of divorce shall be handed to her privately, only in the presence of two witnesses. The humble *Tsaddiq* of Nazareth would not willingly have brought the blush to any face, least of all would he make of her ‘a public exhibition of shame.’ ^{f378} It was a relief that he could legally divorce her either publicly or privately, whether from change of feeling, or because he had found just cause for it, but hesitated to make it known, either from regard for his own character, or because he had not sufficient *legal* evidence ^{f379} of the charge. He would follow, all unconscious of it, the truer manly feeling of R. Eliezar, {Keth. 74 b 75 a.} R. Jochanan, and R. Zera, {Keth. 97 b.} according to which a man would not like to put his wife to shame before a Court of Justice, rather than the opposite sentence of R. Meir.

The assurance, which Joseph could scarcely dare to hope for, was miraculously conveyed to him in a dream-vision. All would now be clear; even the terms in which he was addressed (‘thou son of David’), so utterly unusual in ordinary circumstances, would prepare him for the Angel’s message. The naming of the unborn Messiah would accord with popular notions; ^{f380} the symbolism of such a name was deeply rooted in Jewish belief; ^{f381} while the explanation of *Jehoshua* or *Jeshua* (*Jesus*), as He who would save His people (primarily, as he would understand it, Israel) from their sins, described at least one generally expected aspect of His Mission, ^{f382} although Joseph may not have known that it was the basis of all the rest. And perhaps it was not without deeper meaning and insight into His

character, that the Angel laid stress on this very element in His communication to Joseph, and not to Mary.

The fact that such an announcement came to Him in a dream, would dispose Joseph all the more readily to receive it. 'A good dream' was one of the three things ^{f383} popularly regarded as marks of God's favor; and so general was the belief in their significance, as to have passed into this popular saying: 'If any one sleeps seven days without dreaming (or rather, remembering his dream for interpretation), call him wicked' (as being unremembered of God {Ber. 55 b} ^{f384}). Thus Divinely set at rest, Joseph could no longer hesitate. The highest duty towards the Virgin-Mother and the unborn Jesus demanded an immediate marriage, which would afford not only outward, but moral protection to both. ^{f385}

Viewing events, not as isolated, but as links welded in the golden chain of the history of the Kingdom of God, 'all this' — not only the birth of Jesus from a Virgin, nor even His symbolic Name with its import, but also the unrestful questioning of Joseph — 'happened' ^{f386} in fulfilment ^{f387} of what had been prefigured. {²³⁷⁴Isaiah 7:14.} The promise of a Virgin-born son as a sign of the firmness of God's covenant of old with David and his house; the now unfolded meaning of the former symbolic name *Immanuel*; even the unbelief of Ahaz, with its counterpart in the questioning of Joseph, — 'all this' could now be clearly read in the light of the breaking day. Never had the house of David sunk morally lower than when, in the words of Ahaz, it seemed to renounce the very foundation of its claim to continuance; never had the fortunes of the house of David fallen lower, than when a Herod sat on its throne, and its lineal representative was a humble village carpenter, from whose heart doubts of the Virgin-Mother had to be Divinely chased. And never, not even when God gave to the doubts of Moses this as the sign of Israel's future deliverance, that in that mountain they should worship {⁴¹⁸²Exodus 3:12.} — had unbelief been answered by more strange evidence. But as, nevertheless, the stability of the Davidic house was ensured by the future advent of *Immanuel* — and with such certainty, that before even such a child could discern between choice of good and evil, the land would be freed of its dangers; so now all that was then prefigured was to become literally true, and Israel to be saved from its real danger by the Advent of Jesus, Immanuel. ^{f388} And so it had all been intended. The golden cup of prophecy which Isaiah had placed empty on the Holy Table, waiting for the time of the end, was now full filled, up to its brim, with the new wine of the Kingdom.

Meanwhile the long-looked-for event had taken place in the home of Zacharias. No domestic solemnity so important or so joyous as that in which, by circumcision, the child had, as it were, laid upon it the yoke of the Law, with all of duty and privilege which this implied. Even the circumstance, that it took place at early morning {Pes. 4 *a.*} might indicate this. It was, so tradition has it, as if the father had acted sacrificially as High-Priest, {Yalkut Sh. 1 par. 81.} offering his child to God in gratitude and love; {Tanch. P Tetsavveh, at the beginning, ed. Warshau, p. 111 *a.*} and it symbolized this deeper moral truth, that man must by his own act complete what God had first instituted. {Tanch. u. s.} To Zacharias and Elisabeth the rite would have even more than this significance, as administered to the child of their old age, so miraculously given, and who was connected with such a future. Besides, the legend which associates circumcision with Elijah, as the restorer of this rite in the apostate period of the Kings of Israel, {Pirq de R. Elies. c. 29.} was probably in circulation at the time. ^{f389} We can scarcely be mistaken in supposing, that then, as now, a benediction was spoken before circumcision, and that the ceremony closed with the usual grace over the cup of wine, ^{f390} when the child received his name in a prayer that probably did not much differ from this at present in use: ‘Our God, and the God of our fathers, raise up this child to his father and mother, and let his name be called in Israel Zacharias, the son of Zacharias. ^{f391} Let his father rejoice in the issue of his loins, and his mother in the fruit of her womb, as it is written in ^{<1135>}Proverbs 23:25, and as it is said in ^{<1116>}Ezekiel 16:6, and again in ^{<1158>}Psalm 105:8, and ^{<1124>}Genesis 21:4;’ the passages being, of course, quoted in full. The prayer closed with the hope that the child might grow up, and successfully, ‘attain to the Torah, the marriage-baldachino, and good works.’ ^{f392}

Of all this Zacharias was, though a deeply interested, yet a deaf and dumb ^{f393} witness. This only had he noticed, that, in the benediction in which the child’s name was inserted, the mother had interrupted the prayer. Without explaining her reason, she insisted that his name should not be that of his aged father, as in the peculiar circumstances might have been expected, but John (*Jochanan*). A reference to the father only deepened the general astonishment, when he also gave the same name. But this was not the sole cause for marvel. For, forthwith the tongue of the dumb was loosed, and he, who could not utter the name of the child, now burst into praise of the name of the Lord. His last words had been those of unbelief, his first were those of praise; his last words had been a question of doubt, his first were a

hymn of assurance. Strictly Hebrew in its cast, and closely following Old Testament prophecy, it is remarkable — and yet almost natural — that this hymn of the Priest closely follows, and, if the expression be allowable, spiritualizes a great part of the most ancient Jewish prayer: the so-called Eighteen Benedictions; rather perhaps, that it transforms the expectancy of that prayer into praise of its realization. And if we bear in mind, that a great portion of these prayers was said by the Priests before the lot was cast for incensing, or by the people in the time of incensing, it almost seems as if, during the long period of his enforced solitude, the aged Priest had meditated on, and learned to understand, what so often he had repeated. Opening with the common form of benediction, his hymn struck, one by one, the deepest chords of that prayer, specially this the most significant of all (the fifteenth Eulogy), ‘Speedily make to shoot forth the Branch ^{f394} of David, Thy servant, and exalt Thou his horn by Thy salvation, for in Thy salvation we trust all the day long. Blessed art Thou, Jehovah! Who causeth to spring forth the Horn of Salvation’ (literally, to branch forth). This analogy between the hymn of Zacharias and the prayers of Israel will best appear from the benedictions with which these eulogies closed. For, when thus examined, their leading thoughts will be found to be as follows: God as the *Shield of Abraham*; He that raises the dead, and *causes salvation to shoot forth*; the Holy One; Who graciously *giveth knowledge*; Who taketh pleasure in *repentance*; Who multiplieth *forgiveness*; Who *redeemeth Israel*; Who *healeth their* (spiritual) *diseases*; Who *blesseth the years*; Who *gathereth the outcasts of His people*; Who *loveth righteousness and judgment*; Who is the *abode and stay of the righteous*; Who *buildeth Jerusalem*; Who causeth the *Horn of Salvation* to shoot forth; Who *heareth prayer*; Who *bringeth back His Shekhinah to Zion*; God the *Gracious One*, to Whom praise is due; Who *blesseth His people Israel with peace.* ^{f395}

It was all most fitting. The question of unbelief had struck the Priest dumb, for most truly unbelief cannot speak; and the answer of faith restored to him speech, for most truly does faith loosen the tongue. The first evidence of his dumbness had been, that his tongue refused to speak the benediction to the people; and the first evidence of his restored power was, that he spoke the benediction of God in a rapturous burst of praise and thanksgiving. The sign of the unbelieving Priest standing before the awe-struck people, vainly essaying to make himself understood by signs, was

most fitting; most fitting also that, when ‘they made signs’ to him, the believing father should burst in their hearing into a prophetic hymn.

But far and wide, as these marvellous tidings spread throughout the hill-country of Judaea, fear fell on all — the fear also of a nameless hope. The silence of a long-clouded day had been broken, and the light which had suddenly riven its gloom, laid itself on their hearts in expectancy: ‘What then shall this Child be? For the Hand of the Lord also was with Him!’ ^{f396}

CHAPTER 5

WHAT MESSIAH DID THE JEWS EXPECT?

It were an extremely narrow, and, indeed, false view, to regard the difference between Judaism and Christianity as confined to the question of the fulfillment of certain prophecies in Jesus of Nazareth. These predictions could only outline individual features in the Person and history of the Messiah. It is not thus that a likeness is recognized, but rather by the combination of the various features into a unity, and by the expression which gives it meaning. So far as we can gather from the Gospel narratives, no objection was ever taken to the fulfillment of individual prophecies in Jesus. But the general conception which the Rabbis had formed of the Messiah, differed totally from what was presented by the Prophet of Nazareth. Thus, what is the fundamental divergence between the two may be said to have existed long before the events which finally divided them. It is the combination of letters which constitute words, and the same letters may be combined into different words. Similarly, both Rabbinism and, what, by anticipation, we designate, Christianity might regard the same predictions as Messianic, and look for their fulfillment; while at the same time the Messianic ideal of the Synagogue might be quite other than that, to which the faith and hope of the Church have clung.

1. The most important point here is to keep in mind the organic *unity* of the Old Testament. Its predictions are not isolated, but features of one grand prophetic picture; its ritual and institutions parts of one great system; its history, not loosely connected events, but an organic development tending towards a definite end. Viewed in its innermost substance, the history of the Old Testament is not different from its typical institutions, nor yet these two from its predictions. The idea, underlying all, is God's gracious manifestation in the world, the Kingdom of God; the meaning of all, the establishment of this Kingdom upon earth. That gracious purpose was, so to speak, individualized, and the Kingdom actually established in the Messiah. Both the fundamental and the final relationship in view was that of God towards man, and of man towards God: the former as expressed by the word Father; the latter by that of Servant — or rather the combination of the two ideas: 'Son-Servant.' This was already implied in

the so-called Protevangel; { ~~10013~~ Genesis 3:13 } and in this sense also the words of Jesus hold true: 'Before Abraham came into being, I am.'

But, narrowing our survey to where the history of the Kingdom of God begins with that of Abraham, it was indeed as Jesus said: 'Your father Abraham rejoiced that he should see My day, and he saw it, and was glad.' { St. ~~10086~~ John 8:56 } For, all that followed from Abraham to the Messiah was one, and bore this twofold impress: heavenwards, that of Son; earthwards, that of Servant. Israel was God's Son, His 'first-born'; their history that of the children of God; their institutions those of the family of God; their predictions those of the household of God. And Israel was also the Servant of God — 'Jacob My Servant'; and its history, institutions, and predictions those of the Servant of the Lord. Yet not merely Servant, but Son-Servant — 'anointed' to such service. This idea was, so to speak, crystallized in the three great representative institutions of Israel. The 'Servant of the Lord' in relation to Israel's history was Kingship in Israel; the 'Servant of the Lord' in relation to Israel's ritual ordinances was the Priesthood in Israel; the 'Servant of the Lord' in relation to prediction was the Prophetic order. But all sprang from the same fundamental idea: that of the 'Servant of Jehovah.'

One step still remains. The Messiah and His history are not presented in the Old Testament as something separate from, or superadded to, Israel. The history, the institutions, and the predictions of Israel run up into Him. ^{f397}

He is the typical Israelite, nay — typical Israel itself — alike the crown, the completion, and the representative of Israel. He is *the* Son of God and *the* Servant of the Lord; but in that highest and only true sense, which had given its meaning to all the preparatory development. As He was 'anointed' to be the 'Servant of the Lord,' not with the typical oil, but by 'the Spirit of Jehovah' 'upon' Him, so was He also the 'Son' in a unique sense. His organic connection with Israel is marked by the designations 'Seed of Abraham' and 'Son of David,' while at the same time He was essentially, what Israel was subordinately and typically: 'Thou art My Son — this day have I begotten Thee.' Hence also, in strictest truthfulness, the Evangelist could apply to the Messiah what referred to Israel, and see it fulfilled in His history: 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son.' { St.

~~10025~~ Matthew 2:15 } And this other correlate idea, of Israel as 'the Servant of the Lord,' is also fully concentrated in the Messiah as the Representative Israelite, so that the Book of Isaiah, as the series of predictions in which His picture is most fully outlined, might be summarized as that concerning

‘the Servant of Jehovah.’ Moreover, the Messiah, as Representative Israelite, combined in Himself as ‘*the* Servant of the Lord’ the threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King, and joined together the two ideas of ‘Son’ and ‘Servant’. {~~QURAN~~Philippians 2:6-11} And the final combination and full exhibition of these two ideas was the fulfillment of the typical mission of Israel, and the establishment of the Kingdom of God among men.

Thus, in its final, as in its initial, {~~QURAN~~Genesis 3:15} stage it was the establishment of the Kingdom of God upon earth — brought about by the ‘Servant’ of the Lord, Who was to stricken humanity the God-sent ‘Anointed Comforter’ (*Mashiach ha-Menachem*): in this twofold sense of ‘Comforter’ of individuals (‘the friend of sinners’), and ‘Comforter’ of Israel and of the world, reconciling the two, and bringing to both eternal salvation. And here the mission of Israel ended. It had passed through three stages. The first, or *historical*, was the preparation of the Kingdom of God; the second, or *ritual*, the typical presentation of that Kingdom; while the third, or *prophetic*, brought that Kingdom into actual contact with the kingdoms of the world. Accordingly, it is during the latter that the designation ‘Son of David’ (typical Israel) enlarged in the visions of Daniel into that of ‘Son of Man’ (the Head of redeemed humanity). It were a one-sided view to regard the Babylonish exile as only a punishment for Israel’s sin. There is, in truth, nothing in all God’s dealings in history exclusively *punitive*. That were a merely negative element. But there is always a positive element also of actual progress; a step forward, even though in the taking of it something should have to be crushed. And this step forward was the development of the idea of the Kingdom of God in its relation to the world.

2. This organic unity of Israel and the Messiah explains how events, institutions, and predictions, which initially were purely Israelitish, could with truth be regarded as finding their full accomplishment in the Messiah. From this point of view the whole Old Testament becomes the perspective in which the figure of the Messiah stands out. And perhaps the most valuable element in Rabbinic commentation on Messianic times is that in which, as so frequently, it is explained, that all the miracles and deliverances of Israel’s past would be re-enacted, only in a much wider manner, in the days of the Messiah. Thus the whole past was symbolic, and typical of the future — the Old Testament the glass, through which the universal blessings of the latter days were seen. It is in this sense that we

would understand the two sayings of the Talmud: ‘All the prophets prophesied only of the days of the Messiah,’ {Sanh. 99 a} and ‘The world was created only for the Messiah.’ {Sanh. 98 b}

In accordance with all this, the ancient Synagogue found references to the Messiah in many more passages of the Old Testament than those verbal predictions, to which we generally appeal; and the latter formed (as in the New Testament) a proportionately small, and secondary, element in the conception of the Messianic era. This is fully borne out by a detailed analysis of those passages in the Old Testament to which the ancient Synagogue referred as Messianic.^{f398} Their number amounts to upwards of 456 (75 from the Pentateuch, 243 from the Prophets, and 138 from the Hagiographa), and their Messianic application is supported by more than 558 references to the most ancient Rabbinic writings.^{f399} But comparatively few of these are what would be termed verbal predictions. Rather would it seem as if every event were regarded as prophetic, and every prophecy, whether by fact, or by word (prediction), as a light to cast its sheen on the future, until the picture of the Messianic age in the far back-ground stood out in the hundredfold variegated brightness of prophetic events, and prophetic utterances; or, as regarded the then state of Israel, till the darkness of their present night was lit up by a hundred constellations kindling in the sky overhead, and its lonely silence broken by echoes of heavenly voices, and strains of prophetic hymns borne on the breeze.

Of course, there was the danger that, amidst these dazzling lights, or in the crowd of figures, each so attractive, or else in the absorbing interest of the general picture, the grand central Personality should not engage the attention it claimed, and so the meaning of the whole be lost in the contemplation of its details. This danger was the greater from the absence of any deeper spiritual elements. All that Israel needed: ‘study of the Law and good works,’ lay within the reach of every one; and all that Israel hoped for, was national restoration and glory. Everything else was but means to these ends; the Messiah Himself only the grand instrument in attaining them. Thus viewed, the picture presented would be of Israel’s exaltation, rather than of the salvation of the world. To this, and to the idea of Israel’s exclusive spiritual position in the world, must be traced much, that otherwise would seem utterly irrational in the Rabbinic pictures of the latter days. But in such a picture there would be neither room nor occasion for a Messiah-Savior, in the only sense in which such a heavenly mission

could be rational, or the heart of humanity respond to it. The Rabbinic ideal of the Messiah was not that of ‘a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of His people Israel’ — the satisfaction of the wants of humanity, and the completion of Israel’s mission — but quite different, even to contrariety. Accordingly, there was a fundamental antagonism between the Rabbis and Christ, quite irrespective of the manner in which He carried out His Messianic work. On the other hand, it is equally noteworthy, that the purely national elements, which well nigh formed the sum total of Rabbinic expectation, scarcely entered into the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God. And the more we realize, that Jesus so fundamentally separated Himself from all the ideas of His time, the more evidential is it of the fact, that He was not the Messiah of Jewish conception, but derived His mission from a source unknown to, or at least ignored by, the leaders of His people.

3. But still, as the Rabbinic ideas were at least based on the Old Testament, we need not wonder that they also embodied the chief features of the Messianic history. Accordingly, a careful perusal of their Scripture quotations ^{f400} shows, that the main postulates of the New Testament concerning the Messiah are fully supported by Rabbinic statements. Thus, such doctrines as the *pre-mundane existence* of the Messiah; His *elevation* above Moses, and even above the Angels; His *representative* character; His *cruel sufferings* and *derision*; His *violent* death, and that *for His people*; His *work* on behalf of the living and of the dead; His *redemption*, and restoration of Israel; the *opposition* of the Gentiles; their *partial judgment* and *conversion*; the *prevalence* of His *Law*; the *universal blessings* of the latter days; and His *Kingdom* — can be clearly deduced from unquestioned passages in ancient Rabbinic writings. Only, as we might expect, all is there indistinct, incoherent, unexplained, and from a much lower standpoint. At best, it is the lower stage of yet unfulfilled prophecy — the haze when the sun is about to rise, not the blaze when it has risen. Most painfully is this felt in connection with the one element on which the New Testament most insists. There is, indeed, in Rabbinic writings frequent reference to the sufferings, and even the death of the Messiah, and these are brought into connection with our sins, as how could it be otherwise in view of Isaiah 53 and other passages, and in one most remarkable comment {Yalkut on ²³⁰¹Isaiah 9:1} the Messiah is represented as willingly taking upon Himself all these sufferings, on condition that all Israel — the living, the dead, and those yet unborn — should be saved, and that, in consequence of His

work, God and Israel should be reconciled, and Satan cast into hell. But there is only the most indistinct reference to the removal of sin by the Messiah, in the sense of vicarious sufferings.

In connection with what has been stated, one most important point must be kept in view. So far as their opinions can be gathered from their writings, the great doctrines of Original Sin, and of the sinfulness of our whole nature, were not held by the ancient Rabbis.^{f401} Of course, it is not meant that they denied the consequences of sin, either as concerned Adam himself, or his descendants; but the final result is far from that seriousness which attaches to the Fall in the New Testament, where it is presented as the basis of the need of a Redeemer, Who, as the Second Adam, restored what the first had lost. The difference is so fundamental as to render further explanation necessary.^{f402}

The fall of Adam is ascribed to the envy of the Angels^{f403} — not the fallen ones, for none were fallen, till God cast them down in consequence of their seduction of man. The Angels, having in vain tried to prevent the creation of man, at last conspired to lead him into sin as the only means of his ruin — the task being undertaken by *Sammael* (and his Angels), who in many respects was superior to the other Angelic princes. {Pirke de R. El. c. 13; Yalkut 1 p. 8 c} The instrument employed was the serpent, of whose original condition the strangest legends are told, probably to make the Biblical narrative appear more rational. {Comp. Pirke de R. El. and Yalkut, u.s.; also Ber. R. 19} The details of the story of the Fall, as told by the Rabbis, need not be here repeated, save to indicate its consequences. The first of these was the withdrawal of the Shekhinah from earth to the first heaven, while subsequent sins successively led to its further removal to the seventh heaven. This, however, can scarcely be considered a permanent sequel of sin, since the good deeds of seven righteous men, beginning with Abraham, brought it again, in the time of Moses, to earth. {Ber. R. 19, ed. Warshau, p. 37a} Six things Adam is said to have lost by his sin; but even these are to be restored to man by the Messiah. {Bemidb. R. 13}^{f404} That the physical death of Adam was the consequence of his sin, is certainly taught. Otherwise he would have lived forever, like Enoch and Elijah. {Vayyikra R. 27} But although the fate which overtook Adam was to rest on all the world, {Ber. R. 16 21, and often} and death came not only on our first father but on his descendants, and all creation lost its perfectness, {Ber. R. 5, 12, 10; comp. also Midr. on ~~2~~² Ecclesiastes 7:13; and 8:1, and Baba B. 17 a} yet even these temporal sequences are not universally

admitted. It rather seems taught, that death was intended to be the fate of all, or sent to show the folly of men claiming Divine worship, or to test whether piety was real, {Ber. R. 9} the more so that with death the weary struggle with our evil inclination ceased. It was needful to die when our work was done, that others might enter upon it. In each case death was the consequence of our own, not of Adam's sin. {Bemidb. R. 19} In fact, over these six, — Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam — the Angel of Death had had no absolute power. Nay, there was a time when all Israel were not only free from death, but like the Angels, and even higher than they. For, originally God had offered the Law to all Gentile nations, {According to ^{<f402>}Deuteronomy 33:2; ^{<f403>}Habakkuk 3:3} but they had refused to submit to it. {Ab. Zar. 2 b} But when Israel took on themselves the Law at Mount Sinai, the description in ^{<f404>}Psalms 82:6 applied literally to them. They would not have died, and were 'the sons of God.' {Ab. Z. 5 a} But all this was lost by the sin of making the golden calf — although the Talmud marks that, if Israel had continued in that Angelic state, the nation would have ceased with that generation. ^{f405} Thus there were two divergent opinions — the one ascribing death to personal, the other tracing it to Adam's guilt. ^{f406} }

When, however, we pass from the physical to the moral sequences of the fall, our Jewish authorities wholly fail us. They teach, that man is created with two inclinations, that to evil (the *Yetser ha-ra*), and that to good; {Targum Ps.-Jon. on ^{<f407>}Genesis 2:7} the first working in him from the beginning, the latter coming gradually in the course of time. {Nedar. 32 b; Midr. on ^{<f408>}Ecclesiastes 4:13, 14, ed. W. p. 89 a; 9:15; ib. p. 101 a} Yet, so far from guilt attaching to the *Yetser ha-ra*, its existence is absolutely necessary, if the world is to continue. {Ber. R. 9} In fact, as the Talmud expressly teaches, {Ber. 61 a} the evil desire or impulse was created by God Himself; while it is also asserted {Sukk. 52 a, and Yalkut 2 p. 149 b} that, on seeing the consequences, God actually repented having done so. This gives quite another character to sin, as due to causes for which no blame attaches to man. {Comp. also Jer. Targum on ^{<f409>}Exodus 32:22} On the other hand, as it is in the power of each wholly to overcome sin, and to gain life by study and works; {Ab. Z. 5 b; Kidd. 30 b} as Israel at Mount Sinai had actually got rid of the *Yetser ha-ra*; and as there had been those, who were entirely righteous — {For example, Yoma 28 b; Chag. 4 b} there scarcely remains any moral sequence of Adam's fall to be considered. Similarly, the Apocrypha are silent on the subject, the only exception being

the very strong language used in II. Esdras, which dates after the Christian era. {Comp. IV. Esdras 3:21, 22, 26; 4:30; and especially 7:46-53} ^{f407}

4. In the absence of felt need of deliverance from sin, we can understand, how Rabbinic tradition found no place for the Priestly office of the Messiah, and how even his claims to be the Prophet of His people are almost entirely overshadowed by His appearance as their King and Deliverer. This, indeed, was the ever-present want, pressing the more heavily as Israel's national sufferings seemed almost inexplicable, while they contrasted so sharply with the glory expected by the Rabbis. *Whence these sufferings?* From sin — national sin; the idolatry of former times; {Gitt. 7 a} the prevalence of crimes and vices; the dereliction of God's ordinances; {Gitt. 88 a} the neglect of instruction, of study, and of proper practice of His Law; and, in later days, the love of money and party strife. {Jer. Yoma 1:1; Yoma 9 a, and many other passages} *But the seventy years' captivity had ceased, why not the present dispersion?* Because hypocrisy had been added to all other sins; {Yoma 9 b} because there had not been proper repentance; {Jer. Yoma 1, 1} because of the half-heartedness of the Jewish proselytes; because of improper marriages, and other evil customs; {Nidd. 13 b} and because of the gross dissoluteness of certain cities. {Yoma 19 b} The consequences appeared not only in the political condition of Israel, but in the land itself, in the absence of rain and dew, of fruitfulness and of plenty; in the general disorder of society; the cessation of piety and of religious study; and the silence of prophecy. {For all these points comp. Ber. 58 b; 59 a; Sot. 48 a; Shabb. 138 b; Baba B. 12 a, b} As significantly summed up, Israel was without Priesthood, without law, without God. {Vayyikra R 19} Nay, the world itself suffered in consequence of the destruction of the Temple. In a very remarkable passage, {Sukk. 55 b} where it is explained, that the seventy bullocks offered during the Feast of Tabernacles were for the nations of the world, R. Jochanan deplors their fate, since while the Temple had stood the altar had atoned for the Gentiles, but who was now to do so? The light, which had shone from out the Temple windows into the world, had been extinguished. {Pesiqta, ^{f408} 1 ed. Buber, p. 145 a, last lines} Indeed, but for the intercession of the Angels the world would now be destroyed. {Midr, on Psalm 137} In the poetic language of the time, the heavens, sun, moon and stars, trees and mountains, even the Angels, mourned over the desolation of the Temple, {Pesiqta 148 b} and the very Angelic hosts had since been diminished. {Chag. 13 b} But, though the Divine Presence had

been withdrawn, it still lingered near His own; it had followed them in all their banishments; it had suffered with them in all their sorrows.^{f409} It is a touching legend, which represents the Shekhinah as still lingering over the western wall of the Temple {Shemoth R. 2. ed. Warsh. p. 7 b, lines 12 etc.} — the only one supposed to be still standing.^{f410} Nay, in language still bolder, and which cannot be fully reproduced, God Himself is represented as mourning over Jerusalem and the Temple. He has not entered His Palace since then, and His hair is wet with the dew.^{f411} He weeps over His children and their desolateness, {Ber. 3 a; 59 a} and displays in the heavens tokens of mourning, corresponding to those which an earthly monarch would show. {Pesiqta 119 b; 120 a}

All this is to be gloriously set right, when the Lord turneth the captivity of Zion, and the Messiah cometh. *But when may He be expected, and what are the signs of His coming?* Or perhaps the question should thus be put: *Why are the redemption of Israel and the coming of the Messiah so unaccountably delayed?* It is here that the Synagogue finds itself in presence of an insoluble mystery. The explanations attempted are, confessedly, guesses, or rather attempts to evade the issue. The only course left is, authoritatively to impose silence on all such inquiries — the silence, as they would put it, of implicit, mournful submission to the inexplicable, in faith that somehow, when least expected, deliverance would come; or, as we would put it, the silence of ever-recurring disappointment and despair. Thus the grand hope of the Synagogue is, as it were, written in an epitaph on a broken tombstone, to be repeated by the thousands who, for these long centuries, have washed the ruins of the Sanctuary with unavailing tears.

5. *Why delayeth the Messiah His coming?* Since the brief and broken sunshine of the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the sky overhead has ever grown darker, nor have even the terrible storms, which have burst over Israel, left the canopy of cloud. The first captivity passed, why not the second? This is the painful question ever and again discussed by the Rabbis. {Jer. Yoma 1:1, ed. Krot. p 38 c, last part, Sanh. 97 b, 98 a} Can they mean it seriously, that the sins of the second, are more grievous than those which caused the first dispersion; or that they of the first captivity repented, but not they of the second? What constitutes this repentance which yet remains to be made? But the reasoning becomes absolutely self-contradictory when, together with the assertion that, if Israel repented but one day, the Messiah would come, {Midr. on ~~ציר~~ Song of Solomon 5:2, ed.

Warsh. p. 25 *a*; Sanh. 98 *a*) we are told, that Israel will not repent till Elijah comes. {Pirque de R. Eliez. 43 end} Besides, bold as the language is, there is truth in the expostulation, which the Midrash {On ^{<2812>}Lamentations 5:21, ed. Warsh. vol. 3 p. 77 *a*} puts into the mouth of the congregation of Israel: 'Lord of the world, it depends on Thee that we repent.' Such truth, that, although at first the Divine reply is a repetition of ^{<3003>}Zechariah 1:3, yet, when Israel reiterates the words, 'Turn Thou us unto Thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned,' supporting them by ^{<3854>}Psalm 85:4, the argument proves unanswerable.

Other conditions of Israel's deliverance are, indeed, mentioned. But we can scarcely regard the Synagogue as seriously making the coming of Messiah dependent on their realization. Among the most touching of these is a beautiful passage (almost reminding us of Hebrews 11.), in which Israel's future deliverance is described as the reward of faith. {Tanch. on ^{<1215>}Exodus 15:1, ed. Warsh. p. 86 *b*} Similarly beautiful is the thought, {On Jer. 31:9} that, when God redeems Israel, it will be amidst their weeping. {Tanch. on ^{<1142>}Genesis 14:2, ed. Warsh.} But neither can this be regarded as the condition of Messiah's coming; nor yet such generalities as the observance of the Law, or of some special commandments. The very variety of suggestions {Sanh. 97 *b* 98 *a*} ^{f412} shows, how utterly unable the Synagogue felt to indicate any condition to be fulfilled by Israel. Such vague statements, as that the salvation of Israel depended on the merits of the patriarchs, or on that of one of them, cannot help us to a solution; and the long discussion in the Talmud {Sanh. 98 *a* and *b*} leaves no doubt, that the final and most sober opinion was, that the time of Messiah's coming depended not on repentance, nor any other condition, but on the mercy of God, when the time fixed had arrived. But even so, we are again thrown into doubt by the statement, that it might be either hastened or retarded by Israel's bearing! ^{f413}

In these circumstances, any attempt at determining the date of Messiah's coming would be even more hypothetical than such calculations generally are. ^{f414} Guesses on the subject could only be grounded on imaginary symbolisms. Of such we have examples in the Talmud. ^{f415} Thus, some fixed the date at 4000 years after the Creation — curiously enough, about the era of Christ — though Israel's sin had blotted out the whole past from the reckoning; others at 4291 from the Creation; {Sanh. 97*b*} others again expected it at the beginning, or end, of the eighty-fifth Jubilee, with this proviso, that it would not take place earlier; and so on, through equally

groundless conjectures. A comparatively late work speaks of five monarchies — Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome and Ishmael. During the last of these God would hear the cry of Israel, {Pirke de R. Ehes. 32} and the Messiah come, after a terrible war between Rome and Ishmael (the West and the East). {u. s. 30} But as the rule of these monarchies was to last altogether one day (= 1000 years), less two-thirds of an hour (1 hour = 83 1/2 years); {Comp. Pirke de R. El. 48} it would follow, that their domination would last 944 4/9 years.^{f416} Again, according to Jewish tradition, the rule of Babylon had lasted 70, that of Medo-Persia 34, and that of Greece 180 years, leaving 660 4/9 years for Rome and Ishmael. Thus the date for the expected Advent of the Messiah would have been about 661 after the destruction of Jerusalem, or about the year 729 of the Christian era.^{f417}

In the category of guesses we must also place such vague statements, as that the Messiah would come, when all were righteous, or all wicked; or else nine months after the empire of Rome had extended over the whole world; {Sanh. 98 b^{f418}} or when all the souls, predestined to inhabit bodies, had been on earth. {Ab. Z. 5 a, Ber. R. 24} But as, after years of unrelieved sufferings, the Synagogue had to acknowledge that, one by one, all the terms had passed, and as despair settled on the heart of Israel, it came to be generally thought, that the time of Messiah's Advent could not be known beforehand, {Targum Pseudo-Jon on ~~Gen~~Genesis 49:1} and that speculation on the subject was dangerous, sinful, even damnable. The time of the end had, indeed, been revealed to two sons of Adam, Jacob and David; but neither of them had been allowed to make it known. {Midrash on Psalm 31 ed. Warsh. p. 41 a, lines 18 to 15 from bottom} In view of this, it can scarcely be regarded as more than a symbolical, though significant guess, when the future redemption of Israel is expected on the Paschal Day, the 15th of Nisan. {Pesikta, ed. Buber, 47 b. 48 a, Sopher. 21, Hal. 2. Shir. haShir. R. 2:8. ed. Warsh. vol. 3 p. 15 a}^{f419}

6. We now approach this most difficult and delicate question: What was the expectation of the ancient Synagogue, as regarded the Nature, Person, and qualifications of the Messiah? In answering it — not at present from the Old Testament, but from the views expressed in Rabbinic literature, and so far as we can gather from the Gospel-narratives, from these cherished by the contemporaries of Christ — two inferences seem evident. First, the idea of a Divine Personality, and of the union of the two Natures in the Messiah, seems to have been foreign to the Jewish auditory of Jesus of

Nazareth, and even at first to His disciples. Secondly, they appear to have regarded the Messiah as far above the ordinary human, royal, prophetic, and even Angelic type, to such extent, that the boundary-line separating it from Divine Personality is of the narrowest, so that when the conviction of the reality of the Messianic manifestation in Jesus burst on their minds, this boundary-line was easily, almost naturally over-stepped, and those who would have shrunk from framing their belief in such dogmatic form, readily owned and worshipped Him as the Son of God. Nor need we wonder at this, even taking the highest view of Old Testament prophecy. For here also the principle applies, which underlies one of St. Paul's most wide reaching utterances: 'We prophesy in part' ^{f420} (ἐκ μέρους προφητεύομεν) In the nature of it, all prophecy presents but *disjecta membra*, and it almost seems, as if we had to take our stand in the prophet's valley of vision (Ezekiel 37), waiting till, at the bidding of the Lord, the scattered bones should be joined into a body, to which the breath of the Spirit would give life.

These two inferences, derived from the Gospel-narratives, are in exact accordance with the whole line of ancient Jewish teaching. Beginning with the LXX. rendering of ^{<0490>}Genesis 49:10, and especially of ^{<0847>}Numbers 24:7, 17, we gather, that the Kingdom of the Messiah ^{f421} was higher than any that is earthly, and destined to subdue them all. But the rendering of ^{<0875>}Psalms 127:5, 7; ^{<0818>}Psalms 110:3; and especially of Isaiah 9, carries us much farther. They convey the idea, that the existence of this Messiah was regarded as premundane (before the moon, { ^{<0721>}Psalms 72.} before the morning-star { ^{<0401>}Psalms 110.}), and eternal, { ^{<0721>}Psalms 72.} and His Person and dignity as superior to that of men and Angels: 'the Angel of the Great Council,' { ^{<2905>}Isaiah 9:6 ^{f422} } probably 'the Angel of the Face' — a view fully confirmed by the rendering of the Targum. ^{f423} The silence of the Apocrypha about the Person of the Messiah is so strange, as to be scarcely explained by the consideration, that those books were composed when the need of a Messiah for the deliverance of Israel was not painfully felt. ^{f424} All the more striking are the allusions in the Pseudepigraphic Writings, although these also do not carry us beyond our two inferences. Thus, the third book of the Sibylline Oracles — which, with few exceptions, ^{f425} dates from more than a century and a half before Christ — presents a picture of Messianic times, {vv. 652-807.} generally admitted to have formed the basis of Virgil's description of the Golden Age, and of similar heathen expectations. In these Oracles, 170 years before Christ, the Messiah is 'the

King sent from heaven’ who would ‘judge every man in blood and splendor of fire.’ {vv. 285, 286.} Similarly, the vision of Messianic times opens with a reference to ‘*the King Whom God will send from the sun.*’ {v. 652.} ^{f426} That a superhuman Kingdom of eternal duration, such as this vision paints, {vv. 652-807.} should have a superhuman King, seems almost a necessary corollary. ^{f427}

Even more distinct are the statements in the so-called ‘Book of Enoch.’ Critics are substantially agreed, that the oldest part of it {ch. 1:36 and 72. 105. dates from between 150 and 130 B.C. ^{f428} The part next in date is full of Messianic allusions; but, as a certain class of modern writers has ascribed to it a post-Christian date, and, however ungrounded, ^{f429} to Christian authorship, it may be better not to refer to it in the present argument, the more so as we have other testimony from the time of Herod. Not to speak, therefore, of such peculiar designations of the Messiah as ‘the Woman’s Son,’ {62:5.} ‘the Son of Man, {For ex. 48:2: 62:7; 69:29.} ‘the Elect,’ and ‘the Just One,’ we mark that the Messiah is expressly designed in the oldest portion as ‘the Son of God’ (‘I and My Son’). {105:2.} That this implies, not, indeed, essential Sonship, but infinite superiority over all other servants of God, and rule over them, appears from the mystic description of the Messiah as ‘the first of the white bulls,’ ‘the great Animal among them, having great and black horns on His head’ {90:38.}, — Whom ‘all the beasts of the field and all the fowls of heaven dread, and to Whom they cry at all times.’

Still more explicit is that beautiful collection of eighteen Psalms, dating from about half a century before Christ, which bears the name of ‘the Psalter of Solomon.’ A chaste anticipation of the Messianic Kingdom {in Psalm 11}. is followed by a full description of its need and its blessings, {in Psalm 17} to which the concluding Psalm {18} forms an apt epilogue. The King Who reigns is of the house of David. {17:5.} He is the Son of David, Who comes at the time known to God only, to reign over Israel. {v. 23.} He is a righteous King, taught of God. {v. 35.} He is Christ the Lord {v. 36.} **Χριστὸς Κύριος** exactly as in the LXX. translations of ~~2000~~ Lamentations 4:20). ‘*He is pure from sin,*’ which qualifies Him for ruling His people, and banishing sinners by His word. {v. 41.} Never in His days will He be infirm towards His God, since God renders Him strong in the Holy Ghost,’ wise in counsel, with might and righteousness (‘mighty in deed and word’). The blessing of the Lord being upon Him, He does not fail. {vv. 42, 43.} ‘This is the beauty of the King of Israel, Whom God hath

chosen, to set Him over the house of Israel to rule it.' {v. 47.} Thus invincible, not by outward might, but in His God, He will bring His people the blessings of restoration to their tribal possessions, and of righteousness, but break in pieces His enemies, not by outward weapons, but by the word of His mouth; purify Jerusalem, and judge the nations, who will be subject to His rule, and behold and own His glory. {vv. 25-35.} Manifestly, this is not an earthly Kingdom, nor yet an earthly King.

If we now turn to works dating after the Christian era, we would naturally expect them, either simply to reproduce earlier opinions, or, from opposition to Christ, to present the Messiah in a less exalted manner.^{f430} But since, strange to say, they even more strongly assert the high dignity of the Messiah, we are warranted in regarding this as the rooted belief of the Synagogue.^{f431} This estimate of the Messiah may be gathered from IV Esdras, {12:32; 13:26, 52; 14:9.}^{f432} with which the kindred picture of the Messiah and His reign in the Apocalypse of Baruch {70:9-74} may be compared. But even in strictly Rabbinic documents, the premundane, if not the eternal *existence of the Messiah* appears as matter of common belief. Such is the view expressed in the Targum on ^{<3906>}Isaiah 9:6, and in that on ^{<3882>}Micah 5:2. But the Midrash on ^{<3889>}Proverbs 8:9 {Ed. Lemb. p. 7 a} expressly mentions the Messiah among the seven things created before the world.^{f433} The passage is the more important, as it throws light on quite a series of others, in which the *Name of the Messiah* is said to have been created before the world.^{f434} {Pirque de R. E. 3; Midr. on ^{<3901>}Psalms 93:1; Psalm 54 a; Nedar. 39 b; Ber. R. 1; 3 Tanch. on ^{<3974>}Numbers 7:14, ed. Warsh. vol. 2 Midr. on Psalm 54 a; Nedar. 39 b; Ber. R. 1; ^{f435}Tanch. ^{f436}on ^{<3974>}Numbers 7:14, ed. Warsh. vol. 2:p. 56 b, at the bottom.} Even if this were an ideal conception, it would prove the Messiah to be elevated above the ordinary conditions of humanity. But it means much more than this, since not only the existence of the Messiah long before His actual appearance, but His *premundane* state are clearly taught in other places. In the Talmud {Jer. Ber. 2:4, p. 5 a.} it is not only implied, that the Messiah may already be among the living, but a strange story is related, according to which He had actually been born in the royal palace at Bethlehem, bore the name *Menachem* (Comforter), was discovered by one R. Judan through a peculiar device, but had been carried away by a storm. Similarly, the Babylon Talmud represents Him as sitting at the gate of Imperial Rome. {Sanh. 98 a; comp. also Jerus. Targ. on ^{<3922>}Exodus 12:42, Pirque de R. El. 30, and other passages.} In general, the idea of the Messiah's appearance

and concealment is familiar to Jewish tradition. {See for example Pesiqta, ed Buber, p. 49 b ^{f437} } But the Rabbis go much farther back, and declare that from the time of Judah's marriage, { ~~-0380-~~Genesis 38:1, 2.} 'God busied Himself with creating the light of the Messiah,' it being significantly added that, 'before the first oppressor was born, the final deliverer was already born.' {Ber. R. 85, ed. Warsh. p. 151 b.} In another passage the Messiah is expressly identified with *Anani*, {Mentioned in 1 Chr. 3:24 ^{f438} } and therefore represented as pre-existent long before his actual manifestation. {Tanch. Par. To edoth, 14. ed. Warsh. p. 37 b.} The same inference may be drawn from His emphatic designation as the First. {Ber. R. 65 ed. Warsh. p. 114 b; Vayyikra R. 30, ed. W. vol. 3:p. 47 a; Pes 5 a.} Lastly, in Yalkut on Isaiah 60., the words 'In Thy light shall we see light' (~~-0380-~~Psalm 36:9) are explained as meaning, that this is the light of the Messiah — the same which God had at the first pronounced to be very good, and which, before the world was created, He had hid beneath the throne of His glory for the Messiah and His age. When Satan asked for whom it was reserved, he was told that it was destined for Him Who would put him to shame, and destroy him. And when, at his request, he was shown the Messiah, he fell on his face and owned, that the Messiah would in the future cast him and the Gentiles into Gehenna {Yalkut 2 p. 56 c} Whatever else may be inferred from it, this passage clearly implies not only the pre-existence, but the premundane existence of the Messiah. ^{f439}

But, indeed, it carries us much farther. For, a Messiah, pre-existent, in the Presence of God, and destined to subdue Satan and cast him into hell, could not have been regarded as *an ordinary man*. It is indeed true that, as the history of Elijah, so that of the Messiah is throughout compared with that of Moses, the 'first' with 'the last Redeemer.' As Moses was educated at the court of Pharaoh, so the Messiah dwells in Rome (or Edom) among His enemies. {Shem. R. 1, ed. W. vol. 2 p. 5 b; Tanch. Par. Tazrya, 8, ed. W. vol. 2 p. 20 a} Like Moses He comes, withdraws, and comes again. {Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 49 b; Midr. Ruth. Par. 5, ed. W. p. 43 b} Like Moses He works deliverance. But here the analogy ceases, for, whereas the redemption by Moses was temporary and comparatively small, that of the Messiah would be eternal and absolute. All the marvels connected with Moses were to be intensified in the Messiah. The ass on which the Messiah would ride — and this humble estate was only caused by Israel's sin {Sanh. 98 a}, — would be not only that on which Moses had come back to Egypt, but also that which Abraham had used when he went to offer up Isaac, and

which had been specially created on the eve of the world's first Sabbath. {Pirque de R. El. 31, ed. Lemb. p. 38 *a*} Similarly, the horns of the ram caught in the thicket, which was offered instead of Isaac, were destined for blowing — the left one by the Almighty on Mount Sinai, the right and larger one by the Messiah, when He would gather the outcasts of Israel (^{<2713>}Isaiah 27:13). {Pirque de R. El. u. s., p. 39 *a*, close} Again, the 'rod' of the Messiah was that of Aaron, which had budded, blossomed, and burst into fruit; as also that on which Jacob had leaned, and which, through Judah, had passed to all the kings of Israel, till the destruction of the Temple. {Bemid. R. 18, close of the Par.} And so the principle that 'the later Deliverer would be like the first' was carried into every detail. *As the first Deliverer brought down the Manna, so the Messiah;* {^{<9716>}Psalm 72:16} *as the first Deliverer had made a spring of water to rise, so would the second.* {According to the last clause of (English version) ^{<2418>}Joel 3:18 (Midr. on ^{<2009>}Ecclesiastes 1:9 ed. Warsh, vol. 4 p. 80 *b*)}

But even this is not all. That the Messiah had, without any instruction, attained to knowledge of God; {Bemid. R. 14, ed. Warsh. p. 55 *a*} and that He had received, directly from Him, all wisdom, knowledge, counsel, and grace, {Bemid. R. 13} is comparatively little, since the same was claimed for Abraham, Job, and Hezekiah. But we are told that, when God showed Moses all his successors, the spirit of wisdom and knowledge in the Messiah equalled that of all the others together. {Yalkut on ^{<0276>}Numbers 27:16, vol. 1 p. 247 *d*} The Messiah would be 'greater than the Patriarchs,' higher than Moses, ^{f440} and *even loftier than the ministering Angels.* {Tanch., Par. Toledoth 14} In view of this we can understand, how the Midrash on ^{<9208>}Psalm 21:3 should apply to the Messiah, in all its literality, that 'God would set His own crown on His head,' and clothe Him with His 'honor and majesty.' It is only consistent that the same Midrash should assign to the Messiah the Divine designations: 'Jehovah is a Man of War,' and 'Jehovah our Righteousness.' {Midr. Tehill. ed. Warsh. p. 30 *b*} One other quotation, from perhaps the most spiritual Jewish commentary, must be added, reminding us of that outburst of adoring wonder which once greeted Jesus of Nazareth. The passage first refers to the seven garments with which God successively robed Himself, the first of 'honor and glory,' at creation; {^{<9441>}Psalm 104:1} the second of 'majesty,' at the Red Sea; {^{<9901>}Psalm 93:1} the third of 'strength,' at the giving of the Law; {^{<9901>}Psalm 93:1} the fourth 'white,' when He blotteth out the sins of Israel; {^{<2009>}Daniel 7:9} the fifth of 'zeal,'

when He avengeth them of their enemies; {²⁸⁹¹⁷Isaiah 59:17} the sixth of ‘righteousness,’ at the time when the Messiah should be revealed; {²⁸⁹¹⁷Isaiah 59:17} and the seventh ‘red,’ when He would take vengeance on Edom (Rome). {²⁸⁹¹⁸Isaiah 63} ‘But,’ continues the commentary, ‘the garment with which in the future He will clothe the Messiah, its splendor will extend from one end of the world to the other, as it is written:

“As a bridegroom priestly in headgear.” {²⁸⁹¹⁹Isaiah 61:10}

And Israel are astounded at His light, and say: Blessed the hour in which the Messiah was created; blessed the womb whence He issued; blessed the generation that sees Him; blessed the eye that is worthy to behold Him; because the opening of His lips is blessing and peace, and His speech quieting of the spirit. Glory and majesty are in His appearance (vesture), and confidence and tranquillity in His words; and on His tongue compassion and forgiveness; His prayer is a sweet-smelling odor, and His supplication holiness and purity. Happy Israel, what is reserved for you! Thus it is written:

“How manifold is Thy goodness, which Thou hast reserved to them that fear Thee.” {²⁹¹⁹Psalms 31:19}

{Pesiqta. ed. Buber. pp. 149, a, b} Such a King Messiah might well be represented as sitting at the Right Hand of God, while Abraham was only at His left; {Midr. on ²⁹¹³⁶Psalms 18:36, ed. Warsh. p. 27 a} nay, as throwing forth His Right Hand, while God stood up to war for Him {Midr. on ²⁹¹⁰¹Psalms 110:1, ed. Warsh. p. 80 b}

It is not without hesitation, that we make reference to Jewish allusions to the miraculous birth of the Savior. Yet there are two expressions, which convey the idea, if not of superhuman origin, yet of some great mystery attaching to His birth. The first occurs in connection with the birth of Seth. ‘Rabbi Tanchuma said, in the name of Rabbi Samuel: Eve had respect to that Seed which is to come from another place. And who is this? This is Messiah the King.’ {Ber. R. 23, ed Warsh p. 45 b} The second appears in the narrative of the crime of Lot’s daughters: {⁰¹¹⁹²Genesis 19:32} ‘It is not written “that we may preserve a son from our father,” but “seed from our father.” This is that seed which is coming from another place. And who is this? This is the King Messiah.’ {Ber. R. 51 ed. Warsh. p. 95 a} ^{f441}

That a superhuman character attached, if not to the Personality, yet to the Mission of the Messiah, appears from three passages, in which the

expression, 'The Spirit of the Lord moved upon the face of the deep,' is thus paraphrased: 'This is the Spirit of the King Messiah.' {Ber. R. 2; and 8; Vayyikra R. 14, ed. Warsh. vol. 3 p. 21 b} ^{f442} Whether this implies some activity of the Messiah in connection with creation, ^{f443} or only that, from the first, His Mission was to have a bearing on all creation, it elevates His character and work above every other agency, human or Angelic. And, without pressing the argument, it is at least very remarkable that even the Ineffable Name *Jehovah* is expressly attributed to the Messiah. {Midr. on ^{<2016}Lamentations 1:16, ed Warsh. p. 64 a, last line comp. Pesiqta, p. 148 a; ^{f444} Midr. on Psalm 21 and the very curious concessions in a controversy with a Christian recorded in Sanh. 38 b} The fact becomes the more significant, when we recall that one of the most familiar names of the Messiah was *Anani*, He Who cometh in the clouds of heaven. {^{<2013}Daniel 7:13}

In what has been stated, no reference has been made to the final conquests of Messiah, to His reign with all its wonders, or to the subdual of all nations — in short, to what are commonly called 'the last things.' This will be treated in another connection. Nor is it contented that, whatever individuals may have expected, the Synagogue taught the doctrine of the Divine Personality of the Messiah, as held by the Christian Church. On the other hand, the cumulative evidence just presented must leave on the mind at least this conviction, that the Messiah expected was far above the conditions of the most exalted of God's servants, even His Angels; in short, so closely bordering on the Divine, that it was almost impossible to distinguish Him therefrom. In such circumstances, it only needed the personal conviction, that He, Who taught and wrought as none other, was really the Messiah, to kindle at His word into the adoring confession, that He was indeed 'the Son of the Living God.' And once that point reached, the mind, looking back through the teaching of the Synagogue, would, with increasing clearness, perceive that, however ill-understood in the past, this had been all along the sum of the whole Old Testament. Thus, we can understand alike the preparedness for, and yet the gradualness of conviction on this point; then, the increasing clearness with which it emerged in the consciousness of the disciples; and, finally, the unhesitating distinctness with which it was put forward in Apostolic teaching as the fundamental article of belief to the Church Catholic. ^{f445}

CHAPTER 6

THE NATIVITY OF JESUS THE MESSIAH.

(St. ~~✠~~Matthew 1:25; St. ~~✠~~Luke 2:1-20.)

SUCH then was ‘the hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers,’ for which the twelve tribes, ‘instantly serving (God) night and day,’ longed — with such vividness, that they read it in almost every event and promise; with such earnestness, that it ever was the burden of their prayers; with such intensity, that many and long centuries if disappointment have not quenched it. Its light, comparatively dim in days of sunshine and calm, seemed to burn brightest in the dark and lonely nights of suffering, as if each gust that swept over Israel only kindled it into fresh flame.

To the question, whether this hope has ever been realized, or rather, whether One has appeared Whose claims to the Messiahship have stood the test of investigation and of time — impartial history can make only one answer. It points to Bethlehem and to Nazareth. If the claims of Jesus have been rejected by the Jewish Nation, He has at least, undoubtedly, fulfilled one part of the Mission prophetically assigned to the Messiah. Whether or not He be the Lion of the tribe of Judah, to Him, assuredly, has been the gathering of the nations, and the isles have waited for His law. Passing the narrow bounds of obscure Judaea, and breaking down the walls of national prejudice and isolation, He has made the sublimer teaching of the Old Testament the common possession of the world, and founded a great Brotherhood, of which the God of Israel is the Father. He alone also has exhibited a life, in which absolutely no fault could be found; and promulgated a teaching, to which absolutely no exception can be taken. Admittedly, He was the *One perfect Man* — the ideal of humanity, His doctrine the one absolute teaching. The world has known none other, none equal. And the world has owned it, if not by the testimony of words, yet by the evidence of facts. Springing from such a people; born, living, and dying in circumstances, and using means, the most unlikely of such results — the Man of Nazareth has, by universal consent, been the mightiest Factor in our world’s history: alike politically, socially, intellectually, and morally. If He be not the Messiah, He has at least thus far done the Messiah’s work. If He be not the Messiah, there has at least been none other, before or after

Him. If He be not the Messiah, the world has not, and never can have, a Messiah.

To Bethlehem as the birthplace of Messiah, not only Old Testament prediction, {~~<38P>~~ Micah 5:2} but the testimony of Rabbinic teaching, unhesitatingly pointed. Yet nothing could be imagined more directly contrary to Jewish thoughts and feelings — and hence nothing less likely to suggest itself to Jewish invention ^{f446} — than the circumstances which, according to the Gospel-narrative, brought about the birth of the Messiah in Bethlehem. A counting of the people, of Census; and that Census taken at the bidding of a heathen Emperor, and executed by one so universally hated as Herod, would represent the ne plus ultra of all that was most repugnant to Jewish feeling. ^{f447} If the account to the Gospel-narrative, brought about the birth of the Bethlehem, has no basis in fact, but is a legend invented to locate the birth of the Nazarene in the royal City of David, it must be pronounced most clumsily devised. There is absolutely nothing to account for its origination — either from parallel events in the past, or from contemporary expectancy. Why then connect the birth of their Messiah with what was most repugnant to Israel, especially if, as the advocates of the legendary hypothesis contend, it did not occur at a time when any Jewish Census was taken, but ten years previously?

But if it be impossible rationally to account for any legendary origin of the narrative of Joseph and Mary's journey to Bethlehem, the historical grounds, on which its accuracy has been impugned, are equally insufficient. They resolve themselves into this: that (beyond the Gospel-narrative) we have no solid evidence that Cyrenius was at that time occupying the needful official position in the East, to order such a registration for Herod to carry out. But even this feeble contention is by no means historically unassailable. ^{f448} At any rate, there are two facts, which render any historical mistake by St. Luke on this point extremely difficult to believe. First, he was evidently aware of a Census under Cyrenius, ten years later; {Comp. ~~<48P>~~ Acts 5:37} secondly, whatever rendered of St. ~~<48P>~~ Luke 2:2 may be adopted, it will at least be admitted, that the intercalated sentence about Cyrenius was not necessary for the narrative, and that the writer must have intended thereby emphatically to mark a certain event. But an author would not be likely to call special attention to a fact, of which he had only indistinct knowledge; rather, if it *must* be mentioned, would he do so in the most indefinite terms. This presumption in favor of St. Luke's

statement is strengthened by the consideration, that such an event as the taxing of Judaea must have been so easily ascertainable by him.

We are, however, not left to the presumptive reasoning just set forth. That the Emperor Augustus made registers of the Roman Empire, and of subject and tributary states, is now generally admitted. This registration, for the purpose of future taxation, would also embrace Palestine. Even if no actual order to that effect had been issued during the lifetime of Herod, we can understand that he would deem it most expedient, both on account of his relations to the Emperor, and in view of the probable excitement which a heathen Census would cause in Palestine, to take steps for making a registration, and that rather according to the Jewish than the Roman manner. This Census, then, arranged by Augustus, and taken by Herod in his own manner, was, according to St. Luke, 'first carried out when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria,' some years after Herod's death and when Judaea had become a Roman province. ^{f449}

We are now prepared to follow the course of the Gospel-narrative. In consequence of 'the decree of Caesar Augustus,' Herod directed a general registration to be made after the Jewish, rather than the Roman, manner. Practically the two would, indeed, in this instance, be very similar. According to the Roman law, all country-people were to be registered in their 'own city', meaning thereby the town to which the village or place, where they were born, was attached. In so doing, the 'house and lineage' (the *nomen* and *cognomen*) of each were marked. ^{f450} According to the Jewish mode of registration, the people would have been enrolled according to tribes, *twfm families* or clans, *twhpcm* and the *house* of their fathers *twna tyn*. But as the ten tribes had not returned to Palestine, this could only take place to a very limited extent, ^{f451} while it would be easy for each to be registered in 'his own city.' In the case of Joseph and Mary, whose descent from David was not only known, but where, for the sake of the unborn Messiah, it was most important that this should be distinctly noted, it was natural that, in accordance with Jewish law, they should have gone to Bethlehem. Perhaps also, for many reasons which will readily suggest themselves, Joseph and Mary might be glad to leave Nazareth, and seek, if possible, a home in Bethlehem. Indeed, so strong was this feeling, that it afterwards required special Divine direction to induce Joseph to relinquish this chosen place of residence, and to return into Galilee. {St. ⁴¹²²Matthew 2:22.} In these circumstances, Mary, now

the 'wife' of Joseph, though standing to him only in the actual relationship of 'betrothed,' {St. ~~415~~ Luke 2:5.} would, of course, accompany her husband to Bethlehem. Irrespective of this, every feeling and hope in her must have prompted such a course, and there is no need to discuss whether Roman or Jewish Census-usage required her presence — a question which, if put, would have to be answered in the negative.

The short winter's day was probably closing in, ^{f452} as the two travellers from Nazareth, bringing with them the few necessities of a poor Eastern household, neared their journey's end. If we think of Jesus as the Messiah from heaven, the surroundings of outward poverty, so far from detracting, seem most congruous to His Divine character. Earthly splendor would here seem like tawdry tinsel, and the utmost simplicity like that clothing of the lilies, which far surpassed all the glory of Solomon's court. But only in the East would the most absolute simplicity be possible, and yet neither it, nor the poverty from which it sprang, necessarily imply even the slightest taint of social inferiority. The way had been long and weary, at the very least, three days' journey, whatever route had been taken from Galilee. Most probably it would be that so commonly followed, from a desire to avoid Samaria, along the eastern banks of the Jordan, and by the fords of Jericho. ^{f453} Although passing through one of the warmest parts of the country, the season of the year must, even in most favorable circumstances, have greatly increased the difficulties of such a journey. A sense of rest and peace must, almost unconsciously, have crept over the travellers when at last they reached the rich fields that surrounded the ancient 'House of Bread,' and, passing through the valley which, like an amphitheater, sweeps up to the twain heights along which Bethlehem stretches (2,704 feet above the sea), ascended through the terraced vineyards and gardens. Winter though it was, the green and silvery foliage of the olive might, even at that season, mingle with the pale pink of the almond — nature's 'early waker' ^{f443} — and with the darker coloring of the opening peach-buds. The chaste beauty and sweet quiet of the place would recall memories of Boaz, of Jesse, and of David. All the more would such thoughts suggest themselves, from the contrast between the past and the present. For, as the travellers reached the heights of Bethlehem, and, indeed, long before, the most prominent object in view must have been the great castle which Herod had built, and called after his own name. Perched on the highest hill south-east of Bethlehem, it was, at the same time magnificent palace, strongest fortress, and almost courtier-city. {*Jos. Ant.* 14:13. 9; 15:9. 4;

War. 1:13. 8:21, 10.} With a sense of relief the travellers would turn from this, to mark the undulating outlines of the highland wilderness of Judaea, till the horizon was bounded by the mountain-ridges of Tekoa. Through the break of the hills eastward the heavy molten surface of the Sea of Judgement would appear in view; westward wound the road to Hebron; behind them lay the valleys and hills which separated Bethlehem from Jerusalem, and concealed the Holy City.

But for the present such thoughts would give way to the pressing necessity of finding shelter and rest. The little town of Bethlehem was crowded with those who had come from all the outlying district to register their names. Even if the strangers from far-off Galilee had been personally acquainted with any one in Bethlehem, who could have shown them hospitality, they would have found every house fully occupied. The very inn was filled, and the only available space was, where ordinarily the cattle were stabled. ^{f455} Bearing in mind the simple habits of the East, this scarcely implies, what it would in the West; and perhaps the seclusion and privacy from the noisy, chattering crowd, which thronged the khan, would be all the more welcome. Scanty as these particulars are, even thus much is gathered rather by inference than from the narrative itself. Thus early in this history does the absence of details, which painfully increases as we proceed, remind us, that the Gospels were not intended to furnish a biography of Jesus, nor even the materials for it; but had only this twofold object: that those who read them ‘might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,’ and that believing they ‘might have life through His Name.’ {St. ~~John~~ John 20:31; comp. St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 1:4.} The Christian heart and imagination, indeed, long to be able to localize the scene of such surpassing importance, and linger with fond reverence over that Cave, which is now covered by ‘the Church of the Nativity.’ It may be — nay, it seems likely — that this, to which the most venerable tradition points, was the sacred spot of the world’s greatest event. ^{f456} But certainly we have not. It is better, that it should be so. As to all that passed in the seclusion of that ‘stable’ — the circumstances of the ‘Nativity,’ even its exact time after the arrival of Mary (brief as it must have been) — the Gospel-narrative is silent. This only is told, that then and there the Virgin-Mother ‘brought forth her first-born Son, and wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger.’ Beyond this announcement of the bare fact, Holy Scripture, with indescribable appropriateness and delicacy, draws a veil over that most sacred mystery. Two impressions only are left on the mind: that of utmost earthly humility,

in the surrounding circumstances; and that of inward fitness, in the contrast suggested by them. Instinctively, reverently, we feel that it is well it should have been so. It best befits the birth of the Christ — if He be what the New Testament declares Him.

On the other hand, the circumstances just noted afford the strongest indirect evidence of the truth of this narrative. For, if it were the outcome of Jewish imagination, where is the basis for it in contemporary expectation? Would Jewish legend have ever presented its Messiah as born in a stable, to which chance circumstances had consigned His Mother? The whole current of Jewish opinion would run in the contrary direction. The opponents of the authenticity of this narrative are bound to face this. Further, it may safely be asserted, that no Apocryphal or legendary narrative of such a (legendary) event would have been characterized by such scantiness, or rather absence, of details. For, the two essential features, alike of legend and of tradition, are, that they ever seek to surround their heroes with a halo of glory, and that they attempt to supply details, which are otherwise wanting. And in both these respects a more sharply-marked contrast could scarcely be presented, than in the Gospel-narrative.

But as we pass from the sacred gloom of the cave out into the night, its sky all aglow with starry brightness, its loneliness is peopled, and its silence made vocal from heaven. There is nothing now to conceal, but much to reveal, though the manner of it would seem strangely incongruous to Jewish thinking. And yet Jewish tradition may here prove both illustrative and helpful. That the Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem, ^{f457} was a settled conviction. Equally so was the belief, that He was to be revealed from *Migdal Eder*, ‘the tower of the flock.’ {Targum Pseudo-Jon. on ~~(1351)~~ Genesis 35:21.} This *Migdal Eder* was *not* the watchtower for the ordinary flocks which pastured on the barren sheepground beyond Bethlehem, but lay close to the town, on the road to Jerusalem. A passage in the Mishnah {Shek. 7:4.} leads to the conclusion, that the flocks, which pastured there, were destined for Temple-sacrifices, ^{f458} and, accordingly, that the shepherds, who watched over them, were not ordinary shepherds. The latter were under the ban of Rabbinism, ^{f459} on account of their necessary isolation from religious ordinances, and their manner of life, which rendered strict legal observance unlikely, if not absolutely impossible. The same Mishnic passage also leads us to infer, that these flocks lay out *all the year round*, since they are spoken of as in the fields

thirty days before the Passover — that is, in the month of February, when in Palestine the average rainfall is nearly greatest. ^{f460} Thus, Jewish tradition in some dim manner apprehended the first revelation of the Messiah from that *Migdal Eder*, where shepherds watched the Temple-flocks all the year round. Of the deep symbolic significance of such a coincidence, it is needless to speak.

It was, then, on that ‘wintry night’ of the 25th of December, ^{f461} that shepherds watched the flocks destined for sacrificial services, in the very place consecrated by tradition as that where the Messiah was to be first revealed. Of a sudden came the long-delayed, unthought of of announcement. Heaven and earth seemed to mingle, as suddenly an Angel stood before their dazzled eyes, while the outstreaming glory of the Lord seemed to enwrap them, as in a mantle of light. ^{f462} Surprise, awe, fear would be hushed into calm and expectancy, as from the Angel they heard, that what they saw boded not judgment, but ushered in to waiting Israel the great joy of those good tidings which he brought: that the long-promised Savior, Messiah, Lord, was born in the City of David, and that they themselves might go and see, and recognize Him by the humbleness of the circumstances surrounding His Nativity.

It was, as if attendant angels had only waited the signal. As, when the sacrifice was laid on the altar, the Temple-music burst forth in three sections, each marked by the blast of the priests’ silver trumpets, as if each Psalm were to be a *Tris-Hagion*; ^{f463} so, when the Herald-Angel had spoken, a multitude of heaven’s host ^{f464} stood forth to hymn the good tidings he had brought. What they sang was but the reflex of what had been announced. It told in the language of praise the character, the meaning, the result, of what had taken place. Heaven took up the strain of ‘glory’; earth echoed it as ‘peace’; it fell on the ears and hearts of men as ‘good pleasure’:

*Glory to God in the highest,
And upon earth peace —
Among men good pleasure!* ^{f465}

Only once before had the words of the Angels’ hymn fallen upon mortal’s ears, when, to Isaiah’s rapt vision, Heaven’s high Temple had opened, and the glory of Jehovah swept its courts, almost breaking down the trembling posts that bore its boundary gates. Now the same glory enwrapt the shepherds on Bethlehem’s plains. Then the Angels’ hymn had heralded the

announcement of the Kingdom coming; now that of the King come. Then it had been the *Tris-Hagion* of prophetic anticipation; now that of Evangelic fulfilment.

The hymn had ceased; the light faded out of the sky; and the shepherds were alone. But the Angelic message remained with them; and the sign, which was to guide them to the Infant Christ, lighted their rapid way up the terraced height to where, at the entering of Bethlehem, the lamp swinging over the hostelry directed them to the strangers of the house of David, who had come from Nazareth. Though it seems as if, in the hour of her utmost need, the Virgin, Mother had not been ministered to by loving hands,^{f466} yet what had happened in the stable must soon have become known in the Khan. Perhaps friendly women were still passing to and fro on errands of mercy, when the shepherds reached the 'stable.'^{f467} There they found, perhaps not what they had expected, but as they had been told. The holy group only consisted of the humble Virgin-Mother, the lowly carpenter of Nazareth, and the Babe laid in the manger. What further passed we know not, save that, having seen it for themselves, the shepherds told what had been spoken to them about this Child, to all around^{f468} — in the 'stable' in the fields, probably also in the Temple, to which they would bring their flocks, thereby preparing the minds of a Simeon, of an Anna, and of all them that looked for salvation in Israel.^{f469}

And now the hush of wondering expectancy fell once more on all, who heard what was told by the shepherds, this time not only in the hill-country of Judaea, but within the wider circle that embraced Bethlehem and the Holy City. And yet it seemed all so sudden, so strange. That such slender thread, as the feeble throb of an Infant-life, the salvation of the world should hang — and no special care watch over its safety, no better shelter be provided it than a 'stable,' no other cradle than a manger! And still it is ever so. On what slender thread has the continued life of the Church often seemed to hang; on what feeble throbbing that of every child of God — with no visible outward means to ward off danger, no home of comfort, no rest of ease. But, 'Lo, children are Jehovah's heritage!' — and: 'So giveth He to His beloved in *his* sleep!'^{f470}

CHAPTER 7

THE PURIFICATION OF THE VIRGIN AND THE PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE

(St. ~~4121~~ Luke 2:21-38.)

FOREMOST amongst those who, wondering, had heard what the shepherds told, was she whom most it concerned, who laid it up deepest in her heart, and brought to it treasured stores of memory. It was the Mother of Jesus. These many months, all connected with this Child could never have been far away from her thoughts. And now that He was hers, yet not hers — belonged, yet did not seem to belong, to her, He would be the more dear to her Mother-heart for what made Him so near, and yet parted Him so far from her. And upon all His history seemed to lie such wondrous light, that she could only see the path behind Him, so far as she had trodden it, while upon that on which she was to move, was such dazzling brightness, that she could scarce look upon the present, and dared not gaze towards the future.

At the very outset of this history, and increasingly in its course, the question meets us, how, if the Angelic message to the Virgin was a reality, and her motherhood so supernatural, she could have been apparently so ignorant of what was to come — nay, so often have even misunderstood it? Strange, that she should have ‘pondered in her heart’ the shepherd’s account; stranger, that afterwards she should have wondered at His lingering in the Temple among Israel’s teachers; strangest, that, at the very first of His miracles, a mother’s fond pride should have so harshly broken in upon the Divine melody of His work, by striking a keynote so different from that, to which His life had been set; or that afterwards, in the height of his activity, loving fears, if not doubts, should have prompted her to interrupt, what evidently she had not as yet comprehended in the fulness of its meaning. Might we not rather have expected, that the Virgin-Mother from the inception of this Child’s life would have understood, that He was truly the Son of God? The question, like so many others, requires only to be clearly stated, to find its emphatic answer. For had it been so, His history, His human life, of which every step is of such importance to mankind, would not have been possible. Apart from all thoughts of the

deeper necessity, both as regarded His Mission and all the salvation of the world, of a true human development of gradual consciousness and personal life, Christ could not, in any true sense, have been subject to His Parents, if they had fully understood that He was Divine; nor could He, in that case, have been watched, as He ‘grew in wisdom and in favor with God and men.’ Such knowledge would have broken the bond of His Humanity to ours, by severing that which bound Him as a child to His mother. We could not have become His brethren, had He not been truly the Virgin’s Son. The mystery of the Incarnation would have been needless and fruitless, had His humanity not been subject to all its right and ordinary conditions. And, applying the same principle more widely, we can thus, in some measure, understand why the mystery of His Divinity had to be kept while He was on earth. Had it been otherwise, the thought of His Divinity would have proved so all-absorbing, as to render impossible that of His Humanity, with all its lessons. The Son of God Most High, Whom they worshipped, could never have been the loving Man, with Whom they could hold such close converse. The bond which bound the Master to His disciples — the Son of Man to humanity — would have been dissolved; His teaching as a Man, the Incarnation, and the Tabernacling among men, in place of the former Old Testament Revelation from heaven, would have become wholly impossible. In short, one, and that the distinctive New Testament, element in our salvation would have been taken away. At the beginning of His life He would have anticipated the lessons of its end — nay, not those of His Death only, but of His Resurrection and Ascension, and of the coming of the Holy Ghost.

In all this we have only been taking the subjective, not the objective, view of the question; considered the earthward, not the heavenward, aspect of His life. The latter, though very real, lies beyond our present horizon. Not so the question as to the development of the Virgin-Mother’s spiritual knowledge. Assuming her to have occupied, in the fullest sense, the standpoint of Jewish Messianic expectancy, and remembering, also, that she was so ‘highly favored’ of God, still, there was not as yet anything, nor could there be for many years, to lead her beyond what might be called the utmost height of Jewish belief. On the contrary, there was much connected with His true Humanity to keep her back. For narrow as, to our retrospective thinking, the boundary-line seems between Jewish belief and that in the hypostatic union of the two Natures, the passage from the one to the other represented such tremendous mental revolution, as to imply

direct Divine teaching. { ~~4628~~ 1 Corinthians 12:3 } An illustrative instance will prove this better than argument. We read, in a commentary on the opening words of ~~01518~~ Genesis 15:18, { Ber. R. 44, ed. Warsh. p. 81 b } that when God made the covenant with Abram, He ‘revealed to him both this *Olam* (dispensation) and the *Olam* to come,’ which latter expression is correctly explained as referring to the days of the Messiah. Jewish tradition, therefore, here asserts exactly what Jesus stated in these words: ‘Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it, and was glad.’ { St. ~~4386~~ John 8:56 } Yet we know what storm of indignation the enunciation of it called forth among the Jews!

Thus it was, that every event connected with the Messianic manifestation of Jesus would come to the Virgin-Mother as a fresh discovery and a new surprise. Each event, as it took place, stood isolated in her mind; not as part of a whole which she would anticipate, nor as only one link in a chain; but as something quite by itself. She knew the beginning, and she knew the end; but she knew not the path which led from the one to the other; and each step in it was a new revelation. Hence it was, that she so carefully treasured in her heart every new fact, { St. ~~4129~~ Luke 2:19, 51 } piecing each to the other, till she could read from it the great mystery that He, Whom Incarnate she had borne, was, indeed, the Son of the living God. And as it was natural, so it was well that it should be so. For, thus only could she truly, because self-unconsciously, as a Jewish woman and mother, fulfil all the requirements of the Law, alike as regarded herself and her Child.

The first of these was Circumcision, representing voluntary subjection to the conditions of the Law, and acceptance of the obligations, but also of the privileges, of the Covenant between God and Abraham and his seed. Any attempt to show the deep significance of such a rite in the case of Jesus, could only weaken the impression which the fact itself conveys. The ceremony took place, as in all ordinary circumstances, on the eighth day, when the Child received the Angel-given name *Jeshua* (Jesus). Two other legal ordinances still remained to be observed. The firstborn son of every household was, according to the Law, to be ‘redeemed’ of the priest at the price of five shekels of the Sanctuary. { ~~04816~~ Numbers 18:16 } Rabbinic casuistry here added many needless, and even repulsive, details. The following, however, are of practical interest. The earliest period of presentation was thirty-one days after birth so as to make the legal month quite complete. The child must have been the firstborn of his mother (according to some writers, of his father also); ^{f471} neither father nor

mother^{f472} must be of Levitic descent; and the child must be free from all such bodily blemishes as would have disqualified him for the priesthood — or, as it was expressed: ‘the firstborn for the priesthood.’ It was a thing much dreaded, that the child should die before his redemption; but if his father died in the interval, the child had to redeem himself when of age. As the Rabbinic law expressly states, that the shekels were to be of ‘Tyrian weight,’ {Bechor 8:7} the value of the ‘redemption money’ would amount to about ten or twelve shillings. The redemption could be made from any priest, and attendance in the Temple was not requisite. It was otherwise with the ‘purification’ of the mother. {~~8:10~~ Leviticus 12.} The Rabbinical law fixed this at forty-one days after the birth of a son, and eighty-one after that of a daughter,^{f473} so as to make the Biblical terms quite complete. {Comp. Sifra, ed. Weiss, p. 59 *a* and *b*; Maimonides, *Yad haChaz. Hal. Mechusre Capp.*, ed. Amst., vol. 3 p. 255 *a* and *b*.} But it might take place any time later, notably, when attendance on any of the great feasts brought a family to Jerusalem. Thus, we read of cases when a mother would offer several sacrifices of purification at the same time.^{f474} But, indeed, the woman was not required to be personally present at all, when her offering was presented, or, rather (as we shall see), provided for, say, by the representatives of the laity, who daily took part in the services for the various districts from which they came. This also is specially provided for in the *Tulmud*.^{f475} But mothers who were within convenient distance of the Temple, and especially the more earnest among them, would naturally attend personally in the Temple;^{f476} and in such cases, when practicable, the redemption of the firstborn, and the purification of his mother, would be combined. Such was undoubtedly the case with the Virgin-Mother and her Son.

For this twofold purpose the Holy Family went up to the Temple, when the prescribed days were completed.^{f477} The ceremony at the redemption of a firstborn son was, no doubt, more simple than that at present in use. It consisted of the formal presentation of the child to the priest, accompanied by two short ‘benedictions’ — the one for the law of redemption money was paid.^{f478} Most solemn, as in such a place, and remembering its symbolic significance as the expression of God’s claim over each family in Israel, must this rite have been.

As regards the rite at the purification of the mother, the scantiness of information has led to serious misstatements. Any comparison with our modern ‘churching’ of women^{f479} is inapplicable, since the latter consists

of thanksgiving, and the former primarily of a sin-offering for the Levitical defilement symbolically attaching to the beginning of life, and a burnt-offering, that marked the restoration of communion with God. Besides, as already stated, the sacrifice for purification might be brought in the absence of the mother. Similar mistakes prevail as to the rubric. It is not case, as generally stated, that the woman was sprinkled with blood, and then pronounced clean by the priest, or that prayers were offered on the occasion. ^{f480} The service simply consisted of the statutory sacrifice. This was what, in ecclesiastical language, was termed an offering *oleh veyored*, that is, ‘ascending and descending,’ according to the means of the offerer. The sin offering was, in all cases, a turtle-dove or a young pigeon. But, while the more wealthy brought a lamb for a burnt-offering, the poor might substitute for it a turtle dove or young pigeon ^{f481} The rubric directed that the neck of the sin-offering was to be broken, but the head not wholly severed; that some of the blood should be sprinkled at the south-western angle of the altar, ^{f482} below the red line, ^{f483} which ran round the middle of the altar, and that the rest should be poured out at the base of the altar. The whole of the flesh belonged to the priests, and had to be eaten within the enclosure of the Sanctuary. The rubric for the burnt-offering of a turtle-dove or a young pigeon was somewhat more intricate. {Sebach. 6:5} The substitution of the latter for a young lamb was expressly designated ‘the poor’s offering.’ And rightly so, since, while a lamb would probably cost about three shillings, the average value of a pair of turtle-doves, for both the sin-and burnt-offering, would be about eightpence, {Comp. Kerith. 1:7} and on one occasion fell so low as twopence. The Temple-price of the meat-and drink-offerings was fixed once a month; and special officials instructed the intending offerers, and provided them with what was needed. {Sheq. 4:9} There was also a special ‘superintendent of turtle-doves and pigeons,’ required for certain purifications, and the holder of that office is mentioned with praise in the Mishnah. {Sheq. 5:1} Much, indeed, depended upon his uprightness. For, at any rate as regarded those who brought the poor’s offering, the purchasers of pigeons or turtle-doves would, as a rule, have to deal with him. In the Court of the Women there were thirteen trumpet-shaped chests for pecuniary contributions, called ‘trumpets.’ ^{f484} Into the third of these they who brought the poor’s offering, like the Virgin-Mother, were to drop the price of the sacrifices which were needed for their purification. ^{f485} As we infer, {Tosepht. Sheq. 3:2} the superintending priest must have been stationed here, alike to inform the offerer of the price of the turtle-doves, and to see that all was in

order. For, the offerer of the poor's offering would not require to deal directly with the sacrificing priest. At a certain time in the day this third chest was opened, and half of its contents applied to burnt, the other half to sin-offerings. Thus sacrifices were provided for a corresponding number of those who were to be purified, without either shaming the poor, needlessly disclosing the character of impurity, or causing unnecessary bustle and work. Though this mode of procedure could, of course, not be obligatory, it would, no doubt, be that generally followed.

We can now, in imagination, follow the Virgin-Mother in the Temple.^{f486} Her child had been given up to the Lord, and received back from Him. She had entered the Court of the Women, probably by the 'Gate of the Women'^{f487} on the north side, and deposited the price of her sacrifices in Trumpet No. 3, which was close to the raised dais or gallery where the women worshipped, apart from the men. And now the sound of the organ, which announced throughout the vast Temple-buildings that the incense was about to be kindled on the Golden Altar, summoned those who were to be purified. The chief of the ministrant lay-representatives of Israel on duty (the so-called 'station-men') ranged those, who presented themselves before the Lord as offerers of special sacrifices, within the wickets on either side the great Nicanor Gate, at the top of the fifteen steps which led up from the Court of the Women to that of Israel. It was, as if they were to be brought nearest to the Sanctuary; as if theirs were to be specially the 'prayers' that rose in the cloud of incense from the Golden Altar; as if for them specially the sacrifices were laid on the Altar of Burnt-offering; as if theirs was a larger share of the benediction which, spoken by the lips of the priests, seemed like Jehovah's answer to the prayers of the people; theirs especially the expression of joy symbolized in the drink-offering, and the hymn of praise whose *Tris-Hagion* filled the Temple. From where they stood they could see it all,^{f488} share in it, rejoice in it. And now the general service was over, and only those remained who brought special sacrifices, or who lingered near them that had such, or whose loved abode was ever in the Temple. The purification-service, with such unspoken prayer and praise as would be the outcome of a grateful heart,^{f489} was soon ended, and they who had shared in it were Levitically clean. Now all stain was removed, and, as the Law put it, they might again partake of sacred offerings.

And in such sacred offering, better than any of which priest's family had ever partaken, was the Virgin-Mother immediately to share. It has been

observed, that by the side of every humiliation connected with the Humanity of the Messiah, the glory of His Divinity was also made to shine forth. The coincidences are manifestly undesigned on the part of the Evangelic writers, and hence all the more striking. Thus, if he was born of the humble Maiden of Nazareth, an Angel announced His birth; if the Infant-Savior was cradled in a manger, the shining host of heaven hymned His Advent. And so afterwards — if He hungered and was tempted in the wilderness, Angels ministered to Him, even as an Angel strengthened Him in the agony of the garden. If He submitted to baptism, the Voice and vision from heaven attested His Sonship; if enemies threatened. He could miraculously pass through them; if the Jews assailed, there was the Voice of God to glorify Him; if He was nailed to the cross, the sun craped his brightness, and earth quaked; if He was laid in the tomb, Angels kept its watches, and heralded His rising. And so, when now the Mother of Jesus, in her humbleness, could only bring the ‘poor’s offering,’ the witness to the greatness of Him Whom she had borne was not wanting. A ‘Eucharistic offering’ — so to speak, was brought, the record of which is the more precious that Rabbinic writings make no allusion to the existence of the party, whose representatives we here meet. Yet they were the true outcome of the spirit of the Old Testament, and, as such, at this time, the special recipients of the ‘Spirit’ of the Old Testament.

The ‘parents’ of Jesus had brought Him into the Temple for presentation and redemption, when they were met by one, whose venerable figure must have been well known in the city and the Sanctuary. Simeon combined the three characteristics of Old Testament piety: ‘*Justice*,’ as regarded his relation and bearing to God and man; ^{f490} ‘*fear of God*,’ ^{f491} in opposition to the boastful self-righteousness of Pharisaism; and, above all, *longing expectancy* of the near fulfilment of the great promises, and that in their *spiritual* import as ‘the Consolation of Israel.’ ^{f492} The Holy Spirit was upon him; and by that same Spirit ^{f493} the gracious Divine answer to his heart’s longing had been communicated him. And now it was as had been promised him. Coming ‘in the Spirit’ into the Temple, just as His parents were bringing the Infant Jesus, he took Him into his arms, and burst into rapt thanksgiving. Now, indeed, had God fulfilled His word. He was not to see death, till he had seen the Lord’s Christ. Now did his Lord ‘dismiss’ him ‘in peace’ ^{f494} — release him ^{f495} in blessed comfort from work and watch — since he had actually seen that salvation, ^{f496} so long preparing for a waiting weary world: a glorious light, Whose rising would light up

heathen darkness, and be the outshining glory around Israel's mission. With this Infant in his arms, it was as if he stood on the mountain-height of prophetic vision, and watched the golden beams of sunrise far away over the isles of the Gentiles, and then gathering their full glow over his own beloved land and people. There was nothing Judaic — quite the contrary: only what was of the Old Testament — in what he first said. {St. ~~119~~ Luke 2:29-32.}

But his unexpected appearance, the more unexpected deed and words, and that most unexpected form in which what was said of the Infant Christ was presented to their minds, filled the hearts of His parents with wonderment. And it was, as if their silent wonderment had been an unspoken question, to which the answer now came in words of blessing from the aged watcher. Mystic they seemed, yet prophetic. But now it was the personal, or rather the Judaic, aspect which, in broken utterances, was set before the Virgin-Mother — as if the whole history of the Christ upon earth were passing in rapid vision before Simeon. That Infant, now again in the Virgin-Mother's arms: It was to be a stone of decision; a foundation and corner-stone, {~~184~~ Isaiah 8:14.} for fall or for uprising; a sign spoken against; the sword of deep personal sorrow would pierce the Mother's heart; and so to the terrible end, when the veil of externalism which had so long covered the hearts of Israel's leaders would be rent, and the deep evil of their thoughts ^{f497} laid bare. Such, as regarded Israel, was the history of Jesus, from His Baptism to the Cross; and such is still the history of Jesus, as ever present to the heart of the believing, loving Church.

Nor was Simeon's the only hymn of praise on that day. A special interest attaches to her who, coming that very moment, responded in praise to God ^{f498} for the pledge she saw of the near redemption. A kind of mystery seems to invest this Anna (*Channah*). A widow, whose early desolateness had been followed by a long life of solitary mourning; one of those in whose home the tribal genealogy had been preserved. ^{f499} We infer from this, and from the fact that it was that of a tribe which had *not* returned to Palestine, that hers was a family of some distinction. Curiously enough, the tribe of Asher alone is celebrated in tradition for the beauty of its women, and their fitness to be wedded to High-Priest or King. {Bar. R. 71, ed. Warsh. p. 131 *b* end; 99. p. 179 *a*, lines 13 and 12 from bottom.}

But Anna had better claim to distinction than family-descent, or long, faithful memory of brief home-joys. These many years she had spent in the

Sanctuary, ^{f500} and spent in fasting and prayer — yet not of that self-righteous, self-satisfied kind which was of the essence of popular religion. Nor, as to the Pharisees around, was it the Synagogue which was her constant and loved resort; but the Temple, with its symbolic and unspoken worship, which Rabbinic self-assertion and rationalism were rapidly superseding, and for whose services, indeed, Rabbinism could find no real basis. Nor yet were ‘fasting and prayer’ to her the all-in-all of religion, sufficient in themselves; sufficient also before God. Deepest in her soul was longing waiting for the ‘redemption’ promized, and now surely nigh. To her widowed heart the great hope of Israel appeared not so much, as to Simeon, in the light of ‘consolation,’ as rather in that of ‘redemption.’ The seemingly hopeless exile of her own tribe, the political state of Judaea, the condition — social, moral, and religious — of her own Jerusalem: all kindled in her, as in those who were like-minded, deep, earnest longing for the time of promized ‘redemption.’ No place so suited to such an one as the Temple, with its services, the only thing free, pure, undefiled, and pointing forward and upward; no occupation so befitting as ‘fasting and prayer.’ And, blessed be God, there were others, perhaps many such, in Jerusalem. Though Rabbinic tradition ignored them, they were the salt which preserved the mass from festering corruption. To her as the representative, the example, friend, and adviser of such, was it granted as prophetess to recognise Him, Whose Advent had been the burden of Simeon’s praise. And, day by day, to those who looked for redemption in Jerusalem, would she speak of Him Whom her eyes had seen, though it must be in whispers and with bated breath. For they were in the city of Herod, and the stronghold of Pharisaism.

CHAPTER 8

THE VISIT AND HOMAGE OF THE MAGI, AND THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT

(St. ~~<411>~~ Matthew 2:1-8.)

WITH the Presentation of the Infant Savior in the Temple, and His acknowledgment — not indeed by the leaders of Israel, but, characteristically, by the representatives of those earnest men and women who looked for His Advent, the Prologue, if such it may be called, to the third Gospel closes. From whatever source its information was derived, perhaps, as has been suggested, its earlier portion from the Virgin-Mother, the later from Anna; or else both alike from her, who with loving reverence and wonderment treasured it all in her heart its marvellous details could not have been told with greater simplicity, nor yet with more exquisitely delicate grace.^{f501} On the other hand, the Prologue to the first Gospel, while omitting these, records other incidents of the infancy of the Savior. The plan of these narratives, or the sources whence they may originally have been derived, may account for the omissions in either case. At first sight it may seem strange, that the cosmopolitan Gospel by St. Luke should have described what took place in the Temple, and the homage of the Jews, while the Gospel by St. Matthew, which was primarily intended for Hebrews, records only the homage of the Gentiles, and the circumstances which led to the flight into Egypt. But of such seeming contrasts there are not a few in the Gospel-history — discords, which soon resolve themselves into glorious harmony.

The story of the homage to the Infant Savior by the Magi is told by St. Matthew, in language of which the brevity constitutes the chief difficulty. Even their designation is not free from ambiguity. The term *Magi* is used in the LXX., by Philo, Josephus, and by profane writers, alike in an evil and, so to speak, in a good sense^{f502} — in the former case as implying the practice of magical arts; {So also in ~~<418>~~ Acts 8:9; ~~<413>~~ 13:6, 8.} in the latter, as referring to the those Eastern (especially Chaldee) priest-sages, whose researches, in great measure as yet mysterious and unknown to us, seem to have embraced much deep knowledge, though not untinged with superstition. It is to these latter, that the Magi spoken of by St. Matthew

must have belonged. Their number — to which, however, no importance attaches — cannot be ascertained. ^{f503} Various suggestions have been made as to the country of ‘the East,’ whence they came. At the period in question the sacerdotal caste of the Medes and Persians was dispersed over various parts of the East, ^{f504} and the presence in those lands of a large Jewish *diaspora*, through which they might, and probably would, gain knowledge of the great hope of Israel, ^{f505} is sufficiently attested by Jewish history. The oldest opinion traces the Magi — though partially on insufficient grounds ^{f506} — to *Arabia*. And there is this in favor of it, that not only the closest intercourse existed between Palestine and Arabia, but that from about 120 *B.C.* to the sixth century of our era, the kings of *Yemen* professed the Jewish faith. ^{f507} For if, on the one hand, it seems unlikely, that Eastern Magi would spontaneously connect a celestial phenomenon with the birth of a Jewish king, evidence will, on the other hand, be presented to connect the meaning attached to the appearance of ‘the star’ at that particular time with Jewish expectancy of the Messiah. But we are anticipating.

Shortly after the Presentation of the Infant Savior in the Temple, certain Magi from the East arrived in Jerusalem with strange tidings. They had seen at its ‘rising’ ^{f508} a sidereal appearance, ^{f509} which they regarded as betokening the birth of the Messiah King of the Jews, in the sense which at the time attached to that designation. Accordingly, they had come to Jerusalem to pay homage ^{f510} to Him, probably not because they imagined He must be born in the Jewish capital ^{f511} but because they would naturally expect there to obtain authentic information, ‘where’ He might be found. In their simplicity of heart, the Magi addressed themselves in the first place to the official head of the nation. The rumor of such an inquiry, and by such persons, would rapidly spread throughout the city. But it produced on King Herod, and in the capital, a far different impression from the feeling of the Magi. Unscrupulously cruel as Herod had always proved, even the slightest suspicion of danger to his rule, the bare possibility of the Advent of One, Who had such claims upon the allegiance of Israel, and Who, if acknowledged, would evoke the most intense movement on their part, must have struck terror to his heart. Not that he could believe the tidings, though a dread of their possibility might creep over a nature such as Herod’s; but the bare thought of a Pretender, with such claims, would fill him with suspicion, apprehension, and impotent rage. Nor is it difficult to understand, that the whole city should, although on different grounds, have

shared the ‘trouble’ of the king. It was certainly not, as some have suggested, from apprehension of ‘the woes’ which, according to popular notions, were to accompany the Advent of Messiah. Throughout the history of Christ the absence of such ‘woes’ was never made a ground of objection to His Messianic claims; and this, because these ‘woes’ were not associated with the first Advent of the Messiah, but with His final manifestation in power. And between these two periods a more or less long interval was supposed to intervene, during which the Messiah would be ‘hidden,’ either in the literal sense, or perhaps as to His power, or else in both respects. ^{f512} This enables us to understand the question of the disciples, as to the sign of His coming and the end of the world, and the answer of the Master. {As reported in St. ~~AMB~~ Matthew 24:3-29} But the people of Jerusalem had far other reason to fear. They knew only too well the character of Herod, and what the consequences would be to them, or to any one who might be suspected, however unjustly, of sympathy with any claimant to the royal throne of David. ^{f513}

Herod took immediate measures, characterized by his usual cunning. He called together all the High-Priests — past and present — and all the learned Rabbis, ^{f514} and, without committing himself as to whether the Messiah was already born, or only expected, ^{f515} This would enable him to judge, how far back he would have to make his own inquiries, since the birth of the Pretender might be made to synchronize with the earliest appearance of the sidereal phenomenon. So long as any one lived, who was born in Bethlehem between the *earliest* appearance of this ‘star’ and the time of the arrival of the Magi, he was not safe. The subsequent conduct of Herod {v. 16.} shows, that the Magi must have told him, that their earliest observation of the sidereal phenomenon had taken place two years before their arrival in Jerusalem.

The assembled authorities of Israel could only return one answer to the question submitted by Herod. As shown by the rendering of the *Targum Jonathan*, the prediction in ~~AMB~~ Micah 5:2 was at the time universally understood as pointing to Bethlehem, as the birthplace of the Messiah. That such was the general expectation, appears from the Talmud, {Jer. Ber. 2:4, p. 5 a.} where, in an imaginary conversation between an Arab and a Jew, Bethlehem is authoritatively named as Messiah’s birthplace. St. Matthew reproduces the prophetic utterance of Micah, exactly as such quotations were popularly made at that time. It will be remembered that, Hebrew being a dead language so far as the people were concerned, the

Holy Scriptures were always translated into the popular dialect, the person so doing being designated *Methurgeman* (*dragoman*) or interpreter. These renderings, which at the time of St. Matthew were not yet allowed to be written down, formed the precedent for, if not the basis of, our later *Targum*. In short, at that time each one *Targumed* for himself, and these *Targumim* (as our existing one on the Prophets shows) were neither literal versions, ^{f516} nor yet paraphrases, but something between them, a sort of interpreting translation. That, when Targuming, the New Testament writers should in preference make use of such a well-known and widely-spread version as the Translation of the LXX. needs no explanation. That they did not confine themselves to it, but, when it seemed necessary, literally or Targumically rendered a verse, appears from the actual quotations in the New Testament. Such *Targuming* of the Old Testament was entirely in accordance with the then universal method of setting Holy Scripture before a popular audience. It is needless to remark, that the New Testament writers would *Targum* as Christians. These remarks apply not only to the case under immediate consideration, {St. ~~4006~~ Matthew 2:6.} but generally to the quotations from the Old Testament in the New. ^{f517}

The further conduct of Herod was in keeping with his plans. He sent for the Magi — for various reasons, *secretly*. After ascertaining the precise time, when they had first observed the ‘star,’ he directed them to Bethlehem, with the request to inform him when they had found the Child; on pretence, that he was equally desirous with them to pay Him homage. As they left Jerusalem ^{f518} for the goal of their pilgrimage, to their surprise and joy, the ‘star,’ which had attracted their attention at its ‘rising,’ ^{f519} and which, as seems implied in the narrative, they had not seen of late, once more appeared on the horizon, and seemed to move before them, till ‘it stood over where the young child was’ — that is, of course, over Bethlehem, not over any special house in it. Whether at a turn of the road, close to Bethlehem, they lost sight of it, or they no longer heeded its position, since it had seemed to go before them to the goal that had been pointed out — for, surely, they needed not the star to *guide* them to Bethlehem — or whether the celestial phenomenon now disappeared, is neither stated in the Gospel-narrative, nor is indeed of any importance. Sufficient for them, and for us: they had been authoritatively directed to Bethlehem; as they had set out for it, the sidereal phenomenon had once more appeared; and it had seemed to go before them, till it actually stood over Bethlehem. And, since in ancient times such extraordinary ‘guidance’

by a 'star' was matter of belief and expectancy,^{f520} the Magi would, from their standpoint, regard it as the fullest confirmation that they had been rightly directed to Bethlehem — and 'they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.' It could not be difficult to learn in Bethlehem, where the Infant, around Whose Birth marvels had gathered, might be found. It appears that the temporary shelter of the 'stable' had been exchanged by the Holy Family for the more permanent abode of a 'house;' {v. 11} and there the Magi found the Infant-Savior with His Mother. With exquisite tact and reverence the narrative attempts not the faintest description of the scene. It is as if the sacred writer had fully entered into the spirit of St. Paul, 'Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more.' {~~486~~2 Corinthians 5:16} And thus it should ever be. It is the great fact of the manifestation of Christ — not its outward surroundings, however precious or touching they might be in connection with any ordinary earthly being — to which our gaze must be directed. The externals may, indeed, attract our sensuous nature; but they detract from the unmatched glory of the great supersensuous Reality.^{f521} Around the Person of the God-Man, in the hour when the homage of the heathen world was first offered Him, we need not, and want not, the drapery of outward circumstances. That scene is best realized, not by description, but by silently joining in the silent homage and the silent offerings of 'the wise men from the East.'

Before proceeding further, we must ask ourselves two questions: What relationship does this narrative bear to Jewish expectancy? and, Is there any astronomical confirmation of this account? Besides their intrinsic interest, the answer to the first question will determine, whether any legendary basis could be assigned to the narrative; while on the second will depend, whether the account can be truthfully charged with an accommodation on the part of God to the superstitions and errors of astrology. For, if the whole was extranatural, and the sidereal appearance specially produced in order to meet the astrological views of the Magi, it would not be a sufficient answer to the difficulty, 'that great catastrophes and unusual phenomena in nature have synchronized in a remarkable manner with great events in human history.'^{f522} On the other hand, if sidereal appearance was not of supernatural origin, and would equally have taken place whether or not there had been Magi to direct to Bethlehem, the difficulty is not only entirely removed, but the narrative affords another instance, alike of the condescension of God to the lower standpoint of the

Magi, and of His wisdom and goodness in the combination of circumstances.

As regards the question of Jewish expectancy, sufficient has been said in the preceding pages, to show that Rabbinism looked for a very different kind and manner of the world's homage to the Messiah than that of a few Magi, guided by a star to His Infant-Home. Indeed, so far from serving as historical basis for the origin of such a 'legend' a more gross caricature of Jewish Messianic anticipation could scarcely be imagined. Similarly futile would it be to seek a background for this narrative in Balaam's prediction, {^{f522}Numbers 24:17} since it is incredible that any one could have understood it as referring to a brief sidereal apparition to a few Magi, in order to bring them to look for the Messiah. ^{f523} Nor can it be represented as intended to fulfil the prophecy of Isaiah, {^{f524}40:6 last clauses} ^{f524} that 'they shall bring gold and incense, and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord.' For, supposing this figurative language to have been grossly literalized, ^{f525} what would become of the other part of that prophecy, ^{f526} which must, of course, have been treated in the same manner; not to speak of the fact, that the whole evidently refers not to the Messiah (least of all in His Infancy), but to Jerusalem in her latter-day glory. Thus, we fail to perceive any historical basis for a legendary origin of St. Matthew's narrative, either in the Old Testament or, still less, in Jewish tradition. And we are warranted in asking: If the account be not true, what rational explanation can be given of its origin, since its invention would never have occurred to any contemporary Jew?

But this is not all. There seems, indeed, no logical connection between this astrological interpretation of the Magi, and any supposed practice of astrology among the Jews. Yet, strange to say, writers have largely insisted on this. ^{f527} The charge is, to say the least, grossly exaggerated. That Jewish — as other Eastern — impostors pretended to astrological knowledge, and that such investigations may have been secretly carried on by certain Jewish students, is readily admitted. But the language of disapproval in which these pursuits are referred to — such as that knowledge of the Law is not found with astrologers — {Deb. R. 8,} and the emphatic statement, that he who learned even one thing from a *Mage* deserved death, show what views were authoritatively held. {Comp. Shabb. 75 a} ^{f528} Of course, the Jews (or many of them), like most ancients, believed in the influence of the planets upon the destiny of man. {See for ex. *Jos. War* 6, 5. 3} But it was a principle strongly expressed,

and frequently illustrated in the Talmud, that such planetary influence did not extend to Israel. {Shabb. 156 a} It must be admitted, that this was not always consistently carried out; and there were Rabbis who computed a man's future from the constellation (the *Mazzal*), either of the day, or the hour, under which he was born. {Shabb. u. s.} It was supposed, that some persons had a star of their own, {Moed K. 16 a} and the (representative) stars of all proselytes were said to have been present at Mount Sinai. Accordingly, they also, like Israel, had lost the defilement of the serpent (sin). {Shabb. 145 b; 146 a comp. Yeb. 103 b} One Rabbi even had it, that success, wisdom, the duration of life, and a posterity, depended upon the constellation. {Moed K. 28 a} Such views were carried out till they merged in a kind of fatalism, {Comp. Baba K. 2 b; Shabb. 121 b} or else in the idea of a 'natal affinity,' by which persons born under the same constellation were thought to stand in sympathetic *rapport*. {Ned. 39 b} The further statement, that conjunctions of the planets ^{f529} is scarcely astrological; nor perhaps this, that an eclipse of the sun betokened evil to the nations, an eclipse of the moon to Israel, because the former calculated time by the sun, the latter by the moon.

But there is one illustrative Jewish statement which, though not astrological, is of the greatest importance, although it seems to have been hitherto overlooked. Since the appearance of *Munter's* well known tractate on the Star of the Magi, ^{f530} and this on the ground of a quotation from the well-known Jewish commentator Abarbanel (or rather *Abrabanel*). {Born 143; died 1508.} In his Commentary on Daniel that Rabbi laid it down, that the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation Pisces betokened not only the most important events, but referred especially to Israel (for which he gives five mystic reasons). He further argues that, as that conjunction had taken place three years before the birth of Moses, which heralded the first deliverance of Israel, so it would also precede the birth of the Messiah, and the final deliverance of Israel. But the argument fails, not only because Abarbanel's calculations are inconclusive and even erroneous, ^{f531} but because it is manifestly unfair to infer the state of Jewish belief at the time of Christ from a haphazard astrological conceit of a Rabbi of the fifteenth century. There is, however, testimony which seems to us not only reliable, but embodies most ancient Jewish tradition. It is contained in one of the smaller *Midrashim*, of which a collection has lately been published. ^{f532} On account of its importance, one quotation at least from it should be made in full. The so-called Messiah-Haggadah (*Aggadoth Mashiach*)

opens as follows: ‘*A star shall come out of Jacob*. There is a Boraita in the name of the Rabbis: The heptad in which the Son of David cometh — in the *first* year, there will not be sufficient nourishment; in the *second* year the arrows of famine are launched; in the *third*, a great famine; in the *fourth*, neither famine nor plenty; in the *fifth*, great abundance, and the *Star shall shine forth from the East*, and *this is the Star of the Messiah*. And it will shine from the East for fifteen days, and if it be prolonged, it will be for the good of Israel; in the *sixth*, sayings (voices), and announcements (hearings); in the *seventh*, wars, and at the close of the seventh the Messiah is to be expected.’ A similar statement occurs at the close of a collection of three Midrashim — respectively entitled, ‘The Book of Elijah,’ ‘Chapters about the Messiah,’ and ‘The Mysteries of R. Simon, the son of Jochai’ {Jellinek, Beth ha-Midrash, fasc. 3 p. 8.} — where we read that a Star in the East was to appear two years before the birth of the Messiah. The statement is almost equally remarkable, whether it represents a tradition previous to the birth of Jesus, or originated after that event. But *two years* before the birth of Christ, which, as we have calculated, took place in December 749 A.U.C., or 5 before the Christian era, brings us to the year 747 A.U.C., or 7 before Christ, in which such a Star should appear in the East. ^{f533}

Did such a Star, then, really appear in the East seven years before the Christian era? Astronomically speaking, and without any reference to controversy, there can be no doubt that the most remarkable conjunction of planets — that of Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation of Pisces, which occurs only once in 800 years — *did* take place no less than three times in the year 747 A.U.C., or two years before the birth of Christ (in May, October and December). This conjunction is admitted by all astronomers. It was not only extraordinary, but presented the most brilliant spectacle in the night-sky, such as could not but attract the attention of all who watched the sidereal heavens, but especially of those who busied themselves with astrology. In the year following, that is, in 748 A.U.C., another planet, Mars, joined this conjunction. The merit of first discovering these facts, of which it is unnecessary here to present the literary history ^{f534} — belongs to the great *Kepler*, {*De Stella Nova* etc., Pragae, 160.} who, accordingly, placed the Nativity of Christ in the year 748 A.U.C. This date, however, is not only well nigh impossible; but it has also been shown that such a conjunction would, for various reasons, not answer the requirements of the Evangelical narrative, so far as the guidance to

Bethlehem is concerned. But it does fully account for the attention of the Magi being aroused, and — even if they had not possessed knowledge of the Jewish expectancy above described — for their making inquiry of all around, and certainly, among others, of the Jews. Here we leave the domain of the *certain*, and enter upon that of the *probable*. Kepler, who was led to the discovery by observing a similar conjunction in 1603-4, also noticed, that when the three planets came into conjunction, a new, extraordinary, brilliant, and peculiarly colored evanescent star was visible between Jupiter and Saturn, and he suggested that a similar star had appeared under the same circumstances in the conjunction preceding the Nativity. Of this, of course, there is not, and cannot be, absolute certainty. But, if so, this would be ‘the star’ of the Magi, ‘in its rising.’ There is yet another remarkable statement, which, however, must also be assigned only to the domain of the *probable*. In the astronomical tables of the Chinese — to whose general trustworthiness so high an authority as *Humboldt* bears testimony {Cosmos. vol. 1 p. 92.} — the appearance of an evanescent star was noted. Pingre and others have designated it as a comet, and calculated its first appearance in February 750 *a.U.C.*, which is just the time when the Magi would, in all probability, leave Jerusalem for Bethlehem, since this must have preceded the death of Herod, which took place in March 750. Moreover, it has been astronomically ascertained, that such a sidereal apparition would be visible to those who left Jerusalem, and that it would point — almost seem to go before — in the direction of, and stand over, Bethlehem. ^{f535} Such, impartially stated, are the facts of the case — and here the subject must, in the present state of our information, be left. ^{f536}

Only two things are recorded of this visit of the Magi to Bethlehem: their humblest Eastern homage, and their offerings. ^{f537} Viewed as gifts, the incense and the myrrh would, indeed, have been strangely inappropriate. But their offerings were evidently intended as specimens of the products of their country, and their presentation was, even as in our own days, expressive of the homage of their country to the new-found King. In this sense, then, the Magi may truly be regarded as the representatives of the Gentile world; their homage as the first and typical acknowledgment of Christ by those who hitherto had been ‘far off;’ and their offerings as symbolic of the world’s tribute. This deeper significance the ancient Church has rightly apprehended, though, perhaps, mistaking its grounds. Its symbolism, twining, like the convolvulus, around the Divine Plant, has traced in the gold the emblem of His Royalty; in the myrrh, of His

Humanity, and that in the fullest evidence of it, in His burying; and in the incense, that of His Divinity. ^{f538}

As always in the history of Christ, so here also, glory and suffering appear in juxtaposition. It could not be, that these Magi should become the innocent instruments of Herod's murderous designs; nor yet that the Infant-Savior should fall a victim to the tyrant. Warned of God in a dream, the 'wise men' returned 'into their own country another way;' and, warned by the angel of the Lord in a dream, the Holy Family sought temporary shelter in Egypt. Baffled in the hope of attaining his object through the Magi, the reckless tyrant sought to secure it by an indiscriminate slaughter of all the children in Bethlehem and its immediate neighborhood, from two years and under. True, considering the population of Bethlehem, their number could only have been small, probably twenty at most. ^{f539} But the deed was none the less atrocious; and these infants may justly be regarded as the 'protomartyrs,' the first witnesses, of Christ, 'the blossom of martyrdom' ('flores martyrum,' as *Prudentius* calls them). The slaughter was entirely in accordance with the character and former measures of Herod. ^{f540} Nor do we wonder, that it remained unrecorded by Josephus, since on other occasions also he has omitted events which to us seem important. ^{f541} The murder of a few infants in an insignificant village might appear scarcely worth notice in a reign stained by so much bloodshed. Besides, he had, perhaps, a special motive for this silence. Josephus always carefully suppresses, so far as possible, all that refers to the Christ ^{f542} — probably not only in accordance with his own religious views, but because mention of a Christ might have been dangerous, certainly would have been inconvenient, in a work written by an intense self-seeker, mainly for readers in Rome.

Of two passages in his own Old Testament Scriptures the Evangelist sees a fulfilment in these events. The flight into Egypt is to him the fulfilment of this expression by Hosea, 'Out of Egypt have I called My Son.' {^{2800b}Hosea 11:1.} In the murder of 'the Innocents,' he sees the fulfilment of Rachel's lament {²⁸¹⁵Jeremiah 31:15.} (who died and was buried in Ramah) ^{f543} over her children, the men of Benjamin, when the exiles to Babylon met in Ramah, {^{2410b}Jeremiah 11:1.} and there was bitter wailing at the prospect of parting for hopeless captivity, and yet bitterer lament, as they who might have encumbered the onward march were pitilessly slaughtered. Those who have attentively followed the course of Jewish thinking, and marked how the ancient Synagogue, and that rightly, read the Old Testament in its

unity, as ever pointing to the Messiah as the fulfilment of Israel's history, will not wonder at, but fully accord with, St. Matthew's retrospective view. The words of Hosea were in the highest sense 'fulfilled' in the flight to, and return of, the Savior from Egypt.^{f544} To an inspired writer, nay — to a true Jewish reader of the Old Testament, the question in regard to any prophecy could not be: What did *the prophet* — but, What did the *prophecy* — mean? And this could only be unfolded in the course of Israel's history. Similarly, those who ever saw in the past the prototype of the future, and recognized in events, not only the principle, but the very features, of that which was to come, could not fail to perceive, in the bitter wail of the mothers of Bethlehem over their slaughtered children, the full realization of the prophetic description of the scene enacted in Jeremiah's days. Had not the prophet himself heard, in the lament of the captives to Babylon, the echoes of Rachel's voice in the past? In neither one nor the other case had the utterances of the prophets (Hosea and Jeremiah) been *predictions*: they were *prophetic*. In neither one nor the other case was the 'fulfilment' literal: it was Scriptural, and that in the truest Old Testament sense.

CHAPTER 9

THE CHILD-LIFE IN NAZARETH.

(St. ~~4129~~ Matthew 2:19-23; St. ~~4129~~ Luke 2:39, 40.)

THE stay of the Holy Family in Egypt must have been of brief duration. The cup of Herod's misdeeds, but also of his misery, was full. During the whole latter part of his life, the dread of a rival to the throne had haunted him, and he had sacrificed thousands, among them those nearest and dearest to him, to lay that ghost. ^{f545} And still the tyrant was not at rest. A more terrible scene is not presented in history than that of the closing days of Herod. Tormented by nameless fears; ever and again a prey to vain remorse, when he would frantically call for his passionately-loved, murdered wife Mariamme, and her sons; even making attempts on his own life; the *delirium* of tyranny, the passion for blood, drove him to the verge of madness. The most loathsome disease, such as can scarcely be described, had fastened on his body, ^{f546} and his sufferings were at times agonizing. By the advice of his physicians, he had himself carried to the baths of Callirhoe (east of the Jordan), trying all remedies with the determination of one who will do hard battle for life. It was in vain. The namelessly horrible distemper, which had seized the old man of seventy, held him fast in its grasp, and, so to speak, played death on the living. He knew it, that his hour was come, and had himself conveyed back to his palace under the palm-trees of Jericho. They had known it also in Jerusalem, and, even before the last stage of his disease, two of the most honored and loved Rabbis — Judas and Matthias — had headed the wild band, which would sweep away all traces of Herod's idolatrous rule. They began by pulling down the immense golden eagle, which hung over the great gate of the Temple. The two ringleaders, and forty of their followers, allowed themselves to be taken by Herod's guards. A mock public trial in the theater at Jericho followed. Herod, carried out on a couch, was both accuser and judge. The zealots, who had made noble answer to the tyrant, were burnt alive; and the High-Priest, who was suspected of connivance, deposed.

After that the end came rapidly. On his return from Callirhoe, feeling his death approaching, the King had summoned the noblest of Israel

throughout the land of Jericho, and shut them up in the Hippodrome, with orders to his sister to have them slain immediately upon his death, in the grim hope that the joy of the people at his decease would thus be changed into mourning. Five days before his death one ray of passing joy lighted his couch. Terrible to say, it was caused by a letter from Augustus allowing Herod to execute his son Antipater — the false accuser and real murderer of his half-brothers Alexander and Aristobulus. The death of the wretched prince was hastened by his attempt to bribe the jailer, as the noise in the palace, caused by an attempted suicide of Herod, led him to suppose his father was actually dead. And now the terrible drama was hastening to a close. The fresh access of rage shortened the life which was already running out. Five days more, and the terror of Judaea lay dead. He had reigned thirty-seven years, thirty-four since his conquest of Jerusalem. Soon the rule for which he had so long plotted, striven, and stained himself with untold crimes, passed from his descendants. A century more, and the whole race of Herod had been swept away.

We pass by the empty pageant and barbaric splendor of his burying in the Castle of Herodium, close to Bethlehem. The events of the last few weeks formed a lurid back-ground to the murder of ‘the Innocents.’ As we have reckoned it, the visit of the Magi took place in February 750 *a.U.C.* On the 12th of March the Rabbis and their adherents suffered. On the following night (or rather early morning) there was a lunar eclipse; the execution of Antipater preceded the death of his father by five days, and the latter occurred from seven to fourteen days before the Passover, which in 750 took place on the 12th of April. ^{f547}

It need scarcely be said, that Salome (Herod’s sister) and her husband were too wise to execute Herod’s direction in regard to the noble Jews shut up in the Hippodrome. Their liberation, and the death of Herod, were marked by the leaders of the people as joyous events in the so-called *Megillath Taanith*, or Roll of Fasts, although the date is not exactly marked. {Meg. Taan 11, 1, ed Warsh, p. 16 *a.*} Henceforth this was to be a *Yom Tobh* (feast-day), on which mourning was interdicted. ^{f548}

Herod had three times before changed his testament. By the first will Antipater, the successful calumniator of Alexander and Aristobulus, had been appointed his successor, while the latter two were named kings, though we know not of what districts. {*Jos. War* 1:23.5} After the execution of the two sons of Mariamme, Antipater was named king, and, in

case of his death, Herod, the son of Mariamme II. When the treachery of Antipater was proved, Herod made a third will, in which Antipas (the Herod Antipas of the New Testament) was named his successor. {*Jos. Ant.* 17:6. 1; *War* 1:32. 7} But a few days before his death he made yet another disposition, by which Archelaus, the elder brother of Antipas (both sons of Malthake, a Samaritan), was appointed king; Antipas tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea; and Philip (the son of Cleopatra, of Jerusalem ^{f549}), tetrarch of the territory east of the Jordan. ^{f550} These testaments reflected the varying phases of suspicion and family-hatred through which Herod had passed. Although the Emperor seems to have authorized him to appoint his successor, {*Jos. War* 1:23.5} Herod wisely made his disposition dependent on the approval of Augustus. {*Ant.* 17:8.2} But the latter was not by any means to be taken for granted. Archelaus had, indeed, been immediately proclaimed King by the army; but he prudently declined the title, till it had been confirmed by the Emperor. The night of his father's death, and those that followed, were characteristically spent by Archelaus in rioting with his friends. {*Ant.* 17:8.4; 9.5} But the people of Jerusalem were not easily satisfied. At first liberal promises of amnesty and reforms had assuaged the populace. {*Ant.* 17:8.4} But the indignation excited by the late murder of the Rabbis soon burst into a storm of lamentation, and then of rebellion, which Archelaus silenced by the slaughter of not less than three thousand, and that within the sacred precincts of the Temple itself. {*Ant.* 17:1-3}

Other and more serious difficulties awaited him in Rome, whither he went in company with his mother, his aunt Salome, and other relatives. These, however, presently deserted him to espouse the claims of Antipas, who likewise appeared before Augustus to plead for the royal succession, assigned to him in a former testament. The Herodian family, while intriguing and clamoring each on his own account, were, for reasons easily understood, agreed that they would rather not have a king at all, but be under the suzerainty of Rome; though, if king there must be, they preferred Antipas to Archelaus. Meanwhile, fresh troubles broke out in Palestine, which were suppressed by fire, sword, and crucifixions. And now two other deputations arrived in the Imperial City. Philip, the step-brother of Archelaus, to whom the latter had left the administration of his kingdom, came to look after his own interests, as well as to support Archelaus. {*Ant.* 17:11.1; *War* 11. 6.1} ^{f551} At the same time, a Jewish deputation of fifty, from Palestine, accompanied by eight thousand Roman Jews, clamored for the deposition of the entire Herodian race, on account of their crimes, ^{f552}

and the incorporation of Palestine with Syria — no doubt in hope of the same semi-independence under their own authorities, enjoyed by their fellow-religionists in the Grecian cities. Augustus decided to confirm the last testament of Herod, with certain slight modifications, of which the most important was that Archelaus should bear the title of Ethnarch, which, if he deserved it, would by-and-by be exchanged for that of King. His dominions were to be Judaea, Idumaea, and Samaria, with a revenue of 600 talents ^{f553} (about 230,000*l* to 240,000*l*). It is needless to follow the fortunes of the new Ethnarch. He began his rule by crushing all resistance by the wholesale slaughter of his opponents. Of the High-Priestly office he disposed after the manner of his father. But he far surpassed him in cruelty, oppression, luxury, the grossest egotism, and the lowest sensuality, and that, without possessing the talent or the energy of Herod. ^{f554} His brief reign ceased in the year 6 of our era, when the Emperor banished him, on account of his crimes to Gaul.

It must have been soon after the accession of Archelaus, ^{f555} but before tidings of it had actually reached Joseph in Egypt, that the Holy Family returned to Palestine. The first intention of Joseph seems to have been to settle in Bethlehem, where he had lived since the birth of Jesus. Obvious reasons would incline him to choose this, and, if possible, to avoid Nazareth as the place of his residence. His trade, even had he been unknown in Bethlehem, would have easily supplied the modest wants of his household. But when, on reaching Palestine, he learned who the successor of Herod was, and also, no doubt, in what manner he had inaugurated his reign, common prudence would have dictated the withdrawal of the Infant-Savior from the dominions of Archelaus. But it needed Divine direction to determine his return to Nazareth. ^{f556}

Of the many years spent in Nazareth, during which Jesus passed from infancy to childhood, from childhood to youth, and from youth to manhood, the Evangelic narrative has left us but briefest notice. Of His *childhood*: that ‘He grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him;’ {St. ~~400~~ Luke 2:40} of His *youth*: besides the account of His questioning the Rabbis in the Temple, the year before he attained Jewish majority — that ‘He was subject to His parents,’ and that ‘He increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man.’ Considering what loving care watched over Jewish child-life, tenderly marking by not fewer than eight designations the various stages of its development, ^{f557} and the deep interest naturally attaching to the early

life of the Messiah, that silence, in contrast to the almost blasphemous absurdities of the Apocryphal Gospels, teaches us once more, and most impressively, that the Gospels furnish a history of the Savior, not a biography of Jesus of Nazareth.

St. Matthew, indeed, summarizes the whole outward history of the life in Nazareth in one sentence. Henceforth Jesus would stand out before the Jews of His time — and, as we know, of all times ^{f558} — by the distinctive designation: ‘of Nazareth,’ **γρxn** (Notsri), **Ναζωραῖος** ‘the Nazarene.’ In the mind of a Palestinian a peculiar significance would attach to the by-Name of the Messiah, especially in its connection with the general teaching of prophetic Scripture, And here we must remember, that St. Matthew primarily addressed his Gospel to Palestinian readers, and that it is the Jewish presentation of the Messiah as meeting Jewish expectancy. In this there is nothing derogatory to the character of the Gospel, no accommodation in the sense of adaptation, since Jesus was not only the Savior of the world, but especially also the King of the Jews, and we are now considering how He would stand out before the Jewish mind. On one point all were agreed: His Name was *Notsri* (of Nazareth). St. Matthew proceeds to point out, how entirely this accorded with prophetic Scripture — not, indeed, with any single prediction, but with the whole language of the prophets. From this ^{f559} the Jews derived not fewer than eight designations or Names by which the Messiah was to be called. The most prominent among them was that of *Tsemach*, or ‘Branch.’ {In accordance with ^{<2426>}Jeremiah 23:5; ^{<2435>}33:15; and especially ^{<3806>}Zechariah 3:18} We call it the most prominent, not only because it is based upon the clearest Scripture-testimony, but because it evidently occupied the foremost rank in Jewish thinking, being embodied in this earliest portion of their daily liturgy: ‘The *Branch* of David, Thy Servant, speedily make to shoot forth, and His Horn exalt Thou by Thy Salvation....Blessed art Thou Jehovah, Who causeth to spring forth (literally: to branch forth) the Horn of Salvation’ (15th Eulogy). Now, what is expressed by the word *Tsemach* is also conveyed by the term *Netser*, ‘Branch,’ in such passages as ^{<2806>}Isaiah 11:1, which was likewise applied to the Messiah. ^{f560} Thus, starting from ^{<2806>}Isaiah 11:1, *Netser* being equivalent to *Tsemach*, Jesus would, as *Notsri* or *Ben Netser*, {So in Be R. 76} ^{f561} bear in popular parlance, and that on the ground of prophetic Scriptures, the exact equivalent of the best-known designation of the Messiah. ^{f562} is His Name.} The more significant this, that it was not a self-chosen nor man-given name, but arose, in the

providence of God, from what otherwise might have been called the accident of His residence. We admit that this is a Jewish view; but then this Gospel is the Jewish view of the Jewish Messiah.

But, taking this Jewish title in its Jewish significance, it has also a deeper meaning, and that not only to Jews, but to all men. The idea of Christ as the Divinely placed 'Branch' (symbolized by His Divinely-appointed early residence), small and despized in its forthshooting, or then visible appearance (like Nazareth and the Nazarenes), but destined to grow as the Branch sprung out of Jesse's roots, is most marvellously true to the whole history of the Christ, alike as sketched 'by the prophets,' and as exhibited in reality. And thus to us all, Jews or Gentiles, the Divine guidance to Nazareth and the name Nazarene present the truest fulfilment of the prophecies of His history.

Greater contrast could scarcely be imagined than between the intricate scholastic studies of the Judaeans, and the active pursuits that engaged men in Galilee. It was a common saying: 'If a person wishes to be rich, let him go north; if he wants to be wise, let him come south', and to Judaea, accordingly, flocked, from ploughshare and workshop, whoever wished to become 'learned in the Law.' The very neighborhood of the Gentile world, the contact with the great commercial centers close by, and the constant intercourse with foreigners, who passed through Galilee along one of the world's great highways, would render the narrow exclusiveness of the Southerners impossible. Galilee was to Judaism 'the Court of the Gentiles' — the Rabbinic Schools of Judaea its innermost Sanctuary. The natural disposition of the people, even the soil and climate of Galilee, were not favorable to the all-engrossing passion for Rabbinic study. In Judaea all seemed to invite to retrospection and introspection; to favor habits of solitary thought and study, till it kindled into fanaticism. Mile by mile as you travelled southwards, memories of the past would crowd around, and thoughts of the future would rise within. Avoiding the great towns as the centers of hated heathenism, the traveller would meet few foreigners, but everywhere encounter those gaunt representatives of what was regarded as the superlative excellency of his religion. These were the embodiment of Jewish piety and asceticism, the possessors and expounders of the mysteries of his faith, the fountain-head of wisdom, who were not only sure of heaven themselves, but knew its secrets, and were its very aristocracy; men who could tell him all about his own religion, practiced its most minute injunctions, and could interpret every stroke and letter of the

Law — nay, whose it actually was to ‘loose and to bind,’ to pronounce an action lawful or unlawful, and to ‘remit or retain sins,’ by declaring a man liable to, or free from, expiatory sacrifices, or else punishment in this or the next world. No Hindoo fanatic would more humbly bend before Brahmin saints, nor devout Romanist more venerate the members of a holy fraternity, than the Jew his great Rabbis.^{f563} Reason, duty, and precept, alike bound him to reverence them, as he revered the God Whose interpreters, representatives, deputies, intimate companions, almost colleagues in the heavenly Sanhedrin, they were. And all around, even nature itself, might seem to foster such tendencies. Even at that time Judaea was comparatively desolate, barren, grey. The decaying cities of ancient renown; the lone highland scenery; the bare, rugged hills; the rocky terraces from which only artificial culture could woo a return; the wide solitary plains, deep glens, limestone heights — with distant glorious Jerusalem ever in the far background, would all favor solitary thought and religious abstraction.

It was quite otherwise in Galilee. The smiling landscape of Lower Galilee invited the easy labor of the agriculturist. Even the highlands of Upper Galilee^{f564} were not, like those of Judaea, sombre, lonely, enthusiasm-killing, but gloriously grand, free, fresh, and bracing. A more beautiful country — hill, dale, and lake — could scarcely be imagined than Galilee Proper. It was here that Asher had ‘dipped his foot in oil.’ According to the Rabbis, it was easier to rear a forest of olive-trees in Galilee than one child in Judaea. Corn grew in abundance; the wine, though not so plentiful as the oil, was rich and generous. Proverbially, all fruit grew in perfection, and altogether the cost of living was about one-fifth that in Judaea. And then, what a teeming, busy population! Making every allowance for exaggeration, we cannot wholly ignore the account of Josephus about the 240 towns and villages of Galilee, each with not less than 15,000 inhabitants. In the centers of industry all then known trades were busily carried on; the husbandman pursued his happy toil on genial soil, while by the Lake of Gennesaret, with its unrivalled beauty, its rich villages, and lovely retreats, the fisherman plied his healthy avocation. By those waters, overarched by a deep blue sky, spangled with the brilliancy of innumerable stars, a man might feel constrained by nature itself to meditate and pray; he would not be likely to indulge in a morbid fanaticism.

Assuredly, in its then condition, Galilee was not the home of Rabbinism, though that of generous spirits, of warm, impulsive hearts, of intense

nationalism, of simple manners, and of earnest piety. Of course, there would be a reverse side to the picture. Such a race would be excitable, passionate, violent. The Talmud accuses them of being quarrelsome, { *ḥynr-fnq* ‘cantankerous’ (?), Ned. 48 *a* } but admits that they cared more for honor than for money. The great ideal teacher of Palestinian schools was Akiba, and one of his most outspoken opponents a Galilean, Rabbi Jose. { Siphre on ^{<0409>}Numbers 10:19, ed. Friedmann, 4 *a*; Chag. 14 *a* } In religious observances their practice was simpler; as regarded canon-law they often took independent views, and generally followed the interpretations of those who, in opposition to Akiba, inclined to the more mild and rational — we had almost said, the more human — application of traditionalism.^{f565} The Talmud mentions several points in which the practice of the Galileans differed from that of Judaea, all either in the direction of more practical earnestness,^{f566} or of alleviation of Rabbinic rigorism.^{f567} On the other hand, they were looked down upon as neglecting traditionalism, unable to rise to its speculative heights, and preferring the attractions of the Haggadah to the logical subtleties of the Halakhah.^{f568} There was a general contempt in Rabbinic circles for all that was Galilean. Although the Judaeian or Jerusalem dialect was far from pure,^{f569} the people of Galilee were especially blamed for neglecting the study of their language, charged with errors in grammar, and especially with absurd malpronunciation, sometimes leading to ridiculous mistakes.^{f570} ‘Galilean, Fool!’ was so common an expression, that a learned lady turned with it upon so great a man as R. Jose, the Galilean, because he had used two needless words in asking her the road to Lydda. { Erub. 53 *b* }^{f571} Indeed, this R. Jose had considerable prejudices to overcome, before his remarkable talents and learning were fully acknowledged.^{f572}

Among such a people, and in that country, Jesus spent by far the longest part of His life upon earth. Generally, this period may be described as that of His true and full Human Development — physical, intellectual, spiritual — of outward submission to man, and inward submission to God, with the attendant results of ‘wisdom,’ ‘favor,’ and ‘grace.’ Necessary, therefore, as this period was, if the Christ was to be TRUE MAN, it cannot be said that it was lost, even so far as His Work as Savior was concerned. It was more than the preparation for that work; it was the commencement of it: *subjectively* (and passively), the self-abnegation of humiliation in His willing submission; and *objectively* (and actively), the fulfilment of all righteousness through it. But into this ‘mystery of piety’ we may only look

afar off — simply remarking, that it almost needed for us also these thirty years of *Human Life*, that the overpowering thought of His Divinity might not overshadow that of His Humanity. But if He was subject to such conditions, they must, in the nature of things, have affected His development. It is therefore not presumption when, without breaking the silence of Holy Scripture, we follow the various stages of the Nazareth life, as each is, so to speak, initialed by the brief but emphatic summaries of the third Gospel.

In regard to the *Child-Life*, ^{f573} we read: ‘And the Child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, ^{f574} being filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him. {St. ^{<B14>} Luke 2:40} This marks, so to speak, the lowest rung in the ladder. Having entered upon life as the Divine Infant, He began it as the Human Child, subject to all its conditions, yet perfect in them.

These conditions were, indeed, for that time, the happiest conceivable, and such as only centuries of Old Testament life-training could have made them. The Gentile world here presented terrible contrast, in them. alike in regard to the relation of parents and children, and the character and moral object of their upbringing. Education begins in the *home*, and there were not homes like those in Israel; it is imparted by influence and example, before it comes by teaching; it is acquired by what is seen and heard, before it is laboriously learned from books; its real object becomes instinctively felt, before its goal is consciously sought. What Jewish fathers and mothers were; what they felt towards their children; and with what reverence, affection, and care the latter returned what they had received, is known to every reader of the Old Testament. The relationship of father has its highest sanction and embodiment in that of God towards Israel; the tenderness and care of a mother in that of the watchfulness and pity of the Lord over His people. The semi-Divine relationship between children and parents appears in the location, the far more than outward duties which it implies in the wording, of the Fifth Commandment. No punishment more prompt than that of its breach; {^{<B18>} Deuteronomy 21:18-21.} no description more terribly realistic than that of the vengeance which overtakes such sin. {^{<B17>} Proverbs 30:17.}

From the first days of its existence, a religious atmosphere surrounded the child of Jewish parents. Admitted in the number of God’s chosen people by the deeply significant rite of circumcision, when its name was first spoken in the accents of prayer, ^{f575} it was henceforth separated unto God.

Whether or not it accepted the privileges and obligations implied in this dedication, they came to him directly from God, as much as the circumstances of his birth. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of Israel, the God of the promises, claimed him, with all of blessing which this conveyed, and of responsibility which resulted from it. And the first wish expressed for him was that, ‘as he had been joined to the covenant,’ so it might also be to him in regard to the ‘Torah’ (Law), to ‘the Chuppah’ (the marriage-baldachino), and ‘to good works;’ in other words, that he might live ‘godly, soberly, and righteously in this present world’ — a holy, happy, and God-devoted life. And what this was, could not for a moment be in doubt. Putting aside the overlying Rabbinic interpretations, the ideal of life was presented to the mind of the Jew in a hundred different forms — in none perhaps more popularly than in the words, ‘These are the things of which a man enjoys the fruit in this world, but their possession continueth for the next: to honor father and mother, pious works, peacemaking between man and man, and the study of the Law, which is equivalent to them all.’ {~~<900>~~ Psalm 1:1.} This devotion to the Law was, indeed, to the Jew the all in all — the sum of intellectual pursuits, the aim of life. What better thing could a father seek for his child than this inestimable boon?

The first education was necessarily the mother’s. ^{f576} Even the Talmud owns this, when, among the memorable sayings of the sages, it records one of the School of Rabbi Jannai, to the effect that knowledge of the Law may be looked for in those, who have sucked it in at their mother’s breast. {Ber. 63 *b.*} And what the true mothers in Israel were, is known not only from instances in the Old Testament, from the praise of woman in the Book of Proverbs, and from the sayings of the son of Sirach (~~<2000>~~ Ecclesiastes 3 ^{f577}), but from the Jewish women of the New Testament. ^{f578} If, according to a somewhat curious traditional principle, women were dispensed from all such positive obligations as were incumbent at fixed periods of time (such as putting on phylacteries), other religious duties devolved exclusively upon them. The Sabbath meal, the kindling of the Sabbath lamp, and the setting apart a portion of the dough from the bread for the household — these are but instances, with which every ‘Taph,’ as he clung to his mother’s skirts, must have been familiar. Even before he could follow her in such religious household duties, his eyes must have been attracted by the *Mezuzah* attached to the door-post, as the name of the Most High on the outside of the little folded parchment {On which ~~<800>~~ Deuteronomy 6:4-9 and ~~<5113>~~ 11:13-21 were inscribed.} was reverently

touched by each who came or went, and then the fingers kissed that had come in contact with the Holy Name. {*Jos. Ant.* 4:8. 13; *Ber.* 3. 3; *Megill.* 1:8; *Moed K.* 3.} Indeed, the duty of the *Mezuzah* was incumbent on women also, and one can imagine it to have been in the heathen-home of Lois and Eunice in the far-off ‘dispersion,’ where Timothy would first learn to wonder at, then to understand, its meaning. And what lessons for the past and for the present might not be connected with it! In popular opinion it was the symbol of the Divine guard over Israel’s homes, the visible emblem of this joyous hymn: ‘The Lord shall preserve thy going out and coming in, from this time forth, and even for evermore.’ {~~1318~~ *Psalm* 111:8.}

There could not be national history, nor even romance, to compare with that by which a Jewish mother might hold her child entranced. And it was his own history — that of his tribe, clan, perhaps family; of the past, indeed, but yet of the present, and still more of the glorious future. Long before he could go to school, or even Synagogue, the private and united prayers and the domestic rites, whether of the weekly Sabbath or of festive seasons, would indelibly impress themselves upon his mind. In mid-winter there was the festive illumination in each home. In most houses, the first night only one candle was lit, the next two, and so on to the eighth day; and the child would learn that this was symbolic, and commemorative of the *Dedication of the Temple*, its purgation, and the restoration of its services by the lion-hearted Judas the Maccabee. Next came, in earliest spring, the merry time of *Purim*, the Feast of Esther and of Israel’s deliverance through her, with its good cheer and boisterous enjoyments.

^{f579} Although the Passover might call the rest of the family to Jerusalem, the rigid exclusion of all leaven during the whole week could not pass without its impressions. Then, after the Feast of Weeks, came bright summer. But its golden harvest and its rich fruits would remind of the early dedication of the first and best to the Lord, and of those solemn processions in which it was carried up to Jerusalem. As autumn seared the leaves, the Feast of the New Year spoke of the casting up of man’s accounts in the great Book of Judgment, and the fixing of destiny for good or for evil. Then followed the Fast of the Day of Atonement, with its tremendous solemnities, the memory of which could never fade from mind or imagination; and, last of all, in the week of the Feast of Tabernacles, there were the strange leafy booths in which they lived and joyed, keeping

their harvest-thanksgiving; and praying and longing for the better harvest of a renewed world.

But it was not only through sight and hearing that, from its very inception, life in Israel became religious. There was also from the first positive teaching, of which the commencement would necessarily devolve on the mother. It needed not the extravagant laudations, nor the promises held out by the Rabbis, to incite Jewish women to this duty. If they were true to their descent, it would come almost naturally to them. Scripture set before them a continuous succession of noble Hebrew mothers. How well they followed their example, we learn from the instance of her, whose son, the child of a Gentile father, and reared far away, where there was not even a Synagogue to sustain religious life, had ‘from an infant ^{f580} known the Holy Scriptures,’ and that in their life-molding influence. {~~scribes~~ 2 Timothy 3:15; 1. 5.} It was, indeed, no idle boast that the Jews ‘were from their swaddling-clothes . . . trained to recognize God as their Father, and as the Maker of the world;’ that, ‘having been taught the knowledge (of the laws) from earliest youth, they bore in their souls the image of the commandments;’ {*Philo*, Legat. ad Cajum, sec. 16. 31.} that ‘from their earliest consciousness they learned the laws, so as to have them, as it were, engraven upon the soul;’ {*Jos. Ag. Apion* 2:19} and that they were ‘brought up in learning,’ ‘exercised in the laws,’ ‘and made acquainted with the acts of their predecessors in order to their imitation of them.’ {*Jos. Ag. Apion* 2:26; comp. 1.8. 12; 2:27.}

But while the earliest religious teaching would, of necessity, come from the lips of the mother, it was the father who was ‘bound to teach his son.’ {*Kidd*, 29 *a.*} To impart to the child knowledge of the Torah conferred as great spiritual distinction, as if a man had received the Law itself on Mount Horeb. {*Sanh.* 99 *b.*} Every other engagement, even the necessary meal, should give place to this paramount duty; {*Kidd*, 30 *a.*} nor should it be forgotten that, while here real labor was necessary, it would never prove fruitless. {*Meg.* 6 *b.*} That man was of the profane vulgar (an *Am ha-arets*), who had sons, but failed to bring them up in knowledge of the Law. {*Sot.* 22 *a.*} Directly the child learned to speak, his religious instruction was to begin — no doubt, with such verses of Holy Scripture as composed that part of the Jewish liturgy, which answers to our Creed. ^{f581} Then would follow other passages from the Bible, short prayers, and select sayings of the sages. Special attention was given to the culture of the *memory*, since forgetfulness might prove as fatal in its consequences as

ignorance or neglect of the Law. Very early the child must have been taught what might be called his birthday-text — some verse of Scripture beginning, or ending with, or at least containing, the same letters as his Hebrew name. This guardian-promise the child would insert in its daily prayers.^{f582} The earliest hymns taught would be the Psalms for the days of the week, or festive Psalms, such as the *Hallel*, {Psalm 113, 118.} or those connected with the festive pilgrimages to Zion.

The regular instruction commenced with the fifth or sixth year (according to strength), when every child was sent to school. {Baba B. 21 *a*; Keth. 50 *a*.} There can be no reasonable doubt that at that time such schools existed throughout the land. We find references to them at almost every period; indeed, the existence of higher schools and Academies would not have been possible without such primary instruction. Two Rabbis of Jerusalem, specially distinguished and beloved on account of their educational labors, were among the last victims of Herod's cruelty. {*Jos. Ant.* 17:6. 2.} Later on, tradition ascribes to Joshua the son of Gamla the introduction of schools in every town, and the compulsory education in them of all children above the age of six. {Baba B. 21 *a*.} Such was the transcendent merit attaching to this act, that it seemed to blot out the guilt of the purchase for him of the High-Priestly office by his wife Martha, shortly before the commencement of the great Jewish war. {*Yebam.* 61 *a*; *Yoma* 18 *a*.}^{f583} To pass over the fabulous number of schools supposed to have existed in Jerusalem, tradition had it that, despite of this, the City only fell because of the neglect of the education of children. {*Shabb.* 119 *b*.} It was even deemed unlawful to live in a place where there was no school. {*Sanh.* 17 *b*.} Such a city deserved to be either destroyed or excommunicated. {*Shabb.* u.s.}

It would lead too far to give details about the appointment of, and provision for, teachers, the arrangements of the schools, the method of teaching, or the subjects of study, the more so as many of these regulations date from a period later than that under review. Suffice it that, from the teaching of the alphabet or of writing, onwards to the farthest limit of instruction in the most advanced Academies of the Rabbis, all is marked by extreme care, wisdom, accuracy, and a moral and religious purpose as the ultimate object. For a long time it was not uncommon to teach in the open air; {*Shabb.* 127 *a*; *Moed K.* 16. *a*.} but this must have been chiefly in connection with theological discussions, and the instruction of youths. But the children were gathered in the Synagogues, or in School-houses,^{f584}

where at first they either stood, teacher and pupils alike, or else sat on the ground in a semicircle, facing the teacher, as it were, literally to carry into practice the prophetic saying: 'Thine eyes shall see thy teachers.'

{ ^{231D}Isaiah 30:20. } The introduction of benches or chairs was of later date; but the principle was always the same, that in respect of accommodation there was no distinction between teacher and taught. ^{f585} Thus, encircled by his pupils, as by a crown of glory (to use the language of Maimonides), the teacher, generally the *Chazzan*, or Officer of the Synagogue {For example, Shabb. 11 *a.* } — should impart to them the precious knowledge of the Law, with constant adaptation to their capacity, with unwearied patience, intense earnestness, strictness tempered by kindness, but, above all, with the highest object of their training ever in view. To keep children from all contact with vice; to train them to gentleness, even when bitterest wrong had been received; to show sin in its repulsiveness, rather than to terrify by its consequences; to train to strict truthfulness; to avoid all that might lead to disagreeable or indelicate thoughts; and to do all this without showing partiality, without either undue severity, or laxity of discipline, with judicious increase of study and work, with careful attention to thoroughness in acquiring knowledge — all this and more constituted the ideal set before the teacher, and made his office of such high esteem in Israel.

Roughly classifying the subjects of study, it was held, that, up to ten years of age, the Bible exclusively should be the text-book; from ten to fifteen, the Mishnah, or traditional law; after that age, the student should enter on those theological discussions which occupied time and attention in the higher Academies of the Rabbis. {Ab. 5:21.} Not that this progression would always be made. For, if after three, or, at most, five years of tuition — that is, after having fairly entered on Mishnic studies — the child had not shown decided aptitude, little hope was to be entertained of his future. The study of the Bible commenced with that of the Book of Leviticus. ^{f586} Thence it passed to the other parts of the Pentateuch; then to the Prophets; and, finally, to the Hagiographa. What now constitutes the Gemara or Talmud was taught in the Academies, to which access could not be gained till after the age of fifteen. Care was taken not to send a child too early to school, nor to overwork him when there. For this purpose the school-hours were fixed, and attendance shortened during the summer-months.

The teaching in school would, of course, be greatly aided by the services of the Synagogue, and the deeper influences of home-life. We know that,

even in the troublous times which preceded the rising of the Maccabees, the possession of parts or the whole of the Old Testament (whether in the original or the LXX. rendering) was so common, that during the great persecutions a regular search was made throughout the land for every copy of the Holy Scriptures, and those punished who possessed them. {1 Macc. 1:57; comp. *Jos. Ant.* 12:5, 4.} After the triumph of the Maccabees, these copies of the Bible would, of course, be greatly multiplied. And, although perhaps only the wealthy could have purchased a MS. of the whole Old Testament in Hebrew, yet some portion or portions of the Word of God, in the original, would form the most cherished treasure of every pious household. Besides, a school for Bible-study was attached to every academy, {*Jer. Meg.* 3:1, p. 73 d.} in which copies of the Holy Scripture would be kept. From anxious care to preserve the integrity of the text, it was deemed unlawful to make copies of small portions of a book of Scripture. ^{f587} But exception was made of certain sections which were copied for the instruction of children. Among them, the history of the Creation to that of the Flood; Leviticus 1-9; and Numbers 1-10, 35, are specially mentioned. {*Sopher. v.* 9, p. 25 *b*; *Gitt.* 60 *a*; *Jer. Meg.* 74 *a*; *Tos. Yad.* 2.}

It was in such circumstances, and under such influences, that the early years of Jesus passed. To go beyond this, and to attempt lifting the veil which lies over His Child-History, would not only be presumptuous, ^{f588} but involve us in anachronisms. Fain would we know it, whether the Child Jesus frequented the Synagogue School; who was His teacher, and who those who sat beside Him on the ground, earnestly gazing on the face of Him Who repeated the sacrificial ordinances in the Book of Leviticus, that were all to be fulfilled in Him. But it is all 'a mystery of Godliness.' We do not even know quite certainly whether the school-system had, at that time, extended to far-off Nazareth; nor whether the order and method which have been described were universally observed at that time. In all probability, however, there was such a school in Nazareth, and, if so, the Child-Savior would conform to the general practice of attendance. We may thus, still with deepest reverence, think of Him as learning His earliest earthly lesson from the Book of Leviticus. Learned Rabbis there were not in Nazareth — either then or afterwards. ^{f589} He would attend the services of the Synagogue, where Moses and the prophets were read, and, as afterwards by Himself, {*St. ~~QW16~~ Luke* 4:16.} occasional addresses delivered. ^{f590} That His was pre-eminently a pious home in the highest sense, it seems

almost irreverent to say. From His intimate familiarity with Holy Scripture, in its every detail, we may be allowed to infer that the home of Nazareth, however humble, possessed a precious copy of the Sacred Volume in its entirety. At any rate, we know that from earliest childhood it must have formed the meat and drink of the God-Man. The words of the Lord, as recorded by St. Matthew {St. ^{<158>}Matthew 5:18.} and St. Luke, {St. ^{<167>}Luke 16:17.} also imply that the Holy Scriptures which He read were in the original Hebrew, and that they were written in the square, or Assyrian, characters. ^{f591} Indeed, as the Pharisees and Saducees always appealed to the Scriptures in the original, Jesus could not have met them on any other ground, and it was this which gave such point to His frequent expostulations with them: ‘Have ye not read?’

But far other thoughts than theirs gathered around His study of the Old Testament Scriptures. When comparing their long discussions on the letter and law of Scripture with His references to the Word of God, it seems as if it were quite another book which was handled. As we gaze into the vast glory of meaning which He opens to us; follow the shining track of heavenward living to which He points; behold the lines of symbol, type, and prediction converging in the grand unity of that Kingdom which became reality in Him; or listen as, alternately, some question of His seems to rive the darkness, as with flash of sudden light, or some sweet promise of old to lull the storm, some earnest lesson to quiet the tossing waves — we catch faint, it may be far-off, glimpses of how, in that early Child-life, when the Holy Scriptures were His special study, He must have read them, and what thoughts must have been kindled by their light. And thus better than before can we understand it: ‘And the Child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him.’

CHAPTER 10

IN THE HOUSE OF HIS HEAVENLY, AND IN THE HOME OF HIS EARTHLY FATHER — THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM — THE RETIREMENT AT NAZARETH.

(St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ Luke 2:41-52.)

ONCE only is the great silence, which lies on the history of Christ's early life, broken. It is to record what took place on His first visit to the Temple. What this meant, even to an ordinary devout Jew, may easily be imagined. Where life and religion were so intertwined, and both in such organic connection with the Temple and the people of Israel, every thoughtful Israelite must have felt as if his real life were not in what was around, but ran up into the grand unity of the people of God, and were compassed by the halo of its sanctity. To him it would be true in the deepest sense, that, so to speak, each Israelite was born in Zion, as, assuredly, all the well-springs of his life were there. {~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ Psalm 87:5-7} It was, therefore, not merely the natural eagerness to see the City of their God and of their fathers, glorious Jerusalem; nor yet the lawful enthusiasm, national or religious, which would kindle at the thought of 'our feet' standing within those gates, through which priests, prophets, and kings had passed; but far deeper feelings which would make glad, when it was said: 'Let us go into the house of Jehovah.' They were not ruins to which precious memories clung, nor did the great hope seem to lie afar off, behind the evening-mist. But 'glorious things were spoken of Zion, the City of God', in the past, and in the near future 'the thrones of David' were to be set within her walls, and amidst her palaces. {~~ⲁⲓⲃⲏ~~ Psalm 122:1-5}

In strict law, personal observance of the ordinances, and hence attendance on the feasts at Jerusalem, devolved on a youth only when he was of age, that is, at thirteen years. Then he became what was called 'a son of the Commandment,' or 'of the Torah.' {Ab. 5:21} But, as a matter of fact, the legal age was in this respect anticipated by two years, or at least by one. {Yoma 82 a} It was in accordance with this custom, that, ^{f592} on the first Pascha after Jesus had passed His twelfth year, His Parents took Him with them in the 'company' of the Nazarenes to Jerusalem.

The text seems to indicate, that it was their wont ^{f593} to go up to the Temple; and we mark that, although women were not bound to make such personal appearance, {Jer Kidd. 61 c} Mary gladly availed herself of what seems to have been the direction of Hillel (followed also by other religious women, mentioned in Rabbinic writings), to go up to the solemn services of the Sanctuary. Politically, times had changed. The weak and wicked rule of Archelaus had lasted only nine years, {From 4 B.C. to 6 A.D.} when, in consequence of the charges against him, he was banished to Gaul. Judaea, Samaria and Idumaea were now incorporated into the Roman province of Syria, under its Governor, or *Legate*. The special administration of that part of Palestine was, however, entrusted to a *Procurator*, whose ordinary residence was at Caesarea. It will be remembered, that the Jews themselves had desired some such arrangement, in the vain hope that, freed from the tyranny of the Herodians, they might enjoy the semi-independence of their brethren in the Grecian cities. But they found it otherwise. Their privileges were not secured to them; their religious feelings and prejudices were constantly, though perhaps not intentionally, outraged; ^{f594} and their Sanhedrin shorn of its real power, though the Romans would probably not interfere in what might be regarded as purely religious questions. Indeed, the very presence of the Roman power in Jerusalem was a constant offence, and must necessarily have issued in a life and death struggle. One of the first measures of the new Legate of Syria, P. Sulpicius Quirinius, {6-11 (?) A.D.} after confiscating the ill-gotten wealth of Archelaus, was to order a census in Palestine, with the view of fixing the taxation of the country. {~~485~~ Acts 5:37; Jos. Ant. 18:1. 1} The popular excitement which this called forth was due, probably, not so much to opposition on principle, ^{f595} as to this, that the census was regarded as the badge of servitude, and incompatible with the Theocratic character of Israel. ^{f596} Had a census been considered absolutely contrary to the Law, the leading Rabbis would never have submitted to it; ^{f597} nor would the popular resistance to the measure of Quirinius have been quelled by the representations of the High-Priest Joazar. But, although through his influence the census was allowed to be taken, the popular agitation was not suppressed. Indeed, that movement formed part of the history of the time, and not only affected political and religious parties in the land, but must have been presented to the mind of Jesus Himself, since, as will be shown, it had a representative within His own family circle.

This accession of Herod, misnamed the Great, marked a period in Jewish history, which closed with the war of despair against Rome and the flames of Jerusalem and the Temple. It gave rise to the appearance of what Josephus, despite his misrepresentation of them, rightly calls a *fourth* party — besides the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes — that of the *Nationalists*. {Ant. 18:1. 6} A deeper and more independent view of the history of the times would, perhaps, lead us to regard the whole country as ranged either with or against that party. As afterwards expressed in its purest and simplest form, their watchword was, *negatively*, to call no human being their absolute lord; {Ant. 18:1. 6} *positively*, that God alone was to lead as absolute Lord. {u.s. and Jew. War 7:10. 1} It was, in fact, a revival of the Maccabean movement, perhaps more fully in its national than in its religious aspect, although the two could scarcely be separated in Israel, and their motto almost reads like that which according to some, furnished the letters whence the name *Maccabee* was composed: *Mi Camochah Baelim Jehovah*, ‘Who like Thee among the gods, Jehovah?’ {~~Exodus~~ Exodus 15:11} It is characteristic of the times and religious tendencies, that their followers were no more called, as before, *Assideans* or *Chasidim*, ‘the pious,’ but *Zealots* *ζηλωται* or by the Hebrew equivalent *Qannaim* (*Cananoeans*, not ‘*Canaanites*,’ as in A.V.) The real home of that party was not Judaea nor Jerusalem, but Galilee.

Quite other, and indeed antagonistic, tendencies prevailed in the stronghold of the Herodians, Sadducees, and Pharisees. Of the latter only a small portion had any real sympathy with the national movement. Each party followed its own direction. The Essenes, absorbed in theosophic speculations, not untinged with Eastern mysticism, withdrew from all contact with the world, and practiced an ascetic life. With them, whatever individuals may have felt, no such movement could have originated; nor yet with the Herodians or Boethusians, who combined strictly Pharisaic views with Herodian political partisanship; nor yet with the Sadducees; nor, finally, with what constituted the great bulk of the Rabbinist party, the School of Hillel. But the brave, free Highlanders of Galilee, and of the region across their glorious lake, seemed to have inherited the spirit of Jephthah, {~~Judges~~ Judges 11:3-6} and to have treasured as their ideal — alas! often wrongly apprehended — their own Elijah, as, descending in wild, shaggy garb from the mountains of Gilead, he did battle against all the might of Ahab and Jezebel. Their enthusiasm could not be kindled by the

logical subtleties of the Schools, but their hearts burned within them for their God, their land, their people, their religion, and their freedom.

It was in Galilee, accordingly, that such wild, irregular resistance to Herod at the outset of his career, as could be offered, was organized by guerrilla bands, which traversed the country, and owned one Ezekias as their leader. Although Josephus calls them 'robbers,' a far different estimate of them obtained in Jerusalem, where, as we remember, the Sanhedrin summoned Herod to answer for the execution of Ezekias. What followed is told in substantially the same manner, though with difference of form ^{f598} and, sometimes, nomenclature, by Josephus, {Ant. 14:9. 2-5} and in the Talmud. {Sanh. 19 a} The story has already been related in another connection. Suffice it that, after the accession of Herod, the Sanhedrin became a shadow of itself. It was packed with Sadducees and Priests of the King's nomination, and with Doctors of the canon-law, whose only aim was to pursue in peace their subtleties; who had not, and, from their contempt of the people, could not have, any real sympathy with national aspirations; and whose ideal heavenly Kingdom was a miraculous, heaven-instituted, absolute rule of Rabbis. Accordingly, the national movement, as it afterwards developed, received neither the sympathy nor the support of leading Rabbis. Perhaps the most gross manifestation of this was exhibited, shortly before the taking of Jerusalem, by R. Jochanan ben Saccai, the most renowned among its teachers. Almost unmoved he had witnessed the portent of the opening of the Temple-doors by an unseen Hand, which, by an interpretation of ^{<300>}Zechariah 11:1, was popularly regarded as betokening its speedy destruction. {Yoma 39 b} ^{f599} There is cynicism, as well as want of sympathy, in the story recorded by tradition, that when, in the straits of famine during the siege, Jochanan saw people eagerly feasting on soup made from straw, he scouted the idea of such a garrison resisting Vespasian and immediately resolved to leave the city. {Midr. R. on ^{<200>}Lamentations 1:5; ed. Warsh. vol. 3 p. 60 a} In fact, we have distinct evidence that R. Jochanan had, as leader of the School of Hillel, used all his influence, although in vain, to persuade the people to submission to Rome. {Ab. de R. Nathan 4}

We can understand it, how this school had taken so little interest in anything purely national. Generally only one side of the character of Hillel has been presented by writers, and even this in greatly exaggerated language. His much lauded gentleness, peacefulness, and charity were rather negative than positive qualities. He was a philosophic Rabbi, whose

real interest lay in a far other direction than that of sympathy with the people — and whose motto seemed, indeed, to imply, ‘We, the sages, are the people of God; but this people, who know not the Law, are curse.’ {Comp. Ab 2:5} A far deeper feeling, and intense, though misguided earnestness pervaded the School of Shammai. It was in the minority, but it sympathized with the aspirations of the people. It was not philosophic nor eclectic, but intensely national. It opposed all approach to, and by, strangers; it dealt harshly with proselytes, {Shabb. 31} even the most distinguished (such as Akylas or Onkelos); {Ber. R. 70} it passed, by first murdering a number of Hillelites who had come to the deliberative assembly, eighteen decrees, of which the object was to prevent all intercourse with Gentiles; ^{f600} and it furnished leaders or supporters of the national movement.

We have marked the rise of the Nationalist party in Galilee at the time of Herod’s first appearance on the scene, and learned how mercilessly he tried to suppress it: first, by the execution of Ezekias and his adherents, and afterwards, when he became King of Judaea, by the slaughter of the Sanhedrists. The consequence of this unsparing severity was to give Rabbinism a different direction. The School of Hillel which henceforth commanded the majority, were men of no political color, theological theorists, self-seeking Jurists, vain rather than ambitious. The minority, represented by the School of Shammai, were Nationalists. Defective and even false as both tendencies were, there was certainly more hope, as regarded the Kingdom of God, of the Nationalists than of the Sophists and Jurists. It was, of course, the policy of Herod to suppress all national aspirations. No one understood the meaning of Jewish Nationalism so well as he; no one ever opposed it so systematically. There was internal fitness, so to speak, in his attempt to kill the King of the Jews among the infants of Bethlehem. The murder of the Sanhedrists, with the consequent new anti-Messianic tendency of Rabbinism, was one measure in that direction; the various appointments which Herod made to the High-Priesthood another. And yet it was not easy, even in those times, to deprive the Pontificate of its power and influence. The High-Priest was still the representative of the religious life of the people, and he acted on all occasions, when the question under discussion was not one exclusively of subtle canon-law, as the President of the Sanhedrin, in which, indeed, the members of his family had evidently seat and vote. {~~400b~~ Acts 4:6} The four families ^{f601} from which, with few exceptions, the High-Priest — however often changed —

were chosen, absorbed the wealth, and commanded the influence, of a state-endowed establishment, in its worst times. It was, therefore, of the utmost importance to make wise choice of the High-Priest. With the exception of the brief tenure by Aristobulus, the last of the Maccabees — whose appointment, too soon followed by his murder, was at the time a necessity — all the Herodian High-Priests were non-Palestinians. A keener blow than this could not have been dealt at Nationalism.

The same contempt for the High-Priesthood characterized the brief reign of Archelaus. On his death-bed, Herod had appointed to the Pontificate Joazar, a son of Boethos, the wealthy Alexandrian priest, whose daughter, Mariamme II., he had married. The Boethusian family, allied to Herod, formed a party — the Herodians — who combined strict Pharisaic views with devotion to the reigning family.^{f602} Joazar took the popular part against Archelaus, on his accession. For this he was deprived of his dignity in favor of another son of Boethos, Eleazar by name. But the mood of Archelaus was fickle — perhaps he was distrustful of the family of Boethos. At any rate, Eleazar had to give place to Jesus, the son of Sie, an otherwise unknown individual. At the time of the taxing of Quirinius we find Joazar again in office, {Ant. 18:1. 1} apparently restored to it by the multitude, which, having taken matters into its own hands at the change of government, recalled one who had formerly favored national aspirations. {Ant. 18:2. 1} It is thus that we explain his influence with the people, in persuading them to submit to the Roman taxation.

But if Joazar had succeeded with the unthinking populace, he failed to conciliate the more advanced of his own party, and, as the event proved, the Roman authorities also, whose favor he had hoped to gain. It will be remembered, that the Nationalist party — or ‘Zealots,’ as they were afterwards called, first appeared in those guerrilla-bands which traversed Galilee under the leadership of Ezekias, whom Herod executed. But the National party was not destroyed, only held in check, during his iron reign. It was once more the family of Ezekias that headed the movement. During the civil war which followed the accession of Archelaus, or rather was carried on while he was pleading his cause in Rome, the standard of the Nationalists was again raised in Galilee. Judas, the son of Ezekias, took possession of the city of Sepphoris, and armed his followers from the royal arsenal there. At that time, as we know, the High-Priest Joazar sympathized, at least indirectly, with the Nationalists. The rising, which indeed was general throughout Palestine, was suppressed by fire and

sword, and the sons of Herod were enabled to enter on their possessions. But when, after the deposition of Archelaus, Joazar persuaded the people to submit to the taxing of Quirinius, Judas was not disposed to follow what he regarded as the treacherous lead of the Pontiff. In conjunction with a Shammaite Rabbi, Sadduk, he raised again the standard of revolt, although once more unsuccessfully. {Ant. 18 1:1} How the Hillelites looked upon this movement, we gather even from the slighting allusion of Gamaliel. {~~HER~~ Acts 5:37} The family of Ezekias furnished other martyrs to the National cause. The two sons of Judas died for it on the cross in 46 A. D. {Ant. 20:5. 2} Yet a third son, Manahem, who, from the commencement of the war against Rome, was one of the leaders of the most fanatical Nationalists, the Sicarii — the Jacobins of the party, as they have been aptly designated — died under unspeakable sufferings, {Jewish War 2:17 8 and 9} while a fourth member of the family, Eleazar, was the leader of Israel's forlorn hope, and nobly died at Masada, in the closing drama of the Jewish war of independence. {Jewish War, 7:7-9} Of such stuff were the Galilean Zealots made. But we have to take this intense Nationalist tendency also into account in the history of Jesus, the more so that at least one of His disciples, and he a member of His family, had at one time belonged to the party. Only the Kingdom of which Jesus was the King was, as He Himself said, not of this world, and of far different conception from that for which the Nationalists longed.

At the time when Jesus went up to the feast, Quirinius was, as already stated, Governor of Syria. The taxing and the rising of Judas were alike past; and the Roman Governor, dissatisfied with the trimming of Joazar, and distrustful of him, had appointed in his stead Ananos, the son of Seth, the Annas of infamous memory in the New Testament. With brief interruption, he or his son held the Pontifical office till, under the Procuratorship of Pilate, Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Annas, succeeded to that dignity. It has already been stated that, subject to the Roman Governors of Syria, the rule of Palestine devolved on Procurators, of whom Coponius was the first. Of him and his immediate successors — Marcus Ambivius, {9-12 A.D.} Annius Rufus, {12-15 A.D.} and Valerius Gratus, {15-26 A.D.} we know little. They were, indeed, guilty of the most grievous fiscal oppressions, but they seem to have respected, so far as was in them, the religious feelings of the Jews. We know, that they even removed the image of the Emperor from the standards of the Roman soldiers before marching them into Jerusalem, so as to avoid the

appearance of a *cultus* of the Caesars. It was reserved for Pontius Pilate to force this hated emblem on the Jews, and otherwise to set their most sacred feelings at defiance. But we may notice, even at this stage, with what critical periods in Jewish history the public appearance of Christ synchronized. His first visit to the Temple followed upon the Roman possession of Judaea, the taxing, and the national rising, as also the institution of Annas to the High-Priesthood. And the commencement of His public Ministry was contemporaneous with the accession of Pilate, and the institution of Caiaphas. Whether viewed subjectively or objectively, these things also have a deep bearing upon the history of the Christ.

It was, as we reckon it, in spring A. D. 9, that Jesus for the first time went up to the Paschal Feast in Jerusalem. Coponius would be there as the Procurator; and Annas ruled in the Temple as High-Priest, when He appeared among its doctors. But far other than political thoughts must have occupied the mind of Christ. Indeed, for a time a brief calm had fallen upon the land. There was nothing to provoke active resistance, and the party of the Zealots, although existing, and striking deeper root in the hearts of the people, was, for the time, rather what Josephus called it, 'the philosophical party' — their minds busy with an ideal, which their hands were not yet preparing to make a reality. And so, when, according to ancient wont, {~~491~~ Psalm 42, ~~339~~ Isaiah 30:29.} the festive company from Nazareth, soon swelled by other festive bands, went up to Jerusalem, chanting by the way those 'Psalms of Ascent' {A.V. 'Degrees'; Psalm 120-134.} to the accompaniment of the flute, they might implicitly yield themselves to the spiritual thoughts kindled by such words.

When the pilgrims' feet stood within the gates of Jerusalem, there could have been no difficulty in finding hospitality, however crowded the City may have been on such occasions ^{f603} — the more so when we remember the extreme simplicity of Eastern manners and wants, and the abundance of provisions which the many sacrifices of the season would supply. But on this subject, also, the Evangelic narrative keeps silence. Glorious as a view of Jerusalem must have seemed to a child coming to it for the first time from the retirement of a Galilean village, we must bear in mind, that He Who now looked upon it was not an ordinary Child. Nor are we, perhaps, mistaken in the idea that the sight of its grandeur would, as on another occasion, {St. ~~494~~ Luke 19:41.} awaken in Him not so much feelings of admiration, which might have been akin to those of pride, as of sadness, though He may as yet have been scarcely conscious of its deeper reason.

But the one all-engrossing thought would be of the *Temple*. This, his first visit to its halls, seems also to have called out the first outspoken — and may we not infer, the first conscious — thought of that Temple as the House of His Father, and with it the first conscious impulse of his Mission and Being. Here also it would be the higher meaning, rather than the structure and appearance, of the Temple, that would absorb the mind. And yet there was sufficient, even in the latter, to kindle enthusiasm. As the pilgrim ascended the Mount, crested by that symmetrically proportioned building, which could hold within its gigantic girdle not fewer than 210,000 persons, his wonder might well increase at every step. The Mount itself seemed like an island, abruptly rising from out deep valleys, surrounded by a sea of walls, palaces, streets, and houses, and crowned by a mass of snowy marble and glittering gold, rising terrace upon terrace. Altogether it measured a square of about 1,000 feet, or, to give a more exact equivalent of the measurements furnished by the Rabbis, 927 feet. At its north-western angle, and connected with it, frowned the Castle of Antonia, held by the Roman garrison. The lofty walls were pierced by massive gates — the unused gate (*Tedi*) on the north; the Susa Gate on the east, which opened on the arched roadway to the Mount of Olives; ^{f604} the two so-called ‘Huldah’ (probably, ‘weasel’) gates, which led by tunnels ^{f605} from the priest-suburb Ophel into the outer Court; and, finally, four gates on the west.

Within the gates ran all around covered double colonnades, with here are there benches for those who resorted thither for prayer or for conference. The most magnificent of those was the southern, or twofold double colonnade, with a wide space between; the most venerable, the ancient ‘Solomon’s Porch,’ or eastern colonnade. Entering from the Xystus bridge, and under the tower of John, {*Jos. War* 6:3. 2.} one would pass along the southern colonnade (over the tunnel of the Huldah-gates) to its eastern extremity, over which another tower rose, probably ‘the pinnacle’ of the history of the Temptation. From this height yawned the Kedron valley 450 feet beneath. From that lofty pinnacle the priest each morning watched and announced the earliest streak of day. Passing along the eastern colonnade, or Solomon’s Porch, we would, if the description of the Rabbis is trustworthy, have reached the Susa Gate, the carved representation of that city over the gateway reminding us of the *Eastern* Dispersion. Here the standard measures of the Temple are said to have been kept; and here, also, we have to locate the first or lowest of the three Sanhedrins, which,

according to the Mishnah, {Sanh. 11:2.} held their meetings in the Temple; the second, or intermediate Court of Appeal, being in the 'Court of the Priests' (probably close to the Nicanor Gate); and the highest, that of the Great Sanhedrin, at one time in the 'Hall of Hewn Square Stones' (*Lishkath ha-Gazith*.)

Passing out of these 'colonnades,' or 'porches,' you entered the 'Court of the Gentiles,' or what the Rabbis called 'the Mount of the House,' which was widest on the west side, and more and more narrow respectively on the east, the south, and the north. This was called the *Chol*, or 'profane' place to which Gentiles had access. Here must have been the market for the sale of sacrificial animals, the tables of the money-changers, and places for the sale of other needful articles. {St. ^{<B124>}John 2:14; St. ^{<B12>}Matthew 21:12; Jerus. Chag. p. 78 *a*; comp. ^{<B134>}Nehemiah 13:4 etc.} ^{f606} Advancing within this Court, you reached a low breast-wall (the *Soreg*), which marked the space beyond which no Gentile, nor Levitically unclean person, might proceed — tablets, bearing inscriptions to that effect, warning them off. Thirteen openings admitted into the inner part of the Court. Thence fourteen steps led up to the *Chel* or Terrace, which was bounded by the wall of the Temple-buildings in the stricter sense. A flight of steps led up to the massive, splendid gates. The two on the west side seem to have been of no importance, so far as the worshippers were concerned, and probably intended for the use of workmen. North and south were four gates. ^{f607} But the most splendid gate was that to the east, termed 'the Beautiful.' {^{<B12>}Acts 3:2.}

Entering by the latter, you came into the Court of the Women, so called because the women occupied in it two elevated and separated galleries, which, however, filled only part of the Court. Fifteen steps led up to the Upper Court, which was bounded by a wall, and where was the celebrated Nicanor Gate, covered with Corinthian brass. Here the Levites, who conducted the musical part of the service, were placed. In the Court of the Women were the Treasury and the thirteen 'Trumpets,' while at each corner were chambers or halls, destined for various purposes. Similarly, beyond the fifteen steps, there were repositories for the musical instruments. The Upper Court was divided into two parts by a boundary — the narrow part forming the Court of Israel, and the wider that of the Priests, in which were the great Altar and the Laver.

The Sanctuary itself was on a higher terrace than that Court of the Priests. Twelve steps led up to its Porch, which extended beyond it on either side (north and south). Here, in separate chambers, all that was necessary for the sacrificial service was kept. On two marble tables near the entrance the old shewbread which was taken out, and the new that was brought in, were respectively placed. The Porch was adorned by votive presents, conspicuous among them a massive golden vine. A two-leaved gate opened into the Sanctuary itself, which was divided into two parts. The *Holy Place* had the Golden Candlestick (south), the Table of Shewbread (north), and the Golden Altar of Incense between them. A heavy double veil concealed the entrance to the *Most Holy Place*, which in the second Temple was empty, nothing being there but the piece of rock, called the *Ebhen Shethiyah*, or Foundation Stone, which, according to tradition, covered the mouth of the pit, and on which, it was thought, the world was founded. Nor does all this convey an adequate idea of the vastness of the Temple-buildings. For all around the Sanctuary and each of the Courts were various chambers and out-buildings, which served different purposes connected with the Services of the Temple. ^{f608}

In some part of this Temple, ‘sitting in the midst of the Doctors,’ ^{f609} both hearing them and asking them questions,’ we must look for the Child Jesus on the third and the two following days of the Feast on which He first visited the Sanctuary. Only on the two first days of the Feast of Passover was personal attendance in the Temple necessary. With the third day commenced the so-called half-holydays, when it was lawful to return to one’s home {So according to the Rabbis generally. Comp. *Hoffmann*, *Abh.* 2 d. pent. Ges. pp. 65, 66.} — a provision of which, no doubt, many availed themselves. Indeed, there was really nothing of special interest to detain the pilgrims. For, the Passover had been eaten, the festive sacrifice (or *Chagigah*) offered, and the first ripe barely reaped and brought to the Temple, and waved as the Omer of first flour before the Lord. Hence, in view of the well-known Rabbinic provision, the expression in the Gospel-narrative concerning the ‘Parents’ of Jesus, ‘when they had fulfilled the days,’ {St. ¹¹²⁶ Luke 2:43.} cannot necessarily imply that Joseph and the Mother of Jesus had remained in Jerusalem during the whole Paschal week. ^{f610} On the other hand, the circumstances connected with the presence of Jesus could not have been found among the Doctors after the close of the Feast. The first question here is as to the locality in the Temple, where the scene has to be laid. It has, indeed, been commonly supposed that there

was a Synagogue in the Temple; but of this there is, to say the least, no historical evidence. ^{f611} But even if such had existed, the worship and addresses of the Synagogue would not have offered any opportunity for the questioning on the part of Jesus which the narrative implies. Still more groundless is the idea that there was in the Temple something like a *Beth ha-Midrash*, or theological Academy, not to speak of the circumstance that a child of twelve would not, at any time, have been allowed to take part in its discussions. But there were occasions on which the Temple became virtually, though not formally, a *Beth ha-Midrash*. For we read in the Talmud, {Sanh. 88 b.} that the members of the Temple-Sanhedrin, who on ordinary days sat as a Court of Appeal, from the close of the Morning to the time of the Evening-Sacrifice, were wont on Sabbaths and *feast-days* to come out upon 'the Terrace' of the Temple, and there to teach. In such popular instruction the utmost latitude of questioning would be given. It is in this audience, which sat on the ground, surrounding and mingling with the Doctors — and hence *during*, not *after* the Feast — that we must seek the Child Jesus.

But we have yet to show that the presence and questioning of a Child of that age did not necessarily imply anything so extraordinary, as to convey the idea of supernaturalness to those Doctors or others in the audience. Jewish tradition gives other instances of precocious and strangely advanced students. Besides, scientific theological learning would not be necessary to take part in such popular discussions. If we may judge from later arrangements, not only in Babylon, but in Palestine, there were two kinds of public lectures, and two kinds of students. The first, or more scientific class, was designated *Kallah* (literally, bride), and its attendants *Beney-Kallah* (children of the bride). These lectures were delivered in the last month of summer (Elul), before the Feast of the New Year, and in the last winter month (Adar), immediately before the Feast of Passover. They implied considerable preparation on the part of the lecturing Rabbis, and at least some Talmudic knowledge on the part of the attendants. On the other hand, there were Students of the Court (*Chatsatsta*, and in Babylon *Tarbitsa*), who during ordinary lectures sat separated from the regular students by a kind of hedge, outside, as it were in the Court, some of whom seem to have been ignorant even of the Bible. The lectures addressed to such a general audience would, of course, be of a very different character. {Comp. Jer. Ber. 4 p. 7 d, and other passages.}

But if there was nothing so unprecedented as to render His Presence and questioning marvellous, yet all who heard Him ‘were amazed’ at His ‘combinative insight’ ^{f612} and ‘discerning answers.’ ^{f613} We scarcely venture to inquire towards what His questioning had been directed. Judging by what we know of such discussion, we infer that they may have been connected with the Paschal solemnities. Grave Paschal questions *did* arise. Indeed, the great Hillel obtained his rank as chief when he proved to the assembled Doctors that the Passover might be offered even on the Sabbath. {Jer. Pes. 6:1; Pes. 66 *a*.} Many other questions might arise on the subject of the Passover. Or did the Child Jesus — as afterwards, in connection with the Messianic teaching {St. ~~422~~ Matthew 22:42-45.} — lead up by His questions to the deeper meaning of the Paschal solemnities, as it was to be unfolded, when Himself was offered up, ‘the Lamb of God, Which taketh away the sin of the world’?

Other questions also almost force themselves on the mind — most notably this: whether on the occasion of this His first visit to the Temple, the Virgin-Mother had told her Son the history of His Infancy, and of what had happened when, for the first time, He had been brought to the Temple. It would almost seem so, if we might judge from the contrast between the Virgin-Mother’s complaint about the search of His father and of her, and His own emphatic appeal to the business of His Father. But most surprising — truly wonderful it must have seemed to Joseph, and even to the Mother of Jesus, that the meek, quiet Child should have been found in such company, and so engaged. It must have been quite other than what, from His past, they would have expected; or they would not have taken it for granted, when they left Jerusalem, that He was among their kinsfolk and acquaintance, perhaps mingling with the children. Nor yet would they, in such case, after they missed Him at the first night’s halt — at Sichem, {Jos. Ant. 15:8. 5.} if the direct road north, through Samaria, ^{f614} was taken (or, according to the Mishnah, at Akrah) {Maas. Sh. 5:2.} — have so anxiously sought Him by the way, ^{f615} and in Jerusalem; nor yet would they have been ‘amazed’ when they found Him in the assembly of the Doctors. The reply of Jesus to the half-reproachful, half-relieved expostulation of them who had sought Him ‘sorrowing’ these three days, ^{f616} sets clearly these three things before us. He had been so entirely absorbed by the awakening thought of His Being and Mission, however kindled, as to be not only neglectful, but forgetful of all around. Nay, it even seemed to Him impossible to understand how they could have sought Him, and not known

where He had lingered. *Secondly*: we may venture to say, that He now realized that this was emphatically *His* Father's House. And, *thirdly*: so far as we can judge, it was then and there that, for the first time, He felt the strong and irresistible impulse — that Divine necessity of His Being — to be 'about His Father's business.' ^{f617} We all, when first awakening to spiritual consciousness — or, perhaps, when for the first time taking part in the feast of the Lord's House — may, and, learning from His example, should, make this the hour of decision, in which heart and life shall be wholly consecrated to the 'business' of our Father. But there was far more than this in the bearing of Christ on this occasion. That forgetfulness of His Child-life was a sacrifice — a sacrifice of self; that entire absorption in His Father's business, without a thought of self, either in the gratification of curiosity, the acquisition of knowledge, or personal ambition — a consecration of Himself unto God. It was the first manifestation of His passive and active obedience to the Will of God. Even at this stage, it was the forth-bursting of the inmost meaning of His Life: 'My meat is to do the Will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work.' And yet this awakening of the Christ-consciousness on His first visit to the Temple, partial, and perhaps even temporary, as it may have been, seems itself like the morning-dawn, which from the pinnacle of the Temple the Priest watched, ere he summoned his waiting brethren beneath to offer the early sacrifice.

From what we have already learned of this History, we do not wonder that the answer of Jesus came to His parents as a fresh surprise. For, we can only understand what we perceive in its totality. But here each fresh manifestation came as something separate and new — not as part of a whole; and therefore as a surprise, of which the purport and meaning could not be understood, except in its organic connection and as a whole. And for the true human development of the God-Man, what was the natural was also the needful process, even as it was best for the learning of Mary herself, and for the future reception of His teaching. These three subsidiary reasons may once more be indicated here in explanation of the Virgin-Mother's seeming ignorance of her Son's true character: the necessary gradualness of such a revelation; the necessary development of His own consciousness; and the fact, that Jesus could not have been subject to His Parents, nor had true and proper human training, if they had clearly known that He was the essential Son of God.

A further, though to us it seems a downward step, was His quiet, immediate, unquestioning return to Nazareth with His Parents, and His

willing submission ^{f618} to them while there. It was self-denial, self-sacrifice, self-consecration to His Mission, with all that it implied. It was not self-exinanition but self-submission, all the more glorious in proportion to the greatness of that *Self*. This constant contrast before her eyes only deepened in the heart of Mary the ever-present impression of ‘all those matters,’ ^{f619} of which she was the most cognizant. She was learning to spell out the word Messiah, as each of ‘those matters’ taught her one fresh letter in it, and she looked at them all in the light of the Nazareth-Sun.

With His return to Nazareth began Jesus’ Life of youth and early manhood, with all of inward and outward development, of heavenly and earthly approbation which it carried. {St. ~~412~~ Luke 2:52.} Whether or not He went to Jerusalem on recurring Feasts, we know not, and need not inquire. For only once during that period — on His first visit to the Temple, and in the awakening of His Youth-Life — could there have been such outward forth-bursting of His real Being and Mission. Other influences were at their silent work to weld His inward and outward development, and to determine the manner of His later Manifesting of Himself. We assume that the School-education of Jesus must have ceased soon after His return to Nazareth. Henceforth the Nazareth-influences on the Life and Thinking of Jesus may be grouped — and progressively as He advanced from youth to manhood, under these particulars: *Home, Nature, and Prevailing Ideas*.

1. Home. Jewish Home-Life, especially in the country, was of the simplest. Even in luxurious Alexandria it seems often to have been such, alike as regarded the furnishing of the house, and the provisions of the table. ^{f620} The morning and midday meal must have been of the plainest, and even the larger evening meal of the simplest, in the home at Nazareth. Only the Sabbath and festivals, whether domestic or public, brought what of the best lay within reach. But Nazareth was not the city of the wealthy or influential, and such festive evening-entertainments, with elaborate ceremoniousness of reception, arranging of guests according to rank, and rich spread of board, would but rarely, if ever, be witnessed in those quiet homes. The same simplicity would prevail in dress and manners. ^{f621} But close and loving were the bonds which drew together the members of a family, and deep the influence which they exercised on each other. We cannot here discuss the vexed question whether ‘the brothers and sisters’ of Jesus were such in the real sense, or step-brothers and sisters, or else cousins, though it seems to us as if the primary meaning of the terms would scarcely have been called in question, but for a theory of false asceticism,

and an undervaluing of the sanctity of the married estate. {Comp. St. ^{<0124>}Matthew 1:24; St. ^{<0107>}Luke 2:7; St. ^{<0126>}Matthew 12:46; ^{<0135>}13:55, 56; St. ^{<0131>}Mark 3:31; 6:3; ^{<0114>}Acts 1:14; ^{<0105>}1 Corinthians 9:5; ^{<0109>}Galatians 1:19.} But, whatever the precise relationship between Jesus and these ‘brothers and sisters,’ it must, on any theory, have been of the closest, and exercised its influence upon Him. ^{f622}

Passing over Joses or Joseph, of whose history we know next to nothing, we have sufficient materials to enable us to form some judgment of what must have been the tendencies and thoughts of two of His brothers *James* and *Jude*, before they were heart and soul followers of the Messiah, and of His cousin *Simon*. ^{f623} If we might venture on a general characterization, we would infer from the Epistle of St. James, that his religious views had originally been cast in the mold of *Shammai*. Certainly, there is nothing of the Hillelite direction about it, but all to remind us of the earnestness, directness, vigor, and rigor of *Shammai*. Of *Simon* we know that he had belonged to the Nationalist party, since he is expressly so designated (*Zelotes*, {St. ^{<0115>}Luke 6:15; ^{<0113>}Acts 1:13} *Cananoean*). {St. ^{<0118>}Mark 3:18} Lastly, there are in the Epistle of St. Jude, one undoubted, and another probable reference to two of those (Pseudepigraphic) Apocalyptic books, which at that time marked one deeply interesting phase of the Messianic outlook of Israel. {St. Jude 15:14, 15 to the book of Enoch, and 5:9 probably to the Assum. of Moses} We have thus within the narrow circle of Christ’s Family-Life — not to speak of any intercourse with the sons of Zebedee, who probably were also His cousins ^{f624} — the three most hopeful and pure Jewish tendencies, brought into constant contact with Jesus: in Pharisaism, the teaching of *Shammai*; then, the Nationalist ideal; and, finally, the hope of a glorious Messianic future. To these there should probably be added, at least knowledge of the lonely preparation of His kinsman John, who, though certainly not an Essene, had, from the necessity of his calling, much in his outward bearing that was akin to them.

But we are anticipating. From what are, necessarily, only suggestions, we turn again to what is certain in connection with His Family-Life and its influences. From St. ^{<0116>}Mark 6:3, we may infer with great probability, though not with absolute certainty, {Comp. St. ^{<0135>}Matthew 13:55; St. ^{<0112>}John 6:42.} that He had adopted the trade of Joseph. Among the Jews the contempt for manual labor, which was one of the painful characteristics of heathenism, did not exist. On the contrary, it was deemed a religious duty, frequently and most earnestly insisted upon, to learn some trade,

provided it did not minister to luxury, nor tend to lead away from personal observance of the Law. {Comp. Ab. 1:10; Kidd. 29 *b* ^{f625} } There was not such separation between rich and poor as with us, and while wealth might confer social distinction, the absence of it in no way implied social inferiority. Nor could it be otherwise where wants were so few, life was so simple, and its highest aim so ever present to the mind.

We have already spoken of the religious influences in the family, so blessedly different from that neglect, exposure, and even murder of children among the heathen, or their education by slaves, who corrupted the mind from its earliest opening. ^{f626} The love of parents to children, appearing even in the curse which was felt to attach to childlessness; the reverence towards parents, as a duty higher than any of outward observance; and the love of brethren, which Jesus had learned in His home, form, so to speak, the natural basis of many of the teachings of Jesus. They give us also an insight into the family-life of Nazareth. And yet there is nothing sombre nor morose about it; and even the joyous games of children, as well as festive gatherings of families, find their record in the words and the life of Christ. This also is characteristic of His past. And so are His deep sympathy with all sorrow and suffering, and His love for the family circle, as evidenced in the home of Lazarus. That He spoke Hebrew, and used and quoted the Scriptures in the original, has already been shown, although, no doubt, He understood Greek, possibly also Latin.

Secondly: Nature and Every-day Life. The most superficial perusal of the teaching of Christ must convince how deeply sympathetic He was with nature, and how keenly observant of man. Here there is no contrast between love of the country and the habits of city life; the two are found side by side. On His lonely walks He must have had an eye for the beauty of the lilies of the field, and thought of it, how the birds of the air received their food from an Unseen Hand, and with what maternal affection the hen gathered her chickens under her wing. He had watched the sower or the vinedresser as he went forth to his labor, and read the teaching of the tares which sprang up among the wheat. To Him the vocation of the shepherd must have been full of meaning, as he led, and fed, and watched his flock, spoke to his sheep with well-known voice, brought them to the fold, or followed, and tenderly carried back, those that had strayed, ever ready to defend them, even at the cost of his own life. Nay, He even seems to have watched the habits of the fox in its secret lair. But he also equally knew the joys, the sorrows, the wants and sufferings of the busy multitude. The play

in the market, the marriage processions, the funeral rites, the wrongs of injustice and oppression, the urgent harshness of the creditor, the bonds and prison of the debtor, the palaces and luxury of princes and courtiers, the self-indulgence of the rich, the avarice of the covetous, the exactions of the tax-gatherer, and the oppression of the widow by unjust judges, had all made an indelible impression on His mind. And yet this evil world was not one which He hated, and from which He would withdraw Himself with His disciples, though ever and again He felt the need of periods of meditation and prayer. On the contrary, while He confronted all the evil in it, He would fain pervade the mass with the new leaven; not cast it away, but renew it. He recognized the good and the hopeful, even in those who seemed most lost. He quenched not the dimly burning flax, nor brake the bruized reed. It was not contempt of the world, but sadness over it; not condemnation of man, but drawing him to His Heavenly Father; not despising of the little and the poor, whether outwardly or inwardly such, but encouragement and adoption of them, together with keen insight into the real under the mask of the apparent, and withering denunciation and unsparing exposure of all that was evil, mean, and unreal, wherever it might appear. Such were some of the results gathered from His past life, as presented in His teaching.

Thirdly: Of the *prevailing ideas* around, with which He was brought in contact, some have already been mentioned. Surely, the earnestness of His Shammaite brother, if such we may venture to designate him; the idea of the Kingdom suggested by the Nationalists, only in its purest and most spiritual form, as not of this world, and as truly realizing the sovereignty of God in the individual, whoever he might be; even the dreamy thoughts of the prophetic literature of those times, which sought to read the mysteries of the coming Kingdom; as well as the prophet-like asceticism of His forerunner and kinsman, formed at least so many points of contact for His teaching. Thus, Christ was in sympathy with all the highest tendencies of His people and time. Above all, there was His intimate converse with the Scriptures of the Old Testament. If, in the Synagogue, He saw much to show the hollowness, self-seeking, pride, and literalism which a mere external observance of the Law fostered, He would ever turn from what man or devils said to what He read, to what was 'written.' Not one dot or hook of it could fall to the ground — all must be established and fulfilled. The Law of Moses in all its bearings, the utterances of the prophets — Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Micah, Zechariah, Malachi, and

the hopes and consolations of the Psalms, were all to Him literally true, and cast their light upon the building which Moses had reared. It was all one, a grand unity; not an aggregation of different parts, but the unfolding of a living organism. Chiefest of all, it was the thought of the Messianic bearing of all Scripture to its unity, the idea of the Kingdom of God and the King of Zion, which was the life and light of all. Beyond this, into the mystery of His inner converse with God, the unfolding of His spiritual receptiveness, and the increasing communication from above, we dare not enter. Even what His bodily appearance may have been, we scarcely venture to imagine. ^{f627} It could not but be that His outer man in some measure bodied forth His 'Inner Being.' Yet we dread gathering around our thoughts of Him the artificial flowers of legend. ^{f628} What His manner and mode of receiving and dealing with men were, we can portray to ourselves from His life. And so it is best to remain content with the simple account of the Evangelic narrative: 'Jesus increased in favor with God and Man.'

CHAPTER 11

IN THE FIFTEENTH YEAR OF TIBERIUS CAESAR AND UNDER THE PONTIFICATE OF ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS — A VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS

(St. ~~4000~~ Matthew 3:1-12; St. ~~4000~~ Mark 1:2-8; St. ~~4000~~ Luke 3:1-18.)

THERE is something grand, even awful, in the almost absolute silence which lies upon the thirty years between the Birth and the first Messianic Manifestation of Jesus. In a narrative like that of the Gospels, this must have been designed; and, if so, affords presumptive evidence of the authenticity of what follows, and is intended to teach, that what had preceded concerned only the inner History of Jesus, and the preparation of the Christ. At last that solemn silence was broken by an appearance, a proclamation, a rite, and a ministry as startling as that of Elijah had been. In many respects, indeed, the two messengers and their times bore singular likeness. It was to a society secure, prosperous, and luxurious, yet in imminent danger of perishing from hidden, festering disease; and to a religious community which presented the appearance of hopeless perversion, and yet contained the germs of a possible regeneration, that both Elijah and John the Baptist came. Both suddenly appeared to threaten terrible judgment, but also to open unthought-of possibilities of good. And, as if to deepen still more the impression of this contrast, both appeared in a manner unexpected, and even antithetic to the habits of their contemporaries. John came suddenly out of the wilderness of Judaea, as Elijah from the wilds of Gilead; John bore the same strange ascetic appearance as his predecessor; the message of John was the counterpart of that of Elijah; his baptism that of Elijah's novel rite on Mount Carmel. And, as if to make complete the parallelism, with all of memory and hope which it awakened, even the more minute details surrounding the life of Elijah found their counterpart in that of John. Yet history never repeats itself. It fulfils in its development that of which it gave indication at its commencement. Thus, the history of John the Baptist was the fulfilment of that of Elijah in 'the fulness of time.'

For, alike in the Roman world and in Palestine, the time had fully come; not, indeed, in the sense of any special expectancy, but of absolute need.

The reign of Augustus marked, not only the climax, but the crisis, of Roman history. Whatever of good or of evil the ancient world contained, had become fully ripe. As regarded politics, philosophy, religion, and society, the utmost limits had been reached.^{f629} Beyond them lay, as only alternatives, ruin or regeneration. It was felt that the boundaries of the Empire could be no further extended, and that henceforth the highest aim must be to preserve what had been conquered. The destinies of Rome were in the hands of one man, who was at the same time general-in-chief of a standing army of about three hundred and forty thousand men, head of a Senate (now sunk into a mere court for registering the commands of Caesar), and High-Priest of a religion, of which the highest expression was the apotheosis of the State in the person of the Emperor. Thus, all power within, without, and above lay in his hands. Within the city, which in one short reign was transformed from brick into marble, were, side by side, the most abject misery and almost boundless luxury. Of a population of about two millions, well-nigh one half were slaves; and, of the rest, the greater part either freedmen and their descendants, or foreigners. Each class contributed its share to the common decay. Slavery was not even what we know it, but a seething mass of cruelty and oppression on the one side, and of cunning and corruption on the other. More than any other cause, it contributed to the ruin of Roman society. The freedmen, who had very often acquired their liberty by the most disreputable courses, and had prospered in them, combined in shameless manner the vices of the free with the vileness of the slave. The foreigners, especially Greeks and Syrians, who crowded the city, poisoned the springs of its life by the corruption which they brought. The free citizens were idle, dissipated, sunken; their chief thoughts of the theater and the arena; and they were mostly supported at the public cost. While, even in the time of Augustus, more than two hundred thousand persons were thus maintained by the State, what of the old Roman stock remained was rapidly decaying, partly from corruption, but chiefly from the increasing cessation of marriage, and the nameless abominations of what remained of family-life.

The state of the provinces was in every respect more favorable. But it was the settled policy of the Empire, which only too surely succeeded, to destroy all separate nationalities, or rather to absorb and to Grecianise all. The only real resistance came from the Jews. Their tenacity was religious, and, even in its extreme of intolerant exclusiveness, served a most important Providential purpose. And so Rome became to all the center of

attraction, but also of fast-spreading destructive corruption. Yet this unity also, and the common bond of the Greek language, served another important Providential purpose. So did, in another direction, the conscious despair of any possible internal reformation. This, indeed, seemed the last word of all the institutions in the Roman world: It is not in me! Religion, philosophy, and society had passed through every stage, to that of despair. Without tracing the various phases of ancient thought, it may be generally said that, in Rome at least, the issue lay between Stoicism and Epicureanism. The one flattered its pride, the other gratified its sensuality; the one was in accordance with the original national character, the other with its later decay and corruption. Both ultimately led to atheism and despair, the one, by turning all higher aspirations self-ward, the other, by quenching them in the enjoyment of the moment; the one, by making the extinction of all feeling and self-deification, the other, the indulgence of every passion and the worship of matter, its ideal.

That, under such conditions, all real belief in a personal continuance after death must have ceased among the educated classes, needs not demonstration. If the older Stoics held that, after death, the soul would continue for some time a separate existence, in the case of sages till the general destruction of the world by fire, it was the doctrine of most of their successors that, immediately after death, the soul returned into 'the world-soul' of which it was part. But even this hope was beset by so many doubts and misgivings, as to make it practically without influence or comfort. Cicero was the only one who, following Plato, defended the immortality of the soul, while the Peripatetics denied the existence of a soul, and leading Stoics at least its continuance after death. But even Cicero writes as one overwhelmed by doubts. With his contemporaries this doubt deepened into absolute despair, the only comfort lying in present indulgence of the passions. Even among the Greeks, who were most tenacious of belief in the non-extinction of the individual, the practical upshot was the same. The only healthier tendency, however mixed with error, came from the Neo-Platonic School, which accordingly offered a point of contact between ancient philosophy and the new faith.

In such circumstances, anything like real religion was manifestly impossible. Rome tolerated, and, indeed, incorporated, all national rites. But among the populace religion had degenerated into abject superstition. In the East, much of it consisted of the vilest rites; while, among the philosophers, all religions were considered equally false or equally true, the

outcome of ignorance, or else the unconscious modifications of some one fundamental thought. The only religion on which the State insisted was the deification and worship of the Emperor. ^{f630} These apotheoses attained almost incredible development. Soon not only the Emperors, but their wives, paramours, children, and the creatures of their vilest lusts, were deified; nay, any private person might attain that distinction, if the survivors possessed sufficient means. ^{f631} Mingled with all this was an increasing amount of superstition — by which term some understood the worship of foreign gods, the most part the existence of fear in religion. The ancient Roman religion had long given place to foreign rites, the more mysterious and unintelligible the more enticing. It was thus that Judaism made its converts in Rome; its chief recommendation with many being its contrast to the old, and the unknown possibilities which its seemingly incredible doctrines opened. Among the most repulsive symptoms of the general religious decay may be reckoned prayers for the death of a rich relative, or even for the satisfaction of unnatural lusts, along with horrible blasphemies when such prayers remained unanswered. We may here contrast the spirit of the Old and New Testaments with such sentiments as this, on the tomb of a child: ‘To the unjust gods who robbed me of life;’ or on that of a girl of twenty: ‘I lift my hands against the god who took me away, innocent as I am.’

It would be unsavory to describe how far the worship of in decency was carried; how public morals were corrupted by the mimic representations of everything that was vile, and even by the pandering of a corrupt art. The personation of gods, oracles, divination, dreams, astrology, magic, necromancy, and theurgy, ^{f632} all contributed to the general decay. It has been rightly said, that the idea of conscience, as we understand it, was unknown to heathenism. Absolute right did not exist. Might was right. The social relations exhibited, if possible, even deeper corruption. The sanctity of marriage had ceased. Female dissipation and the general dissoluteness led at last to an almost entire cessation of marriage. Abortion, and the exposure and murder of newly-born children, were common and tolerated; unnatural vices, which even the greatest philosophers practiced, if not advocated, attained proportions which defy description.

But among these sad signs of the times three must be specially mentioned: the treatment of slaves; the bearing towards the poor; and public amusements. The slave was entirely unprotected; males and females were exposed to nameless cruelties, compared to which death by being thrown

to the wild beasts, or fighting in the arena, might seem absolute relief. Sick or old slaves were cast out to perish from want. But what the influence of the slaves must have been on the free population, and especially upon the young — whose tutors they generally were — may readily be imagined. The heartlessness towards the poor who crowded the city is another well-known feature of ancient Roman society. Of course, there was neither hospitals, nor provision for the poor; charity and brotherly love in their every manifestation are purely Old and New Testament ideas. But even bestowal of the smallest alms on the needy was regarded as very questionable; best, not to afford them the means of protracting a useless existence. Lastly, the account which Seneca has to give of what occupied and amused the idle multitude — for all manual labor, except agriculture, was looked upon with utmost contempt — horrified even himself. And so the only escape which remained for the philosopher, the satiated, or the miserable, seemed the power of self-destruction! What is worse, the noblest spirits of the time of self-destruction! What is worse, the noblest spirits of the time felt, that the state of things was utterly hopeless. Society could not reform itself; philosophy and religion had nothing to offer: they had been tried and found wanting. Seneca longed for some hand from without to lift up from the mire of despair; Cicero pictured the enthusiasm which would greet the embodiment of true virtue, should it ever appear on earth; Tacitus declared human life one great farce, and expressed his conviction that the Roman world lay under some terrible curse. All around, despair, conscious need, and unconscious longing. Can greater contrast be imagined, than the proclamation of a coming Kingdom of God amid such a world; or clearer evidence be afforded of the reality of this Divine message, than that it came to seek and to save that which was thus lost? One synchronism, as remarkable as that of the Star in the East and the Birth of the Messiah, here claims the reverent attention of the student of history. On the 19th of December A. D. 69, the Roman Capitol, with its ancient sanctuaries, was set on fire. Eight months later, on the 9th of Ab A. D. 70, the Temple of Jerusalem was given to the flames. It is not a coincidence but a conjunction, for upon the ruins of heathenism and of apostate Judaism was the Church of Christ to be reared.

A silence, even more complete than that concerning the early life of Jesus, rests on the thirty years and more, which intervened between the birth and the open forthshowing ^{f633} in his character as Forerunner of the Messiah. Only his outward and inward development, and his being ‘in the deserts,’ ^{f634}

are briefly indicated. The latter, assuredly, not in order to learn from the *Essenes*,^{f635} but to attain really, in lonely fellowship with God, what they sought externally. It is characteristic that, while Jesus could go straight from the home and workshop of Nazareth to the Baptism of Jordan, His Forerunner required so long and peculiar preparation: characteristic of the difference of their Persons and Mission, characteristic also of the greatness of the work to be inaugurated. St. Luke furnishes precise notices of the time of the Baptist's public appearance — not merely to fix the exact chronology, which would not have required so many details, but for a higher purpose. For, they indicate, more so many details, but for a higher purpose. For, they indicate, more so many details, but for a higher purpose. For, they indicate, more clearly than the most elaborate discussion, the fitness of the moment for the Advent of 'the Kingdom of Heaven.' For the first time since the Babylonish Captivity, the foreigner, the Chief of the hated Roman Empire — according to the Rabbis, the fourth beast of Daniel's vision {Ab. Zar. 2 b.} — was absolute and undisputed master of Judaea; and the chief religious office divided between two, equally unworthy of its functions. And it deserves, at least, notice, that of the Rulers mentioned by St. Luke, Pilate entered on his office {Probably about Easter, 26 A.D.} only shortly before the public appearance of John, and that they all continued till after the Crucifixion of Christ. There was thus, so to speak, a continuity of these powers during the whole Messianic period

As regards Palestine, the ancient kingdom of Herod was now divided into four parts, Judaea being under the direct administration of Rome, two other tetrarchies under the rule of Herod's sons (Herod Antipas and Philip), while the small principality of Abilene was governed by Lysanias.^{f636} Of the latter no details can be furnished, nor are they necessary in this history. It is otherwise as regards the sons of Herod, and especially the character of the Roman government at that time.

Herod Antipas, whose rule extended over forty-three years, reigned over Galilee and Peraea — the districts which were respectively the principal sphere of the Ministry of Jesus and of John the Baptist. Like his brother Archelaus, Herod Antipas possessed in an even aggravated form most of the vices, without any of the greater qualities, of his father. Of deeper religious feelings or convictions he was entirely destitute, though his conscience occasionally misgave, if it did not restrain, him. The inherent weakness of his character left him in the absolute control of his wife, to the

final ruin of his fortunes. He was covetous, avaricious, luxurious, and utterly dissipated suspicious, and with a good deal of that fox-cunning which, especially in the East, often forms the sum total of state-craft. Like his father, he indulged a taste for building — always taking care to propitiate Rome by dedicating all to the Emperor. The most extensive of his undertakings was the building, in 22 A.D., of the city of Tiberias, at the upper end of the Lake of Galilee. The site was under the disadvantage of having formerly been a burying-place, which, as implying Levitical uncleanness, for some time deterred pious Jews from settling there. Nevertheless, it rose in great magnificence from among the reeds which had but lately covered the neighborhood (the ensigns armorial of the city were ‘reeds’). Herod Antipas made it his residence, and built there a strong castle and a palace of unrivalled splendor. The city, which was peopled chiefly by adventurers, was mainly Grecian, and adorned with an amphitheater, of which the ruins can still be traced.

A happier account can be given of Philip, the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem. He was undoubtedly the best of Herod’s sons. He showed, indeed, the same abject submission as the rest of his family to the Roman Emperor, after whom he named the city of Caesarea Philippi, which he built at the sources of the Jordan; just as he changed the name of Bethsaida, a village of which he made an opulent city, into Julias, after the daughter of Augustus. But he was a moderate and just ruler, and his reign of thirty-seven years contrasted favorably with that of his kinsmen. The land was quiet and prosperous, and the people contented and happy.

As regards the Roman rule, matters had greatly changed for the worse since the mild sway of Augustus, under which, in the language of Philo, no one throughout the Empire dared to molest the Jews. {*Philo*, ed. Frcf., Leg. 1015.} The only innovations to which Israel had then to submit were, the daily sacrifices for the Emperor and the Roman people, offerings on festive days, prayers for them in the Synagogues, and such participation in national joy or sorrow as their religion allowed. {u. s. 1031, 1041.}

It was far other when Tiberius succeeded to the Empire, and Judaea was a province. Merciless harshness characterized the administration of Palestine; while the Emperor himself was bitterly hostile to Judaism and the Jews, and that although, personally, openly careless of all religion. {*Suet.* Tiber. 69.} Under his reign the persecution of the Roman Jews occurred, and Palestine suffered almost to the verge of endurance. The first Procurator

whom Tiberius appointed over Judaea, changed the occupancy of the High-Priesthood four times, till he found in Caiaphas a sufficiently submissive instrument of Roman tyranny. The exactions, and the reckless disregard of all Jewish feelings and interests, might have been characterized as reaching the extreme limit, if worse had not followed when Pontius Pilate succeeded to the procuratorship. Venality, violence, robbery, persecutions, wanton malicious insults, judicial murders without even the formality of a legal process, and cruelty — such are the charges brought against his administration. {*Philo*, u.s. 1034.} If former governors had, to some extent, respected the religious scruples of the Jews, Pilate set them purposely at defiance; and this not only once, but again and again, in Jerusalem, {*Jos. Ant.* 18:3. 1, 2.} in Galilee, {*St. Luke* 13:1.} and even in Samaria, {*Ant.* 18:4. 1, 2.} until the Emperor himself interposed. {*Philo*, Leg. 1033.}

Such, then, was the political condition of the land, when John appeared to preach the near Advent of a Kingdom with which Israel associated all that was happy and glorious, even beyond the dreams of the religious enthusiast. And equally loud was the call for help in reference to those who held chief spiritual rule over the people. St. Luke significantly joins together, as the highest religious authority in the land, the names of Annas and Caiaphas. ^{f637} The former had been appointed by Quirinius. After holding the Pontificate for nine years, he was deposed, and succeeded by others, of whom the fourth was his son-in-law Caiaphas. The character of the High-Priests during the whole of that period is described in the Talmud {*Pes.* 57 *a.*} in terrible language. And although there is no evidence that ‘the house of Annas’ ^{f638} (*Parah* 3:5). Professor Delitzsch does not venture to explain its meaning. Would it be too bold to suggest a derivation from — and the meaning to be: He who is ‘at the top’?} was guilty of the same gross self-indulgence, violence, {*Jos. Ant.* 20:8. 8.} luxury, and even public indecency, {*Yoma* 35 *b.*} as some of their successors, they are included in the woes pronounced on the corrupt leaders of the priesthood, whom the Sanctuary is represented as bidding depart from the sacred precincts, which their presence defiled. {*Pes. U.S.*} It deserves notice, that the special sin with which the house of Annas is charged is that of ‘whispering’ — or hissing like vipers — which seems to refer ^{f639} to private influence on the judges in their administration of justice, whereby ‘morals were corrupted, judgment perverted and the Shekhinah withdrawn from Israel.’ {*Tos. Set.* 14.} In illustration of this, we recall the terrorism which

prevented Sanhedrists from taking the part of Jesus, {St. ^{<B15>}John 7:50-52.} and especially the violence which seems to have determined the final action of the Sanhedrin, {St. ^{<B14>}John 11:47-50.} against which not only such men as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, but even a Gamaliel, would feel themselves powerless. But although the expression ‘High-Priest’ appears sometimes to have been used in a general sense, as designating the sons of the High-Priests, ^{f640} and even the principal members of their families, {*Jos.* Jewish War 6:2.2.} there could, of course, be only one actual High-Priest. The conjunction of the two names of Annas and Caiaphas ^{f641} probably indicates that, although Annas was deprived of the Pontificate, he still continued to preside over the Sanhedrin — a conclusion not only borne out by ^{<A06>}Acts 4:6, where Annas appears as the actual President, and by the terms in which Caiaphas is spoken of, as merely ‘one of them,’ {St. ^{<B14>}John 11:49.} but by the part which Annas took in the final condemnation of Jesus. {St. ^{<B13>}John 18:13.}

Such a combination of political and religious distress, surely, constituted the time of Israel’s utmost need. As yet, no attempt had been made by the people to right themselves by armed force. In these circumstances, the cry that the Kingdom of Heaven was near at hand, and the call to preparation for it, must have awakened echoes throughout the land, and startled the most careless and unbelieving. It was, according to St. Luke’s exact statement, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar — reckoning, as provincials would do, ^{f642} from his co-regency with Augustus (which commenced two years before his sole reign), in the year 26 A.D. {779 A.U.C.} According to our former computation, Jesus would then be in His thirtieth year. ^{f643} The scene of John’s first public appearance was in ‘the wilderness of Judaea,’ that is, the wild, desolate district around the mouth of the Jordan. We know not whether John baptized in this place, ^{f644} nor yet how long he continued there; but we are expressly told, that his stay was not confined to that locality. {St. ^{<A13>}Luke 3:3.} Soon afterwards we find him at Bethabara, {St. ^{<A12>}John 1:28.} which is farther up the stream. The outward appearance and the his Mission. Neither his dress nor his food was that of the Essenes; ^{f645} and the former, ^{f646} at least, like that of Elijah, {2 Kings 1.} whose mission he was now to ‘fulfil.’

This was evinced alike by what he preached, and by the new symbolic rite, from which he derived the name of ‘Baptist.’ The grand burden of his message was: the announcement of the approach of ‘the Kingdom of Heaven,’ and the needed preparation of his hearers for that Kingdom. The

latter he sought, positively, by admonition, and negatively, by warnings, while he directed all to the Coming One, in Whom that Kingdom would become, so to speak, individualized. Thus, from the first, it was ‘the good news of the Kingdom,’ to which all else in John’s preaching was but subsidiary.

Concerning this ‘Kingdom of Heaven,’ which was the great message of John, and the great work of Christ Himself, ^{f647} we may here say, that it is the whole Old Testament *sublimated*, and the whole New Testament *realized*. The idea of it did not lie hidden in the Old, to be opened up in the New Testament — as did the mystery of its realization. { ^{f645} Romans 16:25, 26; ^{f646} Ephesians 1:9; ^{f648} Colossians 1:26, 27. } But this rule of heaven and Kingship of Jehovah was the very substance of the Old Testament; the object of the calling and mission of Israel; the meaning of all its ordinances, whether civil or religious; ^{f648} the underlying idea of all its institutions. ^{f649} It explained alike the history of the people, the dealings of God with them, and the prospects opened up by the prophets. Without it the Old Testament could not be understood; it gave perpetuity to its teaching, and dignity to its representations. This constituted alike the real contrast between Israel and the nations of antiquity, and Israel’s real title to distinction. Thus the whole Old Testament was the preparatory presentation of the rule of heaven and of the Kingship of its Lord.

But preparatory not only in the sense of typical, but also in that of inchoative. Even the twofold hindrance — internal and external — which ‘the Kingdom’ encountered, indicated this. The former arose from the resistance of Israel to their King; the latter from the opposition of the surrounding kingdoms of this world. All the more intense became the longing through thousands of years, that these hindrances might be swept away by the Advent of the promised Messiah, Who would permanently establish (by His spirit) the right relationship between the King and His Kingdom, by bringing in an everlasting righteousness, and also cast down existing barriers, by calling the kingdoms of this world to be the Kingdom of our God. This would, indeed, be the Advent of the Kingdom of God, such as had been the glowing hope held out by Zechariah, { ^{f650} ~~814~~14:9 } the glorious vision beheld by Daniel. { ^{f651} ~~2713~~7:13, 14 } Three ideas especially did this Kingdom of God imply: *universality*, *heavenliness*, and *permanency*. Wide as God’s domain would be His Dominion; holy, as heaven in contrast to earth, and God to man, would be his character; and triumphantly lasting its continuance. Such was the teaching of the Old

Testament, and the great hope of Israel. It scarcely needs mental compass, only moral and spiritual capacity, to see its matchless grandeur, in contrast with even the highest aspirations of heathenism, and the blanched ideas of modern culture.

How imperfectly Israel understood this Kingdom, our previous investigations have shown. In truth, the men of that period possessed only the term — as it were, the form. What explained its meaning, filled, and fulfilled it, came once more from heaven. Rabbinism and Alexandrianism kept alive the thought of it; and in their own way filled the soul with its longing — just as the distress in church and State carried the need of it to every heart with the keenness of anguish. As throughout this history, the *form* was of that time; the substance and the spirit were of Him Whose coming was the Advent of that Kingdom. Perhaps the nearest approach to it lay in the higher aspirations of the Nationalist party, only that it sought their realization, not spiritually, but outwardly. Taking the sword, it perished by the sword. It was probably to this that both Pilate and Jesus referred in that memorable question: ‘Art Thou then a King?’ to which our Lord, unfolding the deepest meaning of His mission, replied: ‘My Kingdom is not of this world: if My Kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight.’ {St. ^{<317>}John 17:33-37.}

According to the Rabbinic views of the time, the terms ‘Kingdom,’ ‘Kingdom of heaven,’ ^{f652} and ‘Kingdom of God’ (in the Targum on ^{<307>}Micah 4:7 ‘Kingdom of Jehovah’), were equivalent. In fact, the word ‘heaven’ was very often used instead of ‘God,’ so as to avoid unduly familiarizing the ear with the Sacred Name. ^{f653} This, probably, accounts for the exclusive use of the expression ‘Kingdom of Heaven’ in the Gospel by St. Matthew. ^{f654} And the term did imply a contrast to earth, as the expression ‘the Kingdom of God’ did to this world. The consciousness of its contrast to earth or the world was distinctly expressed in Rabbinic writings. {As in Shebhu 35 b; Ber. R. 9, ed Warsh, pp. 19 b, 20 a.}

This ‘Kingdom of Heaven,’ or ‘of God,’ must, however, be distinguished from such terms as ‘the Kingdom of the Messiah’ (*Malkhutha dimeshicha* {As in the Targum on ^{<1947>}Psalms 14:7, and on ^{<2510>}Isaiah 53:10.}), ‘the future age (world) of the Messiah’ (*Alma deathey dimeshicha* {As in Targum on ^{<1063>}1 Kings 4:33 (v. 13).}), ‘the days of the Messiah,’ ‘the age to come’ (*soeculum futurum*, the *Athid labho* ^{f655} — both this and the previous expression {For example, in Ber. R. 88, ed. Warsh. p. 157 a.}),

‘the end of days,’ {Targ. PseudoJon. on ^{<Q419>}Exodus 40:9, 11.} and ‘the end of the extremity of days’ *Soph Egebh Yomaya* {Jer. Targ. on ^{<Q415>}Genesis 3:15; Jer. and PseudoJon. Targ on ^{<Q444>}Numbers 24:14.}). This is the more important, since the ‘Kingdom of Heaven’ has so often been confounded with the period of its triumphant manifestation in ‘the days,’ or in ‘the Kingdom, of the Messiah.’ Between the Advent and the final manifestation of ‘the Kingdom,’ Jewish expectancy placed a temporary obscuration of the Messiah. ^{f656} Not His first appearance, but His triumphant manifestation, was to be preceded by the so-called ‘sorrows of the Messiah’ (the *Chebhley shel Mashiach*), ‘the tribulations of the latter days.’ ^{f657}

A review of many passages on the subject shows that, in the Jewish mind the expression ‘Kingdom of Heaven’ referred, not so much to any particular period, as in general to *the Rule of God*, — as acknowledged, manifested, and eventually perfected. Very often it is the equivalent for personal acknowledgment of God: the taking upon oneself of the ‘yoke’ of ‘the Kingdom,’ or of the commandments, the former preceding and conditioning the latter. {So expressly in Mechilta, p. 75 *a*; Yalkut, vol. 2 p. 14 *a*, last line.} Accordingly, the Mishnah {Ber. 2:2.} gives this as the reason why, in the collection of Scripture passages which forms the prayer called ‘*Shema*,’ ^{f658} the confession, ^{<R104>}Deuteronomy 6:4 etc., precedes the admonition, ^{<R113>}Deuteronomy 11:13 etc., because a man takes upon himself first the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven, and afterwards that of the commandments. And in this sense, the repetition of this *Shema*, as the personal acknowledgment of the Rule of Jehovah, is itself often designated as ‘taking upon oneself the Kingdom of Heaven.’ {For example, Ber. 13 *b*, 14 *b*; Ber. 2:5; and the touching story of Rabbi Akiba thus taking upon himself the yoke of the Law in the hour of his martyrdom, Ber. 61 *b*.} Similarly, the putting on of phylacteries, and the washing of hands, are also described as taking upon oneself the yoke of the Kingdom of God. ^{f659} To give other instances: Israel is said to have taken up the yoke of the Kingdom of God at Mount Sinai; {So often Comp. Siphre p. 142 *b*, 143 *b*.} the children of Jacob at their last interview with their father; {Ber. R. 98.} and Isaiah on his call to the prophetic office, {Yalkut, vol. 2:p. 43 *a*.} where it is also noted that this must be done willingly and gladly. On the other hand, the sons of Eli and the sons of Ahab are said to have cast off the Kingdom of Heaven. {Midr. on ^{<Q412>}1 Samuel 8:12; Midr. on ^{<Q418>}Ecclesiastes 1:18.} While thus the acknowledgment of the Rule of God,

both in profession and practice, was considered to constitute the Kingdom of God, its full manifestation was expected only in the time of the Advent of Messiah. Thus in the Targum on ^{<2419>}Isaiah 40:9, the words ‘Behold your God!’ are paraphrased: ‘The Kingdom of your God is revealed.’ Similarly, {In Yalkut 2 p. 178 *a*.} we read: ‘When the time approaches that the Kingdom of Heaven shall be manifested, then shall be fulfilled that “the Lord shall be King over all the earth.”’ {^{<3849>}Zechariah 14:9.} ^{f660} On the other hand, the unbelief of Israel would appear in that they would reject these three things: the Kingdom of Heaven, the Kingdom of the House of David, and the building of the Temple, according to the prediction in ^{<2885>}Hosea 3:5. {Midr. on ^{<9907>}1 Samuel 8:7. Comp. also generally Midr. on ^{<9201>}Psalms 147:1.} It follows that, after the period of unbelief, the Messianic deliverances and blessings of the ‘Athid Labho,’ or future age, were expected. But the final completion of all still remained for the ‘Olam Habba,’ or world to come. And that there is a distinction between the time of the Messiah and this ‘world to come’ is frequently indicated in Rabbinic writings. ^{f661}

As we pass from the Jewish ideas of the time to the teaching of the New Testament, we feel that while there is *complete change of spirit*, the form in which the idea of the Kingdom of Heaven is presented is substantially similar. Accordingly, we must dismiss the notion that the expression refers to the Church, whether visible (according to the Roman Catholic view) or invisible (according to certain Protestant writers). ^{f662} ‘The Kingdom of God,’ or Kingly Rule of God, is an *objective fact*. The visible Church can only be the *subjective* attempt at its outward realization, of which the invisible Church is the true counterpart. When Christ says, {St. ^{<2885>}John 3:3.} that ‘except a man be born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God,’ He teaches, in opposition to the Rabbinic representation of how ‘the Kingdom’ was taken up, that a man cannot even comprehend that glorious idea of the Reign of God, and of becoming, by conscious self-surrender, one of His subjects, except he be first born from above. Similarly, the meaning of Christ’s further teaching on this subject {in ver. 5.} seems to be that, except a man be born of water (profession, with baptism ^{f663} as its symbol) and the Spirit, he cannot really enter into the fellowship of that Kingdom.

In fact, an analysis of 119 passages in the New Testament where the expression ‘Kingdom’ occurs, shows that it means *the rule of God*; ^{f664} which was *manifested in and through Christ*; ^{f665} *is apparent in ‘the Church’*;

^{f666} *gradually develops amidst hindrances*; ^{f667} *is triumphant at the second coming of Christ* ^{f668} ('the end'); and, finally, *perfected in the world to come*. ^{f669} Thus viewed, the announcement of John of the near Advent of this Kingdom had deepest meaning, although, as so often in the case of prophetism, the stages intervening between the Advent of the Christ and the triumph of that Kingdom seem to have been hidden from the preacher. He came to call Israel to submit to the Reign of God, about to be manifested in Christ. Hence, on the one hand, he called them to repentance — a 'change of mind' — with all that this implied; and, on the other, pointed them to the Christ, in the exaltation of His Person and Office. Or rather, the two combined might be summed up in the call: 'Change your mind', repent, which implies, not only a turning from the past, but a turning to the Christ in newness of mind. ^{f670} And thus the symbolic action by which this preaching was accompanied might be designated 'the baptism of repentance.'

The account given by St. Luke bears, on the face of it, that it was a summary, not only of the first, but of all John's preaching. {3:18.} The very presence of his hearers at this call to, and baptism of, repentance, gave point to his words. Did they who, notwithstanding their sins, ^{f671} lived in such security of carelessness and self-righteousness, really understand and fear the final consequences of resistance to the coming 'Kingdom'? If so, theirs must be a repentance not only in profession, but of heart and mind, such as would yield fruit, both good and visible. Or else did they imagine that, according to the common notion of the time, the vials of wrath were to be poured out only on the Gentiles, ^{f672} while they, as Abraham's children, were sure of escape — in the words of the Talmud, that 'the night' (^{<2212>}Isaiah 21:12) was 'only to the nations of the world, but the morning to Israel'? {Jer. Taan. 64 a.}

For, no principle was more fully established in the popular conviction, than that all Israel had part in the world to come (Sanh. 10:1), and this, specifically, because of their connection with Abraham. This appears not only from the New Testament, {St. ^{<4083>}John 8:33, 39, 53.} from Philo, and Josephus, but from many Rabbinic passages. 'The merits of the Fathers,' is one of the commonest phrases in the mouth of the Rabbis. ^{f673} Abraham was represented as sitting at the gate of Gehenna, to deliver any Israelite ^{f674} who otherwise might have been consigned to its terrors. {Ber. R. 48; comp. Midr. on ^{<4011>}Psalm 6:1; Pirke d. R. Elies. c. 29; Shem. R. 19 Yalkut 1 p. 23 b.} In fact, by their descent from Abraham, all the children of Israel

were nobles, {Baba Mez. 7:1; Baba K. 91 *a.*} infinitely higher than any proselytes. ‘What,’ exclaims the Talmud, ‘shall the born Israelite stand upon the earth, and the proselyte be in heaven?’ {Jer. Chag. 76 *a.*} In fact, the ships on the sea were preserved through the merit of Abraham; the rain descended on account of it. {Ber. R. 39.} For his sake alone had Moses been allowed to ascend into heaven, and to receive the Law; for his sake the sin of the golden calf had been forgiven; {Shem R. 44.} his righteousness had on many occasions been the support of Israel’s cause; {Vayyikra R. 36.} Daniel had been heard for the sake of Abraham; {Ber. 7 *b.*} nay, his merit availed even for the wicked. {Shabb. 55 *a.*; comp Beer, Leben Abr. p. 88.} ^{f675} In its extravagance the Midrash thus apostrophizes Abraham: ‘If thy children were even (morally) dead bodies, without blood vessels or bones, thy merit would avail for them!’ {Ber. R. ed. Warsh. p. 80 *b.*, par. 44.}

But if such had been the inner thoughts of his bearers, John warned them, that God was able of those stones that strewed the river-bank to raise up children unto Abraham; {Perhaps with reference to ~~Isaiah~~ ^{f676} Isaiah 2:1, 2.} or, reverting to his former illustration of ‘fruits meet for repentance,’ that the proclamation of the Kingdom was, at the same time, the laying of the axe to the root of every tree that bore not fruit. Then making application of it, in answer to the specific inquiry of various classes, the preacher gave them such practical advice as applied to the well-known sins of their past; ^{f677} yet in this also not going beyond the merely negative, or preparatory element of ‘repentance.’ The positive, and all-important aspect of it, was to be presented by the Christ. It was only natural that the hearers wondered whether John himself was the Christ, since he thus urged repentance. For this was so closely connected in their thoughts with the Advent of the Messiah, that it was said, ‘If Israel repented but one day, the Son of David would immediately come.’ {For ex. Jer. Taan. 64 *a.*} But here John pointed them to the difference between himself and his work, and the Person and Mission of the Christ. In deepest reverence he declared himself not worthy to do Him the service of a slave or of a disciple. ^{f678} His Baptism would not be of preparatory repentance and with water, but the Divine Baptism in ^{f679} the Holy Spirit and fire ^{f680} — in the Spirit Who sanctified, and the Divine Light which purified, ^{f681} and so effectively qualified for the ‘Kingdom.’ And there was still another contrast. John’s was but preparing work, the Christ’s that of final decision; after it came the harvest. His was the harvest, and His the garner; His also the fan, with

which He would sift the wheat from the straw and chaff — the one to be garnered, the other burned with fire unextinguished and inextinguishable.^{f682} Thus early in the history of the Kingdom of God was it indicated, that alike that which would prove useless straw and the good corn were inseparably connected in God's harvest-field till the reaping time; that both belonged to Him; and that the final separation would only come at the last, and by His own Hand.

What John preached, that he also symbolized by a rite which, though not in itself, yet in its application, was wholly new. Hitherto the Law had it, that those who had contracted Levitical defilement were to immerse before offering sacrifice. Again, it was prescribed that such Gentiles as became 'proselytes of righteousness,' or 'proselytes of the Covenant' (*Gerey hatstsedeq or Gerey habberith*), were to be admitted to full participation in the privileges of Israel by the threefold rites of circumcision, baptism,^{f683} and sacrifice, the immersion being, as it were, the acknowledgment and symbolic removal of moral defilement, corresponding to that of Levitical uncleanness. But never before had it been proposed that Israel should undergo a 'baptism of repentance,' although there are indications of a deeper insight into the meaning of Levitical baptisms.^{f684} Was it intended, that the hearers of John should give this as evidence of their repentance, that, like persons defiled, they sought purification, and, like strangers, they sought admission among the people who took on themselves the Rule of God? These two ideas would, indeed, have made it truly a 'baptism of repentance.' But it seems difficult to suppose, that the people would have been prepared for such admissions; or, at least, that there should have been no record of the mode in which a change so deeply spiritual was brought about. May it not rather have been that as, when the first Covenant was made, Moses was directed to prepare Israel by symbolic baptism of their persons {Comp. Genesis 35.} and their garments, {~~(1910)~~ Exodus 19:10, 14.} so the initiation of the new Covenant, by which the people were to enter into the Kingdom of God, was preceded by another general symbolic baptism of those who would be the true Israel, and receive, or take on themselves, the Law from God?^{f685} In that case the rite would have acquired not only a new significance, but be deeply and truly the answer to John's call. In such case also, no special explanation would have been needed on the part of the Baptist, nor yet such spiritual insight on that of the people as we can scarcely suppose them to have possessed at that stage. Lastly, in that case nothing could have been more suitable, nor more

solemn, than Israel in waiting for the Messiah and the Rule of God,
preparing as their fathers had done at the foot of Mount Sinai. ^{f686}

CHAPTER 12

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS: ITS HIGHER MEANING.

(St. ~~4013~~ Matthew 3:13-17; St. ~~4007~~ Mark 1:7-11;
St. ~~4192~~ Luke 3:21-23; St. ~~4012~~ John 1:32-34.)

THE more we think of it, the better do we seem to understand how that ‘Voice crying in the wilderness: Repent! for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand,’ awakened echoes throughout the land, and brought from city, village, and hamlet strangest hearers. For once, every distinction was levelled. Pharisee and Sadducee, outcast publican and semi-heathen soldier, met here as on common ground. Their bond of union was the common ‘hope of Israel’ — the only hope that remained: that of ‘the Kingdom.’ The long winter of disappointment had not destroyed, nor the storms of suffering swept away, nor yet could any plant of spurious growth overshadow, what had struck its roots so deep in the soil of Israel’s heart.

That Kingdom had been the last word of the Old Testament. As the thoughtful Israelite, whether Eastern or Western, ^{f687} viewed even the central part of his worship in sacrifices, and remembered that his own Scriptures had spoken of them in terms which pointed to something beyond their offering, ^{f688} he must have felt that ‘the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean,’ could only ‘sanctify to the purifying of the flesh;’ that, indeed, the whole body of ceremonial and ritual ordinances ‘could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience.’ They were only ‘the shadow of good things to come;’ of ‘a new’ and ‘better covenant, established upon better promises.’ ^{f689} It was otherwise with the thought of the Kingdom. Each successive link in the chain of prophecy bound Israel anew to this hope, and each seemed only more firmly welded than the other. And when the voice of prophecy had ceased, the sweetness of its melody still held the people spell-bound, even when broken in the wild fantasies of Apocalyptic literature. Yet that ‘root of Jesse,’ whence this Kingdom was to spring, was buried deep under ground, as the remains of ancient Jerusalem are now under the desolations of many generations. Egyptian, Syrian, Greek, and Roman had trodden it under foot; the Maccabees had come and gone, and it was not in them; the Herodian kingdom had risen and fallen;

Pharisaism, with its learning, had overshadowed thoughts of the priesthood and of prophetism; but the hope of that Davidic Kingdom, of which there was not a single trace or representative left, was even stronger than before. So closely has it been intertwined with the very life of the nation, that, to all believing Israelites, this hope has through the long night of ages, been like that eternal lamp which burns in the darkness of the Synagogue, in front of the heavy veil that shrines the Sanctuary, which holds and conceals the precious rolls of the Law and the Prophets.

This great expectancy would be strung to utmost tension during the pressure of outward circumstances more hopeless than any hitherto experienced. Witness here the ready credence which impostors found, whose promises and schemes were of the wildest character; witness the repeated attempts at risings, which only despair could have prompted; witness, also, the last terrible war against Rome, and, despite the horrors of its end, the rebellion of Bar-Kokhabh, the false Messiah. And now the cry had been suddenly raised: 'The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand!' It was heard in the wilderness of Judaea, within a few hours' distance from Jerusalem. No wonder Pharisee and Sadducee flocked to the spot. How many of them came to inquire, how many remained to be baptized, or how many went away disappointed in their hopes of 'the Kingdom,' we know not. ^{f690} But they would not see anything in the messenger that could have given their expectations a rude shock. His was not a call to armed resistance, but to repentance, such as all knew and felt must precede the Kingdom. The hope which he held out was not of earthly possessions, but of purity. There was nothing negative or controversial in what he spoke; nothing to excite prejudice or passion. His appearance would command respect, and his character was in accordance with his appearance. Not rich nor yet Pharisaic garb with wide *Tsitsith*, ^{f691} bound with many-colored or even priestly girdle, but the old prophet's poor raiment held in by a leathern girdle. Not luxurious life, but one of meanest fare. ^{f692} And then, all in the man was true and real. 'Not a reed shaken by the wind,' but unbendingly firm in deep and settled conviction; not ambitious nor self-seeking, but most humble in his self-estimate, discarding all claim but that of lowliest service, and pointing away from himself to Him Who was to come, and Whom as yet he did not even know. Above all, there was the deepest earnestness, the most utter disregard of man, the most firm belief in what he announced. For himself he sought nothing; for them he had only

one absorbing thought: The Kingdom was at hand, the King was coming — let them prepare!

Such entire absorption in his mission, which leaves us in ignorance of even the details of his later activity, must have given force to his message.^{f693} And still the voice, everywhere proclaiming the same message, travelled upward, along the winding Jordan which cleft the land of promise. It was probably the autumn of the year 779 (A.U.C.), which, it may be noted, was a Sabbatic year.^{f694} Released from business and agriculture, the multitudes flocked around him as he passed on his Mission.

Rapidly the tidings spread from town and village to distant homestead, still swelling the numbers that hastened to the banks of the sacred river. He had now reached what seems to have been the most northern point of his Mission-journey,^{f695} *Beth-Abara* ('the house of passage,' or 'of shipping') — according to the ancient reading, *Bethany* ('the house of shipping') — one of the best known fords across the Jordan into Peraea.^{f696} Here he baptized. {St. ~~4113~~ John 1:28.} The ford was little more than twenty miles from Nazareth. But long before John had reached that spot, tidings of his word and work must have come even into the retirement of Jesus' Home-Life.

It was now, as we take it, the early winter of the year 780.^{f697} Jesus had waited those months. Although there seems not to have been any personal acquaintance between Jesus and John, and how could there be, when their spheres lay so widely apart? — each must have heard and known of the other. Thirty years of silence weaken most human impressions — or, if they deepen, the enthusiasm that had accompanied them passes away. Yet, when the two met, and perhaps had brief conversation, each bore himself in accordance with his previous history. With John it was deepest, reverent humility — even to the verge of misunderstanding his special Mission, and work of initiation and preparation for the Kingdom. He had heard of Him before by the hearing of the ear, and when now he saw Him, that look of quiet dignity, of the majesty of unsullied purity in the only Unfallen, Unsinning Man, made him forget even the express command of God, which had sent him from his solitude to preach and baptize, and that very sign which had been him by which to recognize the Messiah. {St. ~~4113~~ John 1:33} ^{f698} In that Presence it only became to him a question of the more 'worthy' to the misunderstanding of the nature of his special calling.

But Jesus, as He had not made haste, so was He not capable of misunderstanding. To Him it was ‘the fulfilling of all righteousness.’ From earliest ages it has been a question why Jesus went to be baptized. The heretical Gospels put into the mouth of the Virgin-Mother an invitation to go to that baptism, to which Jesus is supposed to have replied by pointing to His own sinlessness, except it might be on the score of ignorance, in regard to a limitation of knowledge.^{f699} Objections lie to most of the explanations offered by modern writers. They include a bold denial of the fact of Jesus’ Baptism; the profane suggestion of collusion between John and Jesus; or such suppositions, as that of His personal sinfulness, of His coming as the Representative of a guilty race, or as the bearer of the sins of others, or of acting in solidarity with His people — or else to separate Himself from the sins of Israel; of His surrendering Himself thereby unto death for man; of His purpose to do honor to the baptism of John; or thus to elicit a token of His Messiahship; or to bind Himself to the observance of the Law; or in this manner to commence His Messianic Work; or to consecrate Himself solemnly to it; or, lastly, to receive the spiritual qualification for it.^{f700} To these and similar views must be added the latest conceit of *Renan*,^{f701} who arranges a scene between Jesus, who comes with some disciples, and John, when Jesus is content for a time to grow in the shadow of John, and to submit to a rite which was evidently so generally acknowledged. But the most reverent of these explanations involve a twofold mistake. They represent the Baptism of John as one of repentance, and they imply an ulterior motive in the coming of Christ to the banks of Jordan. But, as already shown, the Baptism of John was in itself only a consecration to, and preparatory initiation for, the new Covenant of the Kingdom. *As applied to sinful men* it was indeed necessarily a ‘baptism of repentance;’ but not as applied to the sinless Jesus. Had it primarily and always been a ‘baptism of repentance,’ He could not have submitted to it.

Again, and most important of all, we must not seek for any ulterior motive in the coming of Jesus to this Baptism. *He had no ulterior motive of any kind*: it was an act of simple submissive obedience on the part of the Perfect One — and submissive obedience has no motive beyond itself. It asks no reasons; it cherishes no ulterior purpose. And thus it was ‘the fulfilment of all righteousness.’ And it was in perfect harmony with all His previous life. Our difficulty here lies — if we are unbelievers, in thinking simply of the Humanity of the Man of Nazareth; if we are believers, in making abstraction of his Divinity. But thus much, at least, all must

concede, that the Gospels always present Him as the God-Man, in an inseparable mystical union of the two natures, and that they present to us the even more mysterious idea of His Self-exinanition, of the voluntary obscuration of His Divinity, as part of His Humiliation. Placing ourselves on this standpoint — which is, at any rate, that of the Evangelic narrative — we may arrive at a more correct view of this great event. It seems as if, in the Divine Self-exinanition, apparently necessarily connected with the perfect human development of Jesus, some corresponding outward event were ever the occasion of a fresh advance in the Messianic consciousness and work. The first event of that kind had been his appearance in the Temple. These two things then stood out vividly before Him — not in the ordinary human, but in the Messianic sense: that the Temple was the House of His Father, and that to be busy about it was His Life-work. With this He returned to Nazareth, and in willing subjection to His Parents fulfilled all righteousness. And still, as He grew in years, in wisdom, and in favor with God and Man, this thought — rather this burning consciousness, was the inmost spring of His Life. *What* this business specially was, He knew not yet, and waited to learn; the *how* and the *when* of His life-consecration, He left unasked and unanswered in the still waiting for Him. And in this also we see the Sinless, the Perfect One.

When tidings of John's Baptism reached His home, there could be no haste on His part. Even with knowledge of all that concerned John's relation to Him, there was in the 'fulfilment of all righteousness' quiet waiting. The one question with Him was, as He afterwards put it: 'The Baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men?' (St. ~~4125~~ Matthew 21:25). That question once answered, there could be no longer doubt nor hesitation. He went — not for any ulterior purpose, nor from any other motive than that it *was of God*. He went voluntarily, because it was such — and because 'it became Him' in so doing 'to fulfill all righteousness.' There is this great difference between His going to that Baptism, and afterwards into the wilderness: in the former case, His act was of preconceived purpose; in the latter it was not so, but 'He was driven' — without previous purpose to that effect — under the constraining power 'of the Spirit,' without premeditation and resolve of it; without even knowledge of its object. In the one case He was active, in the other passive; in the one case He fulfilled righteousness, in the other His righteousness was tried. But as, on His first visit to the Temple, this consciousness about His Life-business came to Him in His Father's House, ripening slowly and fully those long years of

quiet submission and growing wisdom and grace at Nazareth, so at His Baptism, with the accompanying descent of the Holy Ghost, His abiding in Him, and the heard testimony from His Father, the knowledge came to Him, and, in and with ^{f702} that knowledge, the qualification for the business of His Father's House. In that hour He learned the *when*, and in part the *how*, of His Life-business; the latter to be still farther, and from another aspect, seen in the wilderness, then in His life, in His suffering, and, finally, in His death. In man the subjective and the objective, alike intellectually and morally, are ever separate; in God they are one. What He is, that He wills. And in the God-Man also we must not separate the subjective and the objective. The consciousness of the *when* and the *how* of His Life-business was necessarily accompanied, while He prayed, by the descent, and the abiding in Him, of the Holy Ghost, and by the testifying Voice from heaven. His inner knowledge was real qualification — the forth-bursting of His Power; and it was inseparably accompanied by outward qualification, in what took place at His Baptism. But the first step to all was His voluntary *descent* to Jordan, and in it the fulfilling of all righteousness. His previous life had been that of the Perfect Ideal Israelite — believing, unquestioning, submissive — in preparation for that which, in His thirteenth year, He had learned as its business. The Baptism of Christ was the last act of His private life; and, emerging from its waters in prayer, He learned: *when* His business was to commence, and *how* it would be done.

That one outstanding thought, then, 'I must be about My Father's business,' which had been the principle of His Nazareth life, had come to full ripeness when He knew that the cry, 'The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand,' was from God. The first great question was now answered. His Father's business was the Kingdom of Heaven. It only remained for Him 'to be about it,' and in this determination He went to submit to its initiatory rite of Baptism. We have, as we understand it, distinct evidence — even if it were not otherwise necessary to suppose this — that 'all the people had been baptized,' {St. Luke 21.} when Jesus came to John. Alone the two met, probably for the first time in their lives. Over that which passed between them Holy Scripture has laid the veil of reverent silence, save as regards the beginning and the outcome of their meeting, which it was necessary for us to know. When Jesus came, John knew Him not. And even when He knew Him, that was not enough. Not remembrance of what he had heard and of past transactions, nor the overwhelming power of that

spotless Purity and Majesty of willing submission, were sufficient. For so great a witness as that which John was to bear, a present and visible demonstration from heaven was to be given. Not that God sent the Spirit-Dove, or heaven uttered its voice, for the purpose of giving this as a sign to John. These manifestations were necessary in themselves, and, we might say, would have taken place quite irrespective of the Baptist. But, while necessary in themselves, they were also to be a sign to John. And this may perhaps explain why one Gospel (that of St. John) seems to describe the scene as enacted before the Baptist, whilst others (St. Matthew and St. Mark) tell it as if only visible to Jesus.^{f703} The one bears reference to 'the record,' the other to the deeper and absolutely necessary fact which underlay 'the record.' And, beyond this, it may help us to perceive at least one aspect of what to man is the miraculous: as in itself the higher Necessary, with casual and secondary manifestation to man.

We can understand how what he knew of Jesus, and what he now saw and heard, must have overwhelmed John with the sense of Christ's transcendentally higher dignity, and led him to hesitate about, if not to refuse, administering to Him the rite of Baptism.^{f704} Not because it was 'the baptism of repentance,' but because he stood in the presence of Him 'the latchet of Whose shoes' he was 'not worthy to loose'. Had he not so felt, the narrative would not have been psychologically true; and, had it not been recorded, there would have been serious difficulty to our reception of it. And yet, withal, in so 'forbidding' Him, and even suggesting his own baptism by Jesus, John forgot and misunderstood his mission. John himself was never to be baptized; he only held open the door of the new Kingdom; himself entered it not, and he that was least in that Kingdom was greater than he. Such lowliest place on earth seems ever conjoined with greatest work for God. Yet this misunderstanding and suggestion on the part of John might almost be regarded as a temptation to Christ. Not perhaps, His first, nor yet this His first victory, since the 'sorrow' of His Parents about His absence from them when in the Temple must to the absolute submissiveness of Jesus have been a temptation to turn aside from His path, all the more felt in the tenderness of His years, and the inexperience of a first public appearance. He then overcame by the clear consciousness of His Life-business, which could not be contravened by any apparent call of duty, however specious. And He now overcame by falling back upon the simple and clear principle which had brought him to Jordan: 'It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' Thus, simply putting aside, without argument,

the objection of the Baptist, He followed the Hand that pointed Him to the open door of 'the Kingdom.'

Jesus stepped out of the baptismal waters 'praying.' {1 St. ~~402~~ Luke 3:21.} One prayer, the only one which He taught His disciples, recurs to our minds. ^{f705} We must here individualize and emphasize in their special application its opening sentences: 'Our Father Which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name! Thy Kingdom come! They will be done in earth, as it is in heaven!' The first thought and the first petition had been the conscious outcome of the Temple-visit, ripened during the long years at Nazareth. The others were now the full expression of His submission to Baptism. He knew His Mission; He had consecrated Himself to it in His Baptism; 'Father Which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name.' The unlimited petition for the doing of God's Will on earth with the same absoluteness as in heaven, was His self-consecration: the prayer of His Baptism, as the other was its confession. And the 'hallowed be Thy Name' was the eulogy, because the ripened and experimental principle of His Life. *How* this Will, connected with 'the Kingdom,' was to be done by Him, and *when*, He was to learn *after* His Baptism. But strange, that the petition which followed those which must have been on the lips of Jesus in that hour should have been the subject of the *first temptation* or assault by the Enemy; strange also, that the other two temptations should have rolled back the force of the assault upon the two great experiences He had gained, and which formed the burden of the petitions, 'Thy Kingdom come; Hallowed be Thy Name.' Was it then so, that all the assaults which Jesus bore only concerned and tested the reality of a past and already attained experience, save those last in the Garden and on the Cross, which were 'sufferings' by which He 'was made perfect'?

But, as we have already seen, such inward forth-bursting of Messianic consciousness could not be separated from objective qualification for, and testimony to it. As the prayer of Jesus winged heavenwards, His solemn response to the call of the Kingdom — 'Here am I;' 'Lo, I come to do Thy Will' — the answer came, which at the same time was also the predicted sign to the Baptist. Heaven seemed cleft, and in bodily shape like a dove, the Holy Ghost descended on ^{f706} Jesus, remaining on him. It was as if, symbolically, in the words of St. Peter, {1 St. Pet. 3:21.} that Baptism had been a new flood, and He Who now emerged from it, the Noah — or rest, and comfort-bringer — Who took into His Ark the dove bearing the olive-branch, indicative of a new life. Here, at these waters, was the Kingdom,

into which Jesus had entered in the fulfilment of all righteousness; and from them he emerged as its Heaven-designated, Heaven-qualified, and Heaven-proclaimed King. As such he had received the fulness of the Spirit for His Messianic Work — a fulness abiding in Him — that out of it we might receive, and grace for grace. As such also the voice from Heaven proclaimed it, to Him and to John: ‘Thou art (‘this is’) My Beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.’ The ratification of the great Davidic promise, the announcement of the fulfilment of its predictive import in Psalm 2 ^{f707} was God’s solemn declaration of Jesus as the Messiah, His public proclamation of it, and the beginning of Jesus’ Messianic work. And so the Baptist understood it, when he ‘bare record’ that He was ‘the Son of God.’ {St. ~~John~~ John 1:34.}

Quite intelligible as all this is, it is certainly miraculous; not, indeed, in the sense of contravention of the Laws of Nature (illogical as that phrase is), but in that of having nothing analogous in our present knowledge and experience. But would we not have expected the supra-empirical, the directly heavenly, to attend such an event — that is, if the narrative itself be true, and Jesus what the Gospels represent Him? To reject, therefore, the narrative because of its supra-empirical accompaniment seems, after all, a sad inversion of reasoning, and begging the question. But, to go a step further: if there be no reality in the narrative, whence the invention of the legend? It certainly had no basis in contemporary Jewish teaching; and, equally certainly, it would not have spontaneously occurred to Jewish minds. Nowhere in Rabbinic writings do we find any hint of a Baptism of the Messiah, nor of a descent upon Him of the Spirit in the form of a dove. Rather would such views seem, *a priori*, repugnant to Jewish thinking. An attempt has, however, been made in the direction of identifying two traits in this narrative with Rabbinic notices. The ‘Voice from heaven’ has been represented as the ‘*Bath-Qol*,’ or ‘Daughter-Voice,’ of which we read in Rabbinic writings, as bringing heaven’s testimony or decision to perplexed or hardly bestead Rabbis. And it has been further asserted, that among the Jews ‘the dove’ was regarded as the emblem of the Spirit. In taking notice of these assertions some warmth of language may be forgiven.

We make bold to maintain that no one, who has impartially examined the matter, ^{f708} could find any real analogy between the so-called *Bath-Qol*, and the ‘Voice from heaven’ of which record is made in the New Testament. However opinions might differ, on one thing all were agreed: the *Bath-Qol* had come *after* the voice of prophecy and the Holy Ghost

had ceased in Israel, {Jer. Sot. 9:14; Yoma 9 *b*; Sotah 33 *a*; 48 *b*; Sanh 11*a*.} and, so to speak, had taken, their place.^{f709} *But at the Baptism of Jesus the descent of the Holy Ghost was accompanied by the Voice from Heaven.* Even on this ground, therefore, it could not have been the Rabbinic Bath-Qol. But, further, this 'Daughter-Voice' was regarded rather as the echo of, than as the Voice of God itself^{f710} (Toseph. Sanh. 11:1). The occasions on which this 'Daughter-Voice' was supposed to have been heard are so various and sometimes so shocking, both to common and to moral sense, that a comparison with the Gospels is wholly out of the question. And here it also deserves notice, that references to this *Bath-Qol* increase the farther we remove from the age of Christ.^{f711}

We have reserved to the last the consideration of the statement, that among the Jews the Holy Spirit was presented under the symbol of a dove. It is admitted, that there is no support for this idea either in the Old Testament or in the writings of Philo (*Lucke*, *Evang.* John 1 pp. 425, 426); that, indeed, such animal symbolism of the Divine is foreign to the Old Testament. But all the more confident appeal is made to Rabbinic writings. The suggestion was, apparently, first made by *Wetstein*. {Nov. Test. 1 p. 268.} It is dwelt upon with much confidence by *Gfrorer*^{f712} and others, as evidence of the mythical origin of the Gospels; {Jahrh. des Heils, vol. 2 p. 433.} it is repeated by *Wunsche*, and even reproduced by writers who, had they known the real state of matters, would not have lent their authority to it. Of the *two* passages by which this strange hypothesis is supported, that in the Targum on ~~2122~~ Song of Solomon 2:12 may at once be dismissed, as dating considerably after the close of the Talmud. There remains, therefore, only the one passage in the Talmud, {Chag. 15 *a*.} which is generally thus quoted: 'The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters, like a dove.' {Farrar, *Life of Christ*, 1 p. 117.} That this quotation is incomplete, omitting the most important part, is only a light charge against it. For, if fully made, it would only the more clearly be seen to be *inapplicable*. The passage (Chag. 15 *a*) treats of the supposed distance between 'the upper and the lower waters,' which is stated to amount to only three fingerbreadths. This is proved by a reference to ~~1002~~ Genesis 1:2, where the Spirit of God is said to brood over the face of the waters, 'just as a dove broodeth over her young without touching them.' It will be noticed, that the comparison is not between the Spirit and the dove, but between the closeness with which a dove broods over her young without touching them, and the supposed proximity of the Spirit to the lower waters without

touching them. ^{f713} But, if any doubt could still exist, it would be removed by the fact that in a parallel passage, {Ber. R. 2.} the expression used is not ‘dove’ but ‘that bird.’ Thus much for this oft-misquoted passage. But we go farther, and assert, that the dove was *not* the symbol of the Holy Spirit, but that of Israel. As such it is so universally adopted as to have become almost historical. {Comp. the long illustrations in the Midr. on Song 1:15; Sanh. 95 *a*; Ber. R. 39; Yalkut on ~~19887~~ Psalm 55:7. and other passages.} If, therefore, Rabbinic illustration of the descent of the Holy Spirit with the visible appearance of a dove must be sought for, it would lie in the acknowledgment of Jesus as the ideal typical Israelite, the Representative of His People.

The lengthened details, which have been necessary for the exposure of the mythical theory, will not have been without use, if they carry to the mind the conviction that this history had no basis in existing Jewish belief. Its origin cannot, therefore, be rationally accounted for — except by the answer which Jesus, when He came to Jordan, gave to that grand fundamental question: ‘The Baptism of John, whence was it? From Heaven, or of men?’ {St. ~~42125~~ Matthew 21:25.}

BOOK 3

THE ASCENT: FROM THE RIVER JORDAN TO THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION.

j z rkr wtwn[axwm hta hykqh l c wtrwkg axwm htac
µwqm l k µykwtkb µyayknb ywncw hrwtk kwtk

‘In every passage of Scripture where thou findest the Majesty of God, thou also findest close by His Condescension (Humility). So it is written down in the Law [^{<5807>}Deuteronomy 10:17, followed by verse 18]. repeated in the Prophets [^{<25715>}Isaiah 57:15], and reiterated in the Hagiographa [^{<9804>}Psalms 118:4, followed by verse 5].’ — MEGILL. 31 A.

CHAPTER 1

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS

(St. ~~4001~~ Matthew 4:1-11; St. ~~4012~~ Mark 1:12, 13; St. ~~4001~~ Luke 4:1-13.)

THE proclamation and inauguration of the 'Kingdom of Heaven' at such a time, and under such circumstances, was one of the great *antitheses* of history. With reverence be it said, it is only God Who would thus begin His Kingdom. A similar, even greater antithesis, was the commencement of the Ministry of Christ. From the Jordan to the wilderness with its wild beasts; from the devout acknowledgment of the Baptist, the consecration and filial prayer of Jesus, the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the heard testimony of Heaven, to the utter foresakenness, the felt want and weakness of Jesus, and the assaults of the Devil — no contrast more startling could be conceived. And yet, as we think of it, what followed upon the Baptism, and that it so followed, was necessary, as regarded the Person of Jesus, His Work, and that which was to result from it.

Psychologically, and as regarded the Work of Jesus, even reverent negative Critics ^{f714} have perceived its higher need. That at His consecration to the Kingship of the Kingdom, Jesus should have become clearly conscious of all that it implied in a world of sin; that the Divine method by which that Kingdom should be established, should have been clearly brought out, and its reality tested; and that the King, as Representative and Founder of the Kingdom, should have encountered and defeated the representative, founder, and holder of the opposite power, 'the prince of this world' — these are thoughts which must arise in everyone who believes in any Mission of the Christ. Yet this only as, after the events, we have learned to know the character of that Mission, not as we might have preconceived it. We can understand, how a Life and Work such as that of Jesus, would commence with 'the Temptation,' but none other than His. Judaism never conceived such an idea; because it never conceived a Messiah like Jesus. It is quite true that long previous Biblical teaching, and even the psychological necessity of the case, must have pointed to temptation and victory as the condition of spiritual greatness. It could not have been otherwise in a world hostile to God, nor yet in man, whose conscious choice determines his position. No crown of victory without previous

contest, and that proportionately to its brightness; no moral ideal without personal attainment and probation. The patriarchs had been tried and proved; so had Moses, and all the heroes of faith in Israel. And Rabbinic legend, enlarging upon the Biblical narratives, has much to tell of the original envy of the Angels; of the assaults of Satan upon Abraham, when about to offer up Isaac; of attempted resistance by the Angels to Israel's reception of the Law; and of the final vain endeavor of Satan to take away the soul of Moses.^{f715} Foolish, repulsive, and even blasphemous as some of these legends are, thus much at least clearly stood out, that spiritual trials must precede spiritual elevation. In their own language: 'The Holy One, blessed be His Name, does not elevate a man to dignity till He has first tried and searched him; and if he stands in temptation, then He raises him to dignity.' {Bemidb. R. 15, ed. Warsh. vol. 4 p. 63 *a*, lines 5 and 4 from bottom.}

Thus far as regards man. But in reference to the Messiah there is not a hint of any temptation or assault by Satan. It is of such importance to mark this clearly at the outset of this wonderful history, that proof must be offered even at this stage. In whatever manner negative critics may seek to account for the introduction of Christ's Temptation at the commencement of His Ministry, it cannot have been derived from Jewish legend. The 'mythical' interpretation of the Gospel-narratives breaks down in this almost more manifestly than in any other instance.^{f716} So far from any idea obtaining that Satan was to assault the Messiah, in a well-known passage, which has been previously quoted, {Yalkut on ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 9:1, vol. 2 p. 56.} the Arch-enemy is represented as overwhelmed and falling on his face at sight of Him, and owning his complete defeat.^{f717} On another point in this history we find the same inversion of thought current in Jewish legend. In the Commentary just referred to, {u. s. col. *d*.} the placing of Messiah on the pinnacle of the Temple, so far from being of Satanic temptation, is said to mark the hour of deliverance, of Messianic proclamation, and of Gentile voluntary submission. 'Our Rabbis give this tradition: In the hour when King Messiah cometh, He standeth upon the roof of the Sanctuary, and proclaims to Israel, saying, Ye poor (suffering), the time of your redemption draweth nigh. And if ye believe, rejoice in My Light, which is risen upon you..... ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 60:1..... upon you only ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 60:2..... In that hour will the Holy One, blessed be His Name, make the Light of the Messiah and of Israel to shine forth; and all shall come to the Light of the King Messiah and of Israel, as it is written ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 60:3..... And they

shall come and lick the dust from under the feet of the King Messiah, as it is written, ²³⁴²³Isaiah 49:23..... And all shall come and fall on their faces before Messiah and before Israel, and say, We will be servants to Him and to Israel. And every one in Israel shall have 2,800 servants, ^{f718} as it is written, ³⁸⁸²³Zechariah 8:23.' One more quotation from the same Commentary: {u. s. 11 lines further down.} 'In that hour, the Holy One, blessed be His Name, exalts the Messiah to the heaven of heavens, and spreads over Him of the splendor of His glory because of the nations of the world, because of the wicked Persians. They say to Him, Ephraim, Messiah, our Righteousness, execute judgment upon them, and do to them what Thy soul desireth.'

In another respect these quotations are important. They show that such ideas were, indeed, present to the Jewish mind, but in a sense opposite to the Gospel-narratives. In other words, they were regarded as the rightful manifestation of Messiah's dignity; whereas in the Evangelic record they are presented as the suggestions of Satan, and the Temptation of Christ. Thus the Messiah of Judaism is the Anti-Christ of the Gospels. But if the narrative cannot be traced to Rabbinic legend, may it not be an adaptation of an Old Testament narrative, such as the account of the forty days' fast of Moses on the mount, or of Elijah in the wilderness? Viewing the Old Testament in its unity, and the Messiah as the apex in the column of its history, we admit — or rather, we must expect — throughout points of correspondence between Moses, Elijah, and the Messiah. In fact, these may be described as marking the three stages in the history of the Covenant. Moses was its giver, Elijah its restorer, the Messiah its renewer and perfecter. And as such they all had, in a sense, a similar outward consecration for their work. But that neither Moses nor Elijah was assailed by the Devil, constitutes not the only, though a vital, difference between the fast of Moses and Elijah, and that of Jesus. Moses fasted in the middle, Elijah at the Presence of God; ^{f719} Elijah alone; Jesus assaulted by the Devil. Moses had been called up by God; Elijah had gone forth in the bitterness of his own spirit; Jesus was driven by the Spirit. Moses failed after his forty days' fast, when in indignation he cast the Tables of the Law from him; Elijah failed before his forty days' fast; Jesus was assailed for forty days and endured the trial. Moses was angry against Israel; Elijah despaired of Israel; Jesus overcame for Israel.

Nor must we forget that to each the trial came not only in his human, but in his representative capacity — as giver, restorer, or perfecter of the

Covenant. When Moses and Elijah failed, it was not only as individuals, but as giving or restoring the Covenant. And when Jesus conquered, it was not only as the Unfallen and Perfect Man, but as the Messiah. His Temptation and Victory have therefore a twofold aspect: the general human and the Messianic, and these two are closely connected. Hence we draw also this happy inference: in whatever Jesus overcame, we can overcome. Each victory which He has gained secures its fruits for us who are His disciples (and this alike objectively and subjectively). We walk in His foot-prints; we can ascend by the rock-hewn steps which His Agony has cut. He is the perfect man; and as each temptation marks a human assault (assault on humanity), so it also marks a human victory (of humanity). But He is also the Messiah; and alike the assault and the victory were of the Messiah. Thus, each victory of humanity becomes a victory for humanity; and so is fulfilled, in this respect also, that ancient hymn of royal victory, 'Thou hast ascended on high; Thou hast led captivity captive; Thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that Jehovah God, might dwell among them.' { ~~<99818>~~ Psalm 68:18. } ^{f720}

But even so, there are other considerations necessarily preliminary to the study of one of the most important parts in the life of Christ. They concern these two questions, so closely connected that they can scarcely be kept quite apart: Is the Evangelic narrative to be regarded as the account of a *real* and *outward* event? And if so, how was it possible, or, in what sense can it be asserted — that Jesus Christ, set before us as the Son of God, was 'tempted of the Devil'? All subsidiary questions run up into these two.

As regards the *reality* and *outwardness* of the temptation of Jesus, several suggestions may be set aside as unnatural, and *ex post facto* attempts to remove a felt difficulty. *Renan's* frivolous conceit scarcely deserves serious notice, that Jesus went into the wilderness in order to imitate the Baptist and others, since such solitude was at the time regarded as a necessary preparation for great things. We equally dismiss as more reverent, but not better grounded, such suggestions as that an interview there with the deputies of the Sanhedrin, or with a Priest, or with a Pharisee, formed the historical basis of the Satanic Temptation; or that it was a vision, a dream, the reflection of the ideas of the time; or that it was a parabolic form in which Jesus afterwards presented to His disciples His conception of the Kingdom, and how they were to preach it. ^{f721} Of all such explanations it may be said, that the narrative does not warrant them, and that they would probably never have been suggested, if their authors had been able simply

to accept the Evangelic history. But if so it would have been both better and wiser wholly to reject (as some have done) the authenticity of this, as of the whole early history of the Life of Christ, rather than transform what, if true, is so unspeakably grand into a series of modern platitudes. And yet (as *Keim* has felt) it seems impossible to deny, that such a transaction at the beginning of Christ's Messianic Ministry is not only credible, but almost a necessity; and that such a transaction must have assumed the form of a contest with Satan. Besides, throughout the Gospels there is not only allusion to this first great conflict (so that it does not belong only to the early history of Christ's Life), but constant reference to the power of Satan in the world, as a kingdom opposed to that of God, and of which the Devil is the King.^{f722} And the reality of such a kingdom of evil no earnest mind would call in question, nor would it pronounce *a priori* against the personality of its king. Reasoning *a priori*, its credibility rests on the same kind of, only, perhaps, on more generally patent, evidence as that of the beneficent Author of all Good, so that — with reverence be it said — we have, apart from Holy Scripture, and, as regards one branch of the argument, as much evidence for believing in a personal Satan, as in a Personal God. Holding, therefore, by the reality of this transaction, and finding it equally impossible to trace it to Jewish legend, or to explain it by the coarse hypothesis of misunderstanding, exaggeration, and the like, this one question arises: Might it not have been a purely inward transaction — or does the narrative present an account of what was objectively real?

At the outset, it is only truthful to state, that the distinction does not seem of quite so vital importance as it has appeared to some, who have used in regard to it the strongest language.^{f723} On the other hand it must be admitted that the narrative, if naturally interpreted, suggests an outward and real event, not an inward transaction;^{f724} that there is no other instance of ecstatic state or of vision recorded in the life of Jesus, and that (as Bishop *Ellicott* has shown),^{f725} the special expressions used are all in accordance with the natural view. To this we add, that some of the objections raised — notably that of the impossibility of showing from one spot all the kingdoms of the world — cannot bear close investigation. For no rational interpretation would insist on the absolute literality of this statement, any more than on that of the survey of the whole extent of the land of Israel by Moses from Pisgah. {^{<0340>}Deuteronomy 34:1-3.}^{f726} All the requirements of the narrative would be met by supposing Jesus to have been placed on a very high mountain, whence south, the land of Judaea and

far-off Edom; east, the swelling plains towards Euphrates; north, snow-capped Lebanon; and west, the cities of Herod, the coast of the Gentiles, and beyond, the wide sea dotted with sails, gave far-off prospect of the kingdoms of this world. To His piercing gaze all their grandeur would seem to unroll, and pass before Him like a moving scene, in which the sparkle of beauty and wealth dazzled the eye, the sheen of arms glittered in the far distance, the tramp of armed men, the hum of busy cities, and the sound of many voices fell on the ear like the far-off rush of the sea, while the restful harmony of thought, or the music of art, held and bewitched the senses, and all seemed to pour forth its fullness in tribute of homage at His feet in Whom all is perfect, and to Whom all belongs.

But in saying this we have already indicated that, in such circumstances, the boundary-line between the outward and the inward must have been both narrow and faint. Indeed, with Christ it can scarcely be conceived to have existed at such a moment. The past, the present, and the future must have been open before Him like a map unrolling. Shall we venture to say that such a vision was only inward, and not outwardly and objectively real? In truth we are using terms which have no application to Christ. If we may venture once more to speak in this wise of the Divine Being: With Him what we view as the opposite poles of subjective and objective are absolutely one. To go a step further: many even of *our* temptations are only (contrastedly) inward, for these two reasons, that they have their basis or else their point of contact within us, and that from the limitations of our bodily condition we do not see the enemy, nor can take active part in the scene around. But in both respects it was not so with the Christ. If this be so, the whole question seems almost irrelevant, and the distinction of *outward* and *inward* inapplicable to the present case. Or rather, we must keep by these two landmarks: First, it was not inward in the sense of being merely subjective; but it was all *real* — a real assault by a real Satan, really under these three forms, and it constituted a real Temptation to Christ. Secondly, it was not merely outward in the sense of being only a present assault by Satan; but it must have reached beyond the outward into the inward, and have had for its further object that of influencing the future Work of Christ, as it stood out before His Mind.

A still more difficult and solemn question is this: In what respect could Jesus Christ, the Perfect Sinless Man, the Son of God, have been tempted of the Devil? That He was so tempted is of the very essence of this narrative, confirmed throughout His after-life, and laid down as a

fundamental principle in the teaching and faith of the Church. {^{<8045>}Hebrews 4:15.} On the other hand, temptation without the inward correspondence of existent sin is not only unthinkable, so far as man is concerned, {St. ^{<8014>}James 1:14.} but temptation without the possibility of sin seems unreal — a kind of Docetism. ^{f727} Yet the very passage of Holy Scripture in which Christ's equality with us as regards all temptation is expressed, also emphatically excepts from it this one particular sin, {^{<8045>}Hebrews 4:15.} not only in the sense that Christ actually did not sin, nor merely in this, that 'our concupiscence' {St. ^{<8014>}James 1:14.} had no part in His temptations, but emphatically in this also, that the notion of sin has to be wholly excluded from our thoughts of Christ's temptations.' ^{f728}

To obtain, if we can, a clearer understanding of this subject, two points must be kept in view. Christ's was real, though unfallen Human Nature; and Christ's Human was in inseparable union with His Divine Nature. We are not attempting to explain these mysteries, nor at present to vindicate them; we are only arguing from the standpoint of the Gospels and of Apostolic teaching, which proceeds on these premises — and proceeding on them, we are trying to understand the Temptation of Christ. Now it is clear, that human nature, that of Adam before his fall, was created both sinless and peccable. If Christ's Human Nature was not like ours, but, morally, like that of Adam before his fall, then must it likewise have been both sinless and in itself peccable. We say, in itself — for there is a great difference between the statement that human nature, as Adam and Christ had it, was capable of sinning, and this other, that Christ was peccable. From the latter the Christian mind instinctively recoils, even as it is metaphysically impossible to imagine the Son of God peccable. Jesus voluntarily took upon Himself human nature with all its infirmities and weaknesses — but without the moral taint of the Fall: without sin. It was human nature, in itself capable of sinning, but not having sinned. If He was absolutely sinless, He must have been unfallen. The position of the first Adam was that of being capable of not sinning, not that of being incapable of sinning. The Second Adam also had a nature capable of not sinning, but not incapable of sinning. This explains the possibility of 'temptation' or assault upon Him, just as Adam could be tempted before there was in him any inward *consensus* to it. ^{f729} The first Adam would have been 'perfected', or passed from the capability of not sinning to the incapability of sinning, by obedience. That 'obedience' — or absolute submission to the Will of God — was the grand outstanding characteristic of Christ's work;

but it was so, because He was not only the Unsinning, Unfallen Man, but also the Son of God. Because God was His Father, therefore He must be about His Business, which was to do the Will of His Father. With a peccable Human Nature He was impeccable; not because He obeyed, but being impeccable He so obeyed, because His Human was inseparably connected with His Divine Nature. To keep this Union of the two Natures out of view would be Nestorianism.^{f730} To sum up: The Second Adam, morally unfallen, though voluntarily subject to all the conditions of our Nature, was, with a peccable Human Nature, absolutely impeccable as being also the Son of God — a peccable Nature, yet an impeccable Person: the God-Man, ‘tempted in regard to all (things) in like manner (as we), without (excepting) sin.’

All this sounds, after all, like the stammering of Divine words by a babe, and yet it may in some measure help us to understand the character of Christ’s first great Temptation.

Before proceeding, a few sentences are required in explanation of seeming differences in the Evangelic narration of the event. The historical part of St. John’s Gospel begins after the Temptation, that is, with the actual Ministry of Christ; since it was not within the purport of that work to detail the earlier history. That had been sufficiently done in the Synoptic Gospels. Impartial and serious critics will admit that these are in accord. For, if St. Mark only summarizes, in his own brief manner, he supplies the two-fold notice that Jesus was ‘driven’ into the wilderness, ‘and was with the wild beasts,’ which is in fullest internal agreement with the detailed narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke. The only noteworthy difference between these two is, that St. Matthew places the Temple-temptation before that of the world-kingdom, while St. Luke inverts this order, probably because his narrative was primarily intended for Gentile readers, to whose mind this might present itself as to them the true gradation of temptation. To St. Matthew we owe the notice, that after Temptation ‘Angels came and ministered’ unto Jesus; to St. Luke, that the Tempter only ‘departed from Him for a season.’

To restate in order our former conclusions, Jesus had deliberately, of His own accord and of set firm purpose, gone to be baptized. That one grand outstanding fact of His early life, that He must be about His Father’s Business, had found its explanation when He knew that the Baptist’s cry, ‘the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand,’ was from God. His Father’s Business,

then, was ‘the Kingdom of Heaven,’ and to it He consecrated Himself, so fulfilling all righteousness. But His ‘being about it’ was quite other than that of any Israelite, however devout, who came to Jordan. It was His consecration, not only to the Kingdom, but to the Kingship, in the anointing and permanent possession of the Holy Ghost, and in His proclamation from heaven. That Kingdom was His Father’s Business; its Kingship, the manner in which He was to be ‘about it.’ The next step was not, like the first, voluntary, and of preconceived purpose. Jesus went to Jordan; He was driven of the Spirit into the wilderness. Not, indeed, in the sense of His being unwilling to go, ^{f731} or having had other purpose, such as that of immediate return into Galilee, but in that of not being willing, of having no will or purpose in the matter, but being ‘led up,’ unconscious of its purpose, with irresistible force, by the Spirit. In that wilderness He had to test what He had learned, and to learn what He had tested. So would He have full proof for His Work of the *What* — His Call and Kingship — so would He see its *How*, the manner of it; so, also, would, from the outset, the final issue of His Work appear.

Again — banishing from our minds all thought of sin in connection with Christ’s Temptation, { ~~SC415~~ Hebrews 4:15. } He is presented to us as the Second Adam, both as regarded Himself, and His relation to man. In these two respects, which, indeed, are one, He is now to be tried. Like the first, the Second Adam, sinless, is to be tempted, but under the existing conditions of the Fall: in the wilderness, not in Eden; not in the enjoyment of all good, but in the pressing want of all that is necessary for the sustenance of life, and in the felt weakness consequent upon it. For (unlike the first) the Second Adam was, in His Temptation, to be placed on an absolute equality with us, except as regarded sin. Yet even so, there must have been some point of inward connection to make the outward assault a temptation. It is here that opponents (such as *Strauss* and *Keim*) have strangely missed the mark, when objecting, either that the forty days’ fast was intrinsically unnecessary, or that the assaults of Satan were clumsy suggestions, incapable of being temptations to Jesus. He is ‘driven’ into the wilderness by the Spirit to be tempted. ^{f732} The history of humanity is taken up anew at the point where first the kingdom of Satan was founded, only under new conditions. It is not now a choice, but a contest, for Satan is the prince of this world. During the whole forty days of Christ’s stay in the wilderness His Temptation continued, though it only attained its high point at the last, when, after the long fast, He felt the weariness and weakness of

hunger. As fasting occupies but a very subordinate, we might almost say a tolerated, place in the teaching of Jesus; and as, so far as we know, He exercised on no other occasion such ascetic practices, we are left to infer internal, as well as external, necessity for it in the present instance. The former is easily understood in His pre-occupation; the latter must have had for its object to reduce Him to utmost outward weakness, by the depression of all the vital powers. We regard it as a psychological fact that, under such circumstances, of all mental faculties the memory alone is active, indeed, almost preternaturally active. During the preceding thirty-nine days the plan, or rather the future, of the Work to which He had been consecrated, must have been always before Him. In this respect, then, He must have been tempted. It is wholly impossible that He hesitated for a moment as to the means by which He was to establish the Kingdom of God. He could not have felt tempted to adopt carnal means, opposed to the nature of that Kingdom, and to the Will of God. The unchangeable convictions which He had already attained must have stood out before Him: that His Father's business was the Kingdom of God; that He was furnished to it, not by outward weapons, but by the abiding Presence of the Spirit; above all, that absolute submission to the Will of God was the way to it, nay — itself the Kingdom of God. It will be observed, that it was on these very points that the final attack of the Enemy was directed in the utmost weakness of Jesus. But, on the other hand, the Tempter could not have failed to assault Him with considerations which He must have felt to be true. How could He hope, alone, and with such principles, to stand against Israel? He knew their views and feelings; and as, day by day, the sense of utter loneliness and forsakenness increasingly gathered around Him, in His increasing faintness and weakness, the seeming hopelessness of such a task as He had undertaken must have grown upon Him with almost overwhelming power.^{f733} Alternately, the temptation to despair, presumption, or the cutting short of the contest in some decisive manner, must have presented itself to His mind, or rather have been presented to it by the Tempter.

And this was, indeed, the essence of His last three great temptations; which, as the whole contest, resolved themselves into the one question of absolute submission to the Will of God,^{f734} which is the sum and substance of all obedience. If He submitted to it, it must be suffering, and only suffering — helpless, hopeless suffering to the bitter end; to the extinction of life, in the agonies of the Cross, as a malefactor; denounced, betrayed,

rejected by His people; alone, in very God-forsakenness. And when thus beaten about by temptation, His powers reduced to the lowest ebb of faintness, all the more vividly would memory hold out the facts so well known, so keenly realized at that moment, in the almost utter cessation of every other mental faculty: ^{f735} the scene lately enacted by the banks of Jordan, and the two great expectations of His own people, that the Messiah was to head Israel from the Sanctuary of the Temple, and that all kingdoms of the world were to become subject to Him. Here, then, is the inward basis of the Temptation of Christ, in which the fast was not unnecessary, nor yet the special assaults of the Enemy either ‘clumsy suggestions,’ or unworthy of Jesus.

He is weary with the contest, faint with hunger, alone in that wilderness. His voice falls on no sympathizing ear; no voice reaches Him but that of the Tempter. There is nothing bracing, strengthening in this featureless, barren, stony wilderness, only the picture of desolateness, hopelessness, despair. He must, He will absolutely submit to the Will of God. But can this be the Will of God? One word of power, and the scene would be changed. Let Him despair of all men, of everything — *He* can do it. By His Will the Son of God, as the Tempter suggests — not, however, calling thereby in question His Sonship, but rather proceeding on its admitted reality ^{f736} — can change the stones into bread. He can do miracles, put an end to present want and question, and, as visibly the possessor of absolute miraculous power, the goal is reached! But this would really have been to change the idea of Old Testament miracle into the heathen conception of magic, which was absolute power inherent in an without moral purpose. The moral purpose, the grand moral purpose in all that was of God, was absolute submission to the Will of God. His Spirit had driven Him into that wilderness. His circumstances were God-appointed; and where He so appoints them, He will support us in them, even as, in the failure of bread, He supported Israel by the manna. {^{<BKB>}Deuteronomy 8:3.} ^{f737} And Jesus absolutely submitted to that Will of God by continuing in His present circumstances. To have set himself free from what they implied, would have been *despair* of God, and rebellion. He does more than not succumb: He conquers. The Scriptural reference to a better life upon the Word of God marks more than the end of the contest; it marks the *conquest* of Satan. He emerges on the other side triumphant, with this expression of His assured conviction of the sufficiency of God.

It cannot be despair — and He cannot take up His Kingdom alone, in the exercise of mere power! Absolutely submitting to the Will of God, He must, and He can, absolutely trust Him. But if so, then let Him really trust Himself upon God, and make experiment, nay more, public demonstration — of it. If it be not despair of God, let it be *presumption*! He will not do the work alone! Then God-upborne, according to His promise, let the Son of God suddenly, from that height, descend and head His people, and that not in any profane manner, but in the midst of the Sanctuary, where God was specially near, in sight of incensing priests and worshipping people. So also will the goal at once be reached.

The Spirit of God had driven Jesus into the wilderness; the spirit of the Devil now carried Him to Jerusalem. Jesus stands on the lofty pinnacle of the Tower, or of the Temple-porch, ^{f738} presumably that on which every day a Priest was stationed to watch, as the pale morning light passed over the hills of Judaea far off to Hebron, to announce it as the signal for offering the morning sacrifice. ^{f739} If we might indulge our imagination, the moment chosen would be just as the Priest had quitted that station. The first desert-temptation had been in the grey of breaking light, when to the faint and weary looker the stones of the wilderness seemed to take fantastic shapes, like the bread for which the faint body hungered. In the next temptation Jesus stands on the watch-post which the white-robed priest had just quitted. Fast the rosy morning-light, deepening into crimson, and edged with gold, is spreading over the land. In the Priests' Court below Him the morning-sacrifice has been offered. The massive Temple-gates are slowly opening, and the blasts of the priests' silver trumpets is summoning Israel to begin a new day by appearing before their Lord. Now then let Him descend, Heaven-borne, into the midst of priests and people. What shouts of acclamation would greet His appearance! What homage of worship would be His! The goal can at once be reached, and that at the head of believing Israel. Jesus is surveying the scene. By His side is the Tempter, watching the features that mark the working of the spirit within. And now he has whispered it. Jesus had overcome in the first temptation by simple, absolute trust. This was the time, and this the place to act upon this trust, even as the very Scriptures to which Jesus had appealed warranted. But so to have done would have been not trust — far less the heroism of faith — but *presumption*. The goal might indeed have been reached; but not the Divine goal, nor in God's way — and, as so often, Scripture itself explained and guarded the Divine promise by a preceding

Divine command. ^{f740} And thus once more Jesus not only is not overcome, but He overcomes by absolute submission to the Will of God.

To submit to the Will of God! But is not this to acknowledge His authority, and the order and disposition which He has made of all things? Once more the scene changes. They have turned their back upon Jerusalem and the Temple. Behind are also all popular prejudices, narrow nationalism, and limitations. They no longer breathe the stifled air, thick with the perfume of incense. They have taken their flight into God's wide world. There they stand on the top of some very high mountain. It is in the full blaze of sunlight that He now gazes upon a wondrous scene. Before Him rise, from out the cloud-land at the edge of the horizon, forms, figures, scenes — come words, sounds, harmonies. The world in all its glory, beauty, strength, majesty, is unveiled. Its work, its might, its greatness, its art, its thought, emerge into clear view. And still the horizon seems to widen as He gazes; and more and more, and beyond it still more and still brighter appears. It is a world quite other than that which the retiring Son of the retired Nazareth-home had ever seen, could ever have imagined, that opens its enlarging wonders. To us in the circumstances the temptation, which at first sight seems, so to speak, the clumsiest, would have been well nigh irresistible. In measure as our intellect was enlarged, our heart attuned to this world-melody, we would have gazed with bewitched wonderment on that sight, surrendered ourselves to the harmony of those sounds, and quenched the thirst of our soul with maddening draught. But passively sublime as it must have appeared to the Perfect Man, the God-Man — and to Him far more than to us from His infinitely deeper appreciation of, and wider sympathy with the good, and true, and the beautiful — He had already overcome. It was, indeed, not 'worship,' but homage which the Evil One claimed from Jesus, and that on the truly stated and apparently rational ground, that, in its present state, all this world 'was delivered' unto him, and he exercised the power of giving it to whom he would. But in this very fact lay the answer to the suggestion. High above this moving scene of glory and beauty arched the deep blue of God's heaven, and brighter than the sun, which poured its light over the sheen and dazzle beneath, stood out the fact: 'I must be about My Father's business;' above the din of far-off sounds rose the voice: 'Thy Kingdom come!' Was not all this the Devil's to have and to give, because it was not the Father's Kingdom, to which Jesus had consecrated Himself? What Satan sought was, 'My kingdom come' — a Satanic Messianic time, a Satanic Messiah; the final

realization of an empire of which his present possession was only temporary, caused by the alienation of man from God. To destroy all this: to destroy the works of the Devil, to abolish his kingdom, to set man free from his dominion, was the very object of Christ's Mission. On the ruins of the past shall the new arise, in proportions of grandeur and beauty hitherto unseen, only gazed at afar by prophets' rapt sight. It is to become the Kingdom of God; and Christ's consecration to it is to be the corner-stone of its new Temple. Those scenes are to be transformed into one of higher worship; those sounds to mingle and melt into a melody of praise. An endless train, unnumbered multitudes from afar, are to bring their gifts, to pour their wealth, to consecrate their wisdom, to dedicate their beauty, to lay it all in lowly worship as humble offering at His feet: a world God-restored, God-dedicated, in which dwells God's peace, over which rests God's glory. It is to be the bringing of worship, not the crowning of rebellion, which is the *Kingdom*. And so Satan's greatest becomes to Christ his coarsest temptation,^{f741} which He casts from Him; and the words: 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve,' which now receive their highest fulfilment, mark not only Satan's defeat and Christ's triumph, but the principle of His Kingdom — of all victory and all triumph.

Foiled, defeated, the Enemy has spread his dark pinions towards that far-off world of his, and covered it with their shadow. The sun no longer glows with melting heat; the mists have gathered on the edge of the horizon, and enwrapped the scene which has faded from view. And in the cool and shade that followed have the Angels^{f742} come and ministered to His wants, both bodily and mental. He has refused to assert power; He has not yielded to despair; He would not fight and conquer alone in His own strength; and He has received power and refreshment, and Heaven's company unnumbered in their ministry of worship. He would not yield to Jewish dream; He did not pass from despair to presumption; and lo, after the contest, with no reward as its object, all is His. He would not have Satan's vassals as His legions, and all Heaven's hosts are at His command. It had been victory; it is now shout of triumphant praise. He Whom God had anointed by His Spirit had conquered by the Spirit; He Whom Heaven's Voice had proclaimed God's beloved Son, in Whom He was well pleased, had proved such, and done His good pleasure.

They had been all overcome, these three temptations against submission to the Will of God, present, personal, and specifically Messianic. Yet all His

life long there were echoes of them: of the first, in the suggestion of His brethren to show Himself; {St. ~~ROM~~ John 7:3-5.} of the second, in the popular attempt to make Him a king, and perhaps also in what constituted the final idea of Judas Iscariot; of the third, as being most plainly Satanic, in the question of Pilate: ‘Art Thou then a King?’

The enemy ‘departed from Him’ — yet only ‘for a season.’ But this first contest and victory of Jesus decided all others to the last. These were, perhaps not as to the shaping of His Messianic plan, nor through memory of Jewish expectancy, yet still in substance the same contest about absolute obedience, absolute submission to the Will of God, which constitutes the Kingdom of God. And so also from first to last was this the victory: ‘Not My will, but Thine, be done.’ But as, in the first three petitions which He has taught us, Christ has enfolded us in the mantle of His royalty, so has He Who shared our nature and our temptations gone up with us, want-pressed, sin-laden, and temptation-stricken as we are, to the Mount of Temptation in the four human petitions which follow the first. And over us is spread, as the sheltering folds of His mantle, this as the outcome of His royal contest and glorious victory, ‘For Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever!’ ^{f743}

CHAPTER 2

THE DEPUTATION FROM JERUSALEM — THE THREE SECTS OF THE PHARISEES, SADDUCEES AND ESSENES — EXAMINATION OF THEIR DISTINCTIVE DOCTRINES. ^{F744}

(St. ~~ⲁⲓⲓ~~ John 1:19-24.)

APART from the repulsively carnal form which it had taken, there is something absolutely sublime in the continuance and intensity of the Jewish expectation of the Messiah. It outlived not only the delay of long centuries, but the persecutions and scattering of the people; it continued under the disappointment of the Maccabees, the rule of a Herod, the administration of a corrupt and contemptible Priesthood, and, finally, the government of Rome as represented by a Pilate; nay, it grew in intensity almost in proportion as it seemed unlikely of realization. These are facts which show that the doctrine of the Kingdom, as the sum and substance of Old Testament teaching, was the very heart of Jewish religious life; while, at the same time, they evidence a moral elevation which placed abstract religious conviction far beyond the reach of passing events, and clung to it with a tenacity which nothing could loosen.

Tidings of what these many months had occurred by the banks of the Jordan must have early reached Jerusalem, and ultimately stirred to the depths its religious society, whatever its preoccupation with ritual questions or political matters. For it was not an ordinary movement, nor in connection with any of the existing parties, religious or political. An extraordinary preacher, of extraordinary appearance and habits, not aiming, like others, after renewed zeal in legal observances, or increased Levitical purity, but preaching repentance and moral renovation in preparation for the coming Kingdom, and sealing this novel doctrine with an equally novel rite, had drawn from town and country multitudes of all classes — inquirers, penitents and novices. The great and burning question seemed, what the real and character and meaning of it was? or rather, whence did it issue, and whither did it tend? The religious leaders of the people proposed to answer this by instituting an inquiry through a trustworthy deputation. In the account of this by St. John certain points seem clearly implied; {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲓ~~ John 1:19-28} on others only suggestions can be ventured.

That the interview referred to occurred *after* the Baptism of Jesus, appears from the whole context.^{f745} Similarly, the statement that the deputation which came to John was 'sent from Jerusalem' by 'the Jews,' implies that it proceeded from authority, even if it did not bear more than a semi-official character. For, although the expression '*Jews*' in the fourth Gospel generally conveys the idea of contrast to the disciples of Christ (for ex. St. ^{<B715>}John 7:15), yet it refers to the people in their corporate capacity, that is, as represented by their constituted religious authorities. {Comp. St. ^{<B715>}John 5:15, 16; 9:18,22; 18:12,31.} On the other hand, although the term 'scribes and elders' does not occur in the Gospel of St. John,^{f746} it by no means follows that 'the Priests and Levites' sent from the capital either represented the two great divisions of the Sanhedrin, or, indeed, that the deputation issued from the Great Sanhedrin itself. The former suggestion is entirely ungrounded; the latter at least problematic. It seems a legitimate inference that, considering their own tendencies, and the political dangers connected with such a step, the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem would not have come to the formal resolution of sending a regular deputation on such an inquiry. Moreover, a measure like this would have been entirely outside their recognized mode of procedure. The Sanhedrin did not, and could not, originate charges. It only investigated those brought before it. It is quite true that judgment upon false prophets and religious seducers lay with it; {Sanh. 1:5.} but the Baptist had not as yet said or done anything to lay him open to such an accusation. He had in no way infringed the Law by word or deed, nor had he even claimed to be a prophet.^{f747} If, nevertheless, it seems most probable that 'the Priests and Levites' came from the Sanhedrin, we are led to the conclusion that theirs was an informal mission, rather privately arranged than publicly determined upon.

And with this the character of the deputies agrees. 'Priests and Levites' — the colleagues of John the Priest, would be selected for such an errand, rather than leading Rabbinic authorities. The presence of the latter would, indeed, have given to the movement an importance, if not a sanction, which the Sanhedrin could not have wished. The only other authority in Jerusalem from which such a deputation could have issued was the so-called 'Council of the Temple,' 'Judicature of the Priests,' or 'Elders of the Priesthood,' {For 110. Yoma 1. 5.} which consisted of the fourteen chief officers of the But although they may afterwards have taken their full part in the condemnation of Jesus, ordinarily their duty was only connected with the services of the Sanctuary, and not with criminal questions or doctrinal

investigations.^{f748} It would be too much to suppose, that they would take the initiative in such a matter on the ground that they would take the initiative in such a matter on the ground that the Baptist was a member of the Priesthood. Finally, it seems quite natural that such an informal inquiry, set on foot most probably by the Sanhedrists, should have been entrusted exclusively to the Pharisaic party. It would in no way have interested the Sadducees; and what members of that party had seen of John {St. ~~CHR~~ Matthew 3:7 etc.} must have convinced them that his views and aims lay entirely beyond their horizon.

The origin of the two great parties of Pharisees and Sadducees has already been traced.^{f749} They mark, not sects, but mental directions, such as in their principles are natural and universal, and, indeed, appear in connection with all metaphysical^{f750} questions. They are the different modes in which the human mind views supersensuous problems, and which afterwards, when one-sidedly followed out, harden into diverging schools of thought. If Pharisees and Sadducees were not 'sects' in the sense of separation from the unity of the Jewish ecclesiastical community, neither were theirs 'heresies' in the conventional, but only in the original sense of tendency, direction, or, at most, views, differing from those commonly entertained.^{f751} Our sources of information here are: the New Testament, Josephus, and Rabbinic writings. The New Testament only marks, in broad outlines and popularly, the peculiarities of each party; but from the absence of bias it may safely be regarded^{f752} as the most trustworthy authority on the matter. The inferences which we derive from the statements of Josephus,^{f753} though always to be qualified by our general estimate of his *animus*,^{f754} accord with those from the New Testament. In regard to Rabbinic writings, we have to bear in mind the admittedly unhistorical character of most of their notices, the strong party-bias which colored almost all their statements regarding opponents, and their constant tendency to trace later views and practices to earlier times.

Without entering on the principles and supposed practices of 'the fraternity' or 'association' (*Chebher, Chabhurah, Chabhurta*) of Pharisees, which was comparatively small, numbering only about 6,000 members, {*Jos. Ant.* 17:2. 4.} the following particulars may be of interest. The object of the association was twofold: to observe in the strictest manner, and according to traditional law, all the ordinances concerning Levitical purity, and to be extremely punctilious in all connected with religious dues (tithes and all other dues). A person might undertake only the second, without the

first of these obligations. In that case he was simply a *Neeman*, an ‘accredited one’ with whom one might enter freely into commerce, as he was supposed to have paid all dues. But a person could not undertake the vow of Levitical purity without also taking the obligation of all religious dues. If he undertook both vows he was a *Chabher*, or associate. Here there were four degrees, marking an ascending scale of Levitical purity, or separation from all that was profane. {Chag. 2:5, 7; comp. Tohor. 7:5.} In opposition to these was the *Am ha-arets*, or ‘country people’ (the people which knew not, or cared not for the Law, and were regarded as ‘cursed’). But it must not be thought that every *Chabher* was either a learned Scribe, or that every Scribe was a *Chabher*. On the contrary, as a man might be a *Chabher* without being either a Scribe or an elder, {For ex. Kidd. 33 b.} so there must have been sages, and even teachers, who did not belong to the association, since special rules are laid down for the reception of such. {Bekh. 30.} Candidates had to be formally admitted into the ‘fraternity’ in the presence of three members. But every accredited public ‘teacher’ was, unless anything was known to the contrary, supposed to have taken upon him the obligations referred to.^{f755} The family of a *Chabher* belonged, as a matter of course, to the community; {Bekhor. 30.} but this ordinance was afterwards altered.^{f756} The *Neeman* undertook these four obligations: to tithe what he ate, what he sold, and what he bought, and not to be a guest with an *Am ha-arets*. {Dem. 2:2.} The full *Chabher* undertook not to sell to an ‘Am ha-arets’ any fluid or dry substance (nutriment or fruit), not to buy from him any such fluid, not to be a guest with him, not to entertain him as a guest in his own clothes (on account of their possible impurity) — to which one authority adds other particulars, which, however, were not recognized by the Rabbis generally as of primary importance. {Demai 2:3.}

These two great obligations of the ‘official’ Pharisee, or ‘Associate’ are pointedly referred to by Christ — both that in regard to *tithing* (the vow of the *Neeman*); {In St. ^{<2142>}Luke 11:42; ^{<2182>}18:12; St. ^{<4223>}Matthew 23:23.} and that in regard to Levitical purity (the special vow of the *Chabher*). {In St. ^{<2139>}Luke 11:39, 41; St. ^{<4225>}Matthew 23:25, 26.} In both cases they are associated with a want of corresponding inward reality, and with hypocrisy. These charges cannot have come upon the people by surprise, and they may account for the circumstance that so many of the learned kept aloof from the ‘Association’ as such. Indeed, the sayings of some of the Rabbis in regard to Pharisaism and the professional Pharisee are more withering than any in the New Testament. It is not necessary here to repeat

the well-known description, both in the Jerusalem and the Babylon Talmud, of the seven kinds of 'Pharisees,' of whom six (the 'Shechemite,' the 'stumbling,' the 'bleeding,' the 'mortar,' the 'I want to know what is incumbent on me,' and 'the Pharisee from fear') mark various kinds of unreality, and only one is 'the Pharisee from love.' {Sot. 22 *b*; Jer. Ber. 9:7.} Such an expression as 'the plague of Pharisaism' is not uncommon; and a silly pietist, a clever sinner, and a female Pharisee, are ranked among 'the troubles of life.' {Sot. 3:4.} 'Shall we then explain a verse according to the opinions of the Pharisees?' asks a Rabbi, in supreme contempt for the arrogance of the fraternity. {Pes. 70 *b*.} 'It is as a tradition among the Pharisees {Abhoth de R. Nathan 5.} to torment themselves in this world, and yet they will gain nothing by it in the next.' The Sadducees had some reason for the taunt, that 'the Pharisees would by-and-by subject the globe of the sun itself to their purifications,' {Jer. Chag. 79 *d*; Tos. Chag. 3} the more so that their assertions of purity were sometimes conjoined with Epicurean maxims, betokening a very different state of mind, such as, 'Make haste to eat and drink, for the world which we quit resembles a wedding feast;' or this: 'My son, if thou possess anything, enjoy thyself, for there is no pleasure in Hades, ^{f757} and death grants no respite. But if thou sayest, What then would I leave to my sons and daughters? Who will thank thee for this appointment in Hades?' Maxims these to which, alas! too many of their recorded stories and deeds form a painful commentary. ^{f758}

But it would be grossly unjust to identify Pharisaism, as a religious direction, with such embodiments of it or even with the official 'fraternity.' While it may be granted that the tendency and logical sequence of their views and practices were such, their system, as opposed to Sadduceeism, had very serious bearings: dogmatic, ritual, and legal. It is, however, erroneous to suppose, either that their system represented traditionalism itself, or that Scribes and Pharisees are convertible terms, ^{f759} while the Sadducees represented the civil and political element. The Pharisees represented only the prevailing system of, no traditionalism itself; while the Sadducees also numbered among them many learned men. They were able to enter into controversy, often protracted and fierce, with their opponents, and they acted as members of the Sanhedrin, although they had diverging traditions of their own, and even, as it would appear, at one time a complete code of canon-law. {Megill. Taan. Per. 4 ed. Warsh. p. 8 *a*.} ^{f760} Moreover, the admitted fact, that when in office the Sadducees conformed to the principles and practices of the Pharisees, proves at least that they

must have been acquainted with the ordinances of traditionalism.^{f761} Lastly, there were certain traditional ordinances on which both parties were at one. {Sanh. 33 *t* Horay 4 *a*.} Thus it seems Sadduceeism was in a sense than a practical system, starting from simple and well-defined principles, but wide-reaching in its possible consequences. Perhaps it may best be described as a general reaction against the extremes of Pharisaism, springing from moderate and rationalistic tendencies; intended to secure a footing within the recognized bounds of Judaism; and seeking to defend its principles by a strict literalism of interpretation and application. If so, these interpretations would be intended rather for defensive than offensive purposes, and the great aim of the party would be after rational freedom, or, it might be, free rationality. Practically, the party would, of course, tend in broad, and often grossly unorthodox, directions.

The fundamental *dogmatic* differences between the Pharisees and Sadducees concerned: the rule of faith and practice; the 'after death;' the existence of angels and spirits; and free will and pre-destination. In regard to the first of these points, it has already been stated that the Sadducees did not lay down the principle of absolute rejection of all traditions as such, but that they were opposed to traditionalism as represented and carried out by the Pharisees. When put down by sheer weight of authority, they would probably carry the controversy further, and retort on their opponents by an appeal to Scripture as against their traditions, perhaps ultimately even by an attack on traditionalism; but always as represented by the Pharisees.^{f762} A careful examination of the statements of Josephus on this subject will show that they convey no more than this.^{f763} The Pharisaic view of this aspect of the controversy appears, perhaps, most satisfactorily because indirectly, in certain sayings of the Mishnah, which attribute all national calamities to those persons, whom they adjudge to eternal perdition, who interpret Scripture 'not as does the *Halakhah*,' or established Pharisaic rule. {Ab. 3:11; 5:8.} In this respect, then, the commonly received idea concerning the Pharisees and Sadducees will require to be seriously modified. As regards the *practice* of the Pharisees, as distinguished from that of the Sadducees, we may safely treat the statements of Josephus as the exaggerated representations of a partisan, who wishes to place his party in the best light. It is, indeed, true that the Pharisees, 'interpreting the legal ordinances with rigor,' {Jos. War 1:5.2.}^{f764} imposed on themselves the necessity of much self-denial, especially in regard to food, {Ant. 18:1. 3.} but that their practice was under the guidance of *reason*, as Josephus

asserts, is one of those bold mis-statements with which he has too often to be credited. His vindication of their special reverence for age and authority {Ant. 18:1.3.} must refer to the honors paid by the party to 'the Elders,' not to the old. And that there was sufficient ground for Sadducean opposition to Pharisaic traditionalism, alike in principle and in practice, will appear from the following quotation, to which we add, by way of explanation, that the wearing of phylacteries was deemed by that party of Scriptural obligation, and that the phylactery for the head was to consist (according to tradition) of four compartments. 'Against the words of the Scribes is more punishable than against the words of Scripture. He who says, No phylacteries, so as to transgress the words of Scripture, is not guilty (free); five compartments — to add to the words of the Scribes — he is guilty.' {Sanh. 11:3.} ^{f765}

The second doctrinal difference between Pharisees and Sadducees concerned the 'after death.' According to the New Testament, {St. ~~4023~~Matthew 22:23, and parallel passages; ~~4000~~Acts 4:1, 2; 23:8.} the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, while Josephus, going further, imputes to them denial of reward or punishment after death, {War 2:8. 14.} and even the doctrine that the soul perishes with the body. {Ant. 18:1. 4.} The latter statement may be dismissed as among those inferences which theological controversialists are too fond of imputing to their opponents. This is fully borne out by the account of a later work, to the effect, that by successive misunderstandings of the saying of Antigonus of Socho, that men were to serve God without regard to reward, his *later* pupils had arrived at the inference that there was no other world — which, however, *might* only refer to the Pharisaic ideal of 'the world to come,' not to the denial of the immortality of the soul — and no resurrection of the dead. We may therefore credit Josephus with merely reporting the common inference of his party. But it is otherwise in regard to their denial of the resurrection of the dead. Not only Josephus, but the New Testament and Rabbinic writings attest this. The Mishnah expressly states {Ber 9:5.} that the formula 'from age to age,' or rather 'from world to world,' had been introduced as a protest against the opposite theory; while the Talmud, which records disputations between Gamaliel and the Sadducees ^{f766} on the subject of the resurrection, expressly imputes the denial of this doctrine to the 'Scribes of the Sadducees.' In fairness it is perhaps only right to add that, in the discussion, the Sadducees seem only to have actually denied that there was proof for this doctrine in the Pentateuch, and that they

ultimately professed themselves convinced by the reasoning of Gamaliel.^{f767} Still the concurrent testimony of the New Testament and of Josephus leaves no doubt, that in this instance their views had not been misrepresented. Whether or not their opposition to the doctrine of the Resurrection arose in the first instance from, or was prompted by, Rationalistic views, which they endeavored to support by an appeal to the letter of the Pentateuch, as the source of traditionalism, it deserves notice that in His controversy with the Sadducees Christ appealed to the Pentateuch in proof of His teaching.^{f768}

Connected with this was the equally Rationalistic opposition to belief in Angels and Spirits. It is only mentioned in the New Testament, {Acts 23.} but seems almost to follow as a corollary. Remembering what the Jewish Angelology was, one can scarcely wonder that in controversy the Sadducees should have been led to the opposite extreme.

The last dogmatic difference between the two ‘sects’ concerned that problem which has at all times engaged religious thinkers: man’s free will and God’s pre-ordination, or rather their compatibility. Josephus — or the reviser whom he employed — indeed, uses the purely heathen expression ‘fate’ *εἰμαρμένη*^{f769} to designate the Jewish idea of the pre-ordination of God. But, properly understood, the real difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees seems to have amounted to this: that the former accentuated God’s preordination, the latter man’s free will; and that, while the Pharisees admitted only a partial influence of the human element on what happened, or the co-operation of the human with the Divine, the Sadducees denied all absolute pre-ordination, and made man’s choice of evil or good, with its consequences of misery or happiness, to depend entirely on the exercise of free will and self-determination. And in this, like many opponents of ‘Predestinarianism,’ they seem to have started from the principle, that it was impossible for God ‘either to commit or to foresee [in the sense of fore-ordaining] anything evil.’ The mutual misunderstanding here was that common in all such controversies. Although {In Jewish War 2:8. 14.} Josephus writes as if, according to the Pharisees, the chief part in every good action depended upon fate [pre-ordination] rather than on man’s doing, yet in another place {Ant. 18:1. 3.} he disclaims for them the notion that the will of man was destitute of spontaneous activity, and speaks somewhat confusedly — for he is by no means a good reasoner — of ‘a mixture’ of the Divine and human elements, in which the human will, with its sequence of virtue or wickedness, is subject to the will of fate. A

yet further modification of this statement occurs in another place, {Ant. 13:5. 9.} where we are told that, according to the Pharisees, some things depended upon fate, and more on man himself. Manifestly, there is not a very wide difference between this and the fundamental principle of the Sadducees in what we may suppose its primitive form.

But something more will have to be said as illustrative of Pharisaic teaching on this subject. No one who has entered into the spirit of the Old Testament can doubt that its outcome was *faith*, in its twofold aspect of acknowledgment of the absolute Rule, and simple submission to the Will, of God. What distinguished this so widely from fatalism was what may be termed *Jehovahism* — that is, the *moral* element in its thoughts of God, and that He was ever presented as in *paternal relationship* to men. But the Pharisees carried their accentuation of the Divine to the verge of fatalism. Even the idea that God had created man with two impulses, the one to good, the other to evil; and that the latter was absolutely necessary for the continuance of this world, would in some measure trace the causation of moral evil to the Divine Being. The absolute and unalterable pre-ordination of every event, to its minutest details, is frequently insisted upon. Adam had been shown all the generations that were to spring from him. Every incident in the history of Israel had been foreordained, and the actors in it — for good or for evil — were only instruments for carrying out the Divine Will. What were ever Moses and Aaron? God would have delivered Israel out of Egypt, and given them the Law, had there been no such persons. Similarly was it in regard to Solomon. to Esther, to Nebuchadnezzar, and others. Nay, it was because man was predestined to die that the serpent came to seduce our first parents. And as regarded the history of each individual: all that concerned his mental and physical capacity, or that would betide him, was prearranged. His name, place, position, circumstances, the very name of her whom he was to wed, were proclaimed in heaven, just as the hour of his death was fore-ordered. There might be seven years of pestilence in the land, and yet no one died before his time. {Sanh. 29 a.} Even if a man inflicted a cut on his finger, he might be sure that this also had been pre-ordered. {Chull. 7 b.} Nay, ‘wheresoever a man was destined to die, thither would his feet carry him.’

^{f770} We can well understand how the Sadducees would oppose notions like these, and all such coarse expressions of fatalism. And it is significant of the exaggeration of Josephus, ^{f771} that neither the New Testament, nor

Rabbinic writings, bring the charge of the denial of God's prevision against the Sadducees.

But there is another aspect of this question also. While the Pharisees thus held the doctrine of absolute preordination, side by side with it they were anxious to insist on man's freedom of choice, his personal responsibility, and moral obligation.^{f772} Although every event depended upon God, whether a man served God or not was entirely in his own choice. As a logical sequence of this, fate had no influence as regarded Israel, since all depended on prayer, repentance, and good works. Indeed, otherwise that repentance, on which Rabbinism so largely insists, would have had no meaning. Moreover, it seems as if it had been intended to convey that, while our evil actions were entirely our own choice, if a man sought to amend his ways, he would be helped of God. {Yoma 38 *b.*} It was, indeed, true that God had created the evil impulse in us; but He had also given the remedy in the Law. {Baba B. 16 *a.*} This is parabolically represented under the figure of a man seated at the parting of two ways, who warned all passers that if they chose one road it would lead them among the thorns, while on the other brief difficulties would end in a plain path (joy). {Siphre on ^{<5123>}Deuteronomy 11:26, 53, ed. Friedmann, p. 86 *a.*} Or, to put it in the language of the great Akiba {Ab. 3:15.}: 'Everything is foreseen; free determination is accorded to man; and the world is judged in goodness.' With this simple juxtaposition of two propositions equally true, but incapable of metaphysical combination, as are most things in which the empirically cognisable and uncognisable are joined together, we are content to leave the matter.

The other differences between the Pharisees and Sadducees can be easily and briefly summed up. They concern ceremonial, ritual, and juridical questions. In regard to the first, the opposition of the Sadducees to the excessive scruples of the Pharisees on the subject of Levitical defilements led to frequent controversy. Four points in dispute are mentioned, of which, however, three read more like ironical comments than serious divergences. Thus, the Sadducees taunted their opponents with their many lustrations, including that of the Golden Candlestick in the Temple. {Jer. Chag 3:8; Tos. Chag. 3., where the reader will find sufficient proof that the Sadducees were not in the wrong.} Two other similar instances are mentioned. {In Yad, 4:6, 7.} By way of guarding against the possibility of profanation, the Pharisees enacted, that the touch of any thing sacred 'defiled' the hands. The Sadducees, on the other hand, ridiculed the idea

that the Holy Scriptures ‘defiled’ the hands, but not such a book as Homer.^{f773} In the same spirit, the Sadducees would ask the Pharisees how it came, that water pouring from a clean into an unclean vessel did not lose its purity and purifying power.^{f774} If these represent no serious controversies, on another ceremonial question there was real difference, though its existence shows how far party-spirit could lead the Pharisees. No ceremony was surrounded with greater care to prevent defilement than that of preparing the ashes of the Red Heifer.^{f775} What seem the original ordinances, {Parah 3; Tos. Par. 3.} directed that, for seven days previous to the burning of the Red Heifer, the priest was to be kept in separation in the Temple, sprinkled with the ashes of all sin-offerings, and kept from the touch of his brother-priests, with even greater rigor than the High-Priest in his preparation for the Day of Atonement. The Sadducees insisted that, as ‘till sundown’ was the rule in all purification, the priest must be in cleanliness till then, before burning the Red Heifer. But, apparently for the sake of opposition, and in contravention to their own principles, the Pharisees would actually ‘defile’ the priest on his way to the place of burning, and then immediately make him take a bath of purification which had been prepared, so as to show that the Sadducees were in error. {Parah 3:7.}^{f776} In the same spirit, the Sadducees seem to have prohibited the use of anything made from animals which were either interdicted as food, or by reason of their not having been properly slaughtered; while the Pharisees allowed it, and, in the case of Levitically clean animals which had died or been torn, even made their skin into parchment, which might be used for sacred purposes. {Shabb. 108 *a.*}

These may seem trifling distinctions, but they sufficed to kindle the passions. Even greater importance attached to differences on *ritual* questions, although the controversy here was purely theoretical. For, the Sadducees, when in office, always conformed to the prevailing Pharisaic practices. Thus the Sadducees would have interpreted ^{<821>}Leviticus 23:11, 15, 16, as meaning that the wave-sheaf (or, rather, the Omer) was to be offered on ‘the morrow after the weekly Sabbath’ — that is, on the Sunday in Easter week — which would have brought the Feast of Pentecost always on a Sunday; {Vv. 15, 16.} while the Pharisees understood the term ‘Sabbath’ of the festive Paschal day. {Men. 10:3; 65 *a.*; Chag. 2:4.}^{f777} Connected with this were disputes about the examination of the witnesses who testified to the appearance of the new moon, and whom the Pharisees

accused of having been suborned by their opponents. {Rosh haSh. 1:7; 2:1; Tos. Rosh haSh. ed. Z. 1:15.}

The Sadducean objection to pouring the water of libation upon the altar on the Feast of Tabernacles, led to riot and bloody reprisals on the only occasion on which it seems to have been carried into practice. {Sukk. 48 *b*; comp. *Jos. Ant.* 13:13. 5.} ^{f762} Similarly, the Sadducees objected to the beating off the willow-branches after the procession round the altar on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, if it were a Sabbath. {Sukk. 43 *b*; and in the *Jerus. Talm.* and *Tos. Sukk.* 3:1.} Again, the Sadducees would have had the High-Priest, on the Day of Atonement, kindle the incense *before* entering the Most Holy Place; the Pharisees *after* he had entered the Sanctuary. {*Jer. Yoma* 1:5; *Yoma* 19 *b*; 53 *a*.} Lastly, the Pharisees contended that the cost of the daily Sacrifices should be discharged from the general Temple treasury, while the Sadducees would have paid it from free-will offerings. Other differences, which seem not so well established, need not here be discussed.

Among the divergences on *juridical* questions, reference has already been made to that in regard to marriage with the 'betrothed,' or else actually espoused widow of a deceased, childless brother. *Josephus*, indeed, charges the Sadducees with extreme severity in criminal matters; {Specially *Ant.* 20:9.} but this must refer to the fact that the ingenuity or punctiliousness of the Pharisees would afford to most offenders a loophole of escape. On the other hand, such of the diverging juridical principles of the Sadducees, as are attested on trustworthy authority, ^{f779} seem more in accordance with justice than those of the Pharisees. They concerned (besides the Levirate marriage) chiefly three points. According to the Sadducees, the punishment {Decreed in ^{<f5921>}Deuteronomy 19:21.} against false witnesses was only to be executed if the innocent person, condemned on their testimony, had actually suffered punishment, while the Pharisees held that this was to be done if the sentence had been actually pronounced, although not carried out. {*Makk.* 1:6.} Again, according to Jewish law, only a son, but not a daughter, inherited the father's property. From this the Pharisees argued, that if, at the time of his father's decease, that son were dead, leaving only a daughter, this granddaughter would (as representative of the son) be the heir, while the daughter would be excluded. On the other hand, the Sadducees held that, in such a case, daughter and granddaughter should share alike. {*Baba B.* 115 *b*; *Tos. Yad.* 2:20.} Lastly, the Sadducees argued that if, according to ^{<f728>}Exodus 21:28,

29, a man was responsible for damage done by his cattle, he was equally, if not more, responsible for damage done by his slave, while the Pharisees refused to recognize any responsibility on the latter score. {Yad. 4:7 and Tos. Yad.} ^{f780}

For the sake of completeness it has been necessary to enter into details, which may not possess a general interest. This, however, will be marked, that, with the exception of dogmatic differences, the controversy turned on questions of 'canon law.' Josephus tells us that the Pharisees commanded the masses, {Ant. 13:10, 6} and especially the female world, {Ant. 17:2. 4.} while the Sadducees attached to their ranks only a minority, and that belonging to the highest class. The leading priests in Jerusalem formed, of course, part of that highest class of society; and from the New Testament and Josephus we learn that the High-Priestly families belonged to the Sadducean party. {~~4817~~Acts 5:17; Ant. 20:9.1} But to conclude from this, ^{f781} either that the Sadducees represented the civil and political aspect of society, and the Pharisees the religious; or, that the Sadducees were the priest-party, ^{f782} in opposition to the popular and democratic Pharisees, are inferences not only unsupported, but opposed to historical facts. For, not a few of the Pharisaic leaders were actually priests, {Sheqal. 4:4; 6:1; Eduy. 8:2; Ab. 2:8 etc.} while the Pharisaic ordinances make more than ample recognition of the privileges and rights of the Priesthood. This would certainly not have been the case if, as some have maintained, Sadducean and priest-party had been convertible terms. Even as regards the deputation to the Baptist of 'Priests and Levites' from Jerusalem, we are expressly told that they 'were of the Pharisees.' {St. ~~4024~~John 1:24.}

This bold hypothesis seems, indeed, to have been invented chiefly for the sake of another, still more unhistorical. The derivation of the name 'Sadducee' has always been in dispute. According to a Jewish legend of about the seventh century of our era, {In the Ab. de R. Nath. c. 5.} the name was derived from one *Tsadoq* (Zadok), ^{f783} a disciple of Antigonus of Socho, whose principle of not serving God for reward had been gradually misinterpreted into Sadduceeism. But, apart from the objection that in such case the party should rather have taken the name of *Antigonites*, the story itself receives no support either from Josephus or from early Jewish writings. Accordingly modern critics have adopted another hypothesis, which seems at least equally untenable. On the supposition that the Sadducees were the 'priest-party,' the name of the sect is derived from Zadok (*Tsadoq*), the High-Priest in the time of Solomon. ^{f784} But the

objections to this are insuperable. Not to speak of the linguistic difficulty of deriving *Tsadduqim* (Zaddukim, Sadducees) from *Tsadoq* (Zadok),^{f785} neither Josephus nor the Rabbis know anything of such a connection between *Tsadoq* and the Sadducees, of which, indeed, the *rationale* would be difficult to perceive. Besides, is it likely that a party would have gone back so many centuries for a name, which had no connection with their distinctive principles? The name of a party is, if self-chosen (which is rarely the case), derived from its founder or place of origin, or else from what it claims as distinctive principles or practices. Opponents might either pervert such a name, or else give a designation, generally opprobrious, which would express their own relation to the party, or to some of its supposed peculiarities. But on none of these principles can the origin of the name of Sadducees from *Tsadoq* be accounted for. Lastly, on the supposition mentioned, the Sadducees must have given the name to their party, since it cannot be imagined that the Pharisees would have connected their opponents with the honored name of the High-Priest *Tsadoq*.

If it is highly improbable that the Sadducees, who, of course, professed to be the right interpreters of Scripture, would choose any party-name, thereby stamping themselves as sectaries, this derivation of their name is also contrary to historical analogy. For even the name Pharisees, '*Perushim*,' 'separated ones,' was not taken by the party itself, but given to it by their opponents. {Yad. 4:6 etc.}^{f786} From 1 Macc. 2:42; 7:13; 2 Macc. 14:6, it appears that originally they had taken the sacred name of Chasidim, or 'the pious.' {~~<1814>~~ Psalm 30:4; 31:23; ~~<1878>~~ 37:28.} This, no doubt, on the ground that they were truly those who, according to the directions of Ezra, {~~<1812>~~ 6:21; 9:1; 10:11; ~~<1812>~~ Nehemiah 9:2.} had separated themselves (become *nibhdalim*) 'from the filthiness of the heathen' (all heathen defilement) by carrying out the traditional ordinances.^{f787} In fact, Ezra marked the beginning of the 'later,' in contradistinction to the 'earlier,' or Scripture-*Chasidim*. {Ber. 5:1; comp. with Vayyikra R. 2, ed. Warsh. t. 3 p. 5 a.} If we are correct in supposing that their opponents had called them *Perushim*, instead of the Scriptural designation of *Nibhdalim*, the inference is at hand, that, while the 'Pharisees' would arrogate to themselves the Scriptural name of *Chasidim*, or 'the pious,' their opponents would retort that they were satisfied to be *Tsaddiqim*,^{f788} or 'righteous.' Thus the name of *Tsaddiqim* would become that of the party opposing the Pharisees, that is, of the *Sadducees*. There is, indeed, an admitted linguistic difficulty in the change of the sound *i* into *u* (*Tsaddiqim*

into *Tsadduqim*), but may it not have been that this was accomplished, not grammatically, but by popular witticism? Such mode of giving a ‘by-name’ to a party or government is, at least, not irrational, nor is it uncommon. ^{f789} Some wit might have suggested: Read not *Tsaddiqim*, the ‘righteous,’ but *Tsadduqim* (from *Tsadu*, yrx), ‘desolation,’ ‘destruction.’ Whether or not this suggestion approve itself to critics, the derivation of Sadducees from *Tsaddiqim* is certainly that which offers most probability. ^{f790}

This uncertainty as to the origin of the name of a party leads almost naturally to the mention of another, which, indeed, could not be omitted in any description of those times. But while the Pharisees and Sadducees were parties *within* the Synagogue, the Essenes (Εσσηνοί or Εσσαίοι, the latter always in Philo) were, although strict Jews, yet separatists, and, alike in doctrine, worship, and practice, *outside* the Jewish body ecclesiastic. Their numbers amounted to only about 4,000. { *Philo*, Quod omnis probus liber, 12, ed, Mang. 2 p. 457; *Jos. Ant.* 18:1.5. } They are not mentioned in the New Testament, and only very indirectly referred to in Rabbinic writings, perhaps without clear knowledge on the part of the Rabbis. If the conclusion concerning them, which we shall by-and-by indicate, be correct, we can scarcely wonder at this. Indeed, their entire separation from all who did not belong to their sect, the terrible oaths by which they bound themselves to secrecy about their doctrines, and which would prevent any free religious discussion, as well as the character of what is known of their views, would account for the scanty notices about them. Josephus and Philo, ^{f791} who speak of them in the most sympathetic manner, had, no doubt, taken special pains to ascertain all that could be learned. For this Josephus seems to have enjoyed special opportunities. ^{f792} Still, the secrecy of their doctrines renders us dependent on writers, of whom at least one (Josephus) lies open to the suspicion of coloring and exaggeration. But of one thing we may feel certain: neither John the Baptist, and his Baptism, nor the teaching of Christianity, had any connection with Essenism. It were utterly unhistorical to infer such from a few points of contact — and these only of similarity, not identity — when the differences between them are so fundamental. That an Essene would have preached repentance and the Kingdom of God to multitudes, baptized the uninitiated, and given supreme testimony to One like Jesus, are assertions only less extravagant than this, that One Who mingled with society as Jesus did, and Whose teaching, alike in that respect, and in all its tendencies, was so utterly Non-, and even Anti-Essenic, had derived any

part of His doctrine from Essenism. Besides, when we remember the views of the Essenes on purification, and on Sabbath observance, and their denial of the Resurrection, we feel that, whatever points of resemblance critical ingenuity may emphasize, the teaching of Christianity was in a direction opposite from that of Essenism. ^{f793}

We possess no *data* for the history of the origin and development (if such there was) of Essenism. We may admit a certain connection between Pharisaism and Essenism, though it has been greatly exaggerated by modern Jewish writers. Both directions originated from a desire after 'purity,' though there seems a fundamental difference between them, alike in the idea of what constituted purity, and in the means for attaining it. To the Pharisee it was Levitical and legal purity, secured by the 'hedge' of ordinances which they drew around themselves. To the Essene it was absolute purity in separation from the 'material,' which in itself was defiling. The Pharisee attained in this manner the distinctive merit of a saint; the Essene obtained a higher fellowship with the Divine, 'inward' purity, and not only freedom from the detracting, degrading influence of matter, but command over matter and nature. As the result of this higher fellowship with the Divine, the adept possessed the power of prediction; as the result of his freedom from, and command over matter, the power of miraculous cures. That their purifications, strictest Sabbath observance, and other practices, would form points of contact with Pharisaism, follows as a matter of course; and a little reflection will show, that such observances would naturally be adopted by the Essenes, since they were within the lines of Judaism, although separatists from its body ecclesiastic. On the other hand, their fundamental tendency was quite other than that of Pharisaism, and strongly tinged with Eastern (Parsee) elements. After this the inquiry as to the precise date of its origin, and whether Essenism was an offshoot from the original (ancient) Assideans or *Chasidim*, seems needless. Certain it is that we find its first mention about 150 B.C., {*Jos. Ant.* 13:5. 9.} and that we meet the first Essence in the reign of Aristobulus I. {105-104 B.C.; *Ant.* 13:11. 2; *War* 1:3. 5.}

Before stating our conclusions as to its relation to Judaism and the meaning of the name, we shall put together what information may be derived of the sect from the writings of Josephus, Philo, and Pliny. ^{f794} Even its outward organization and the mode of life must have made as deep, and, considering the habits and circumstances of the time, even deeper impression than does the strictest asceticism on the part of any

modern monastic order, without the unnatural and repulsive characteristics of the latter. There were no vows of absolute silence, broken only by weird chant of prayer or ‘memento mori;’ no penance’s, nor self-chastisement. But the person who had entered the ‘order’ was as effectually separated from all outside as if he had lived in another world. Avoiding the large cities as the centers of immorality, {*Philo*, 2 p. 457.} they chose for their settlements chiefly villages, one of their largest colonies being by the shore of the Dead Sea. {*Pliny*, *Hist. Nat.* 5:16, 17.} At the same time they had also ‘houses’ inmost, if not all the cities of Palestine, {*Philo*, u.s. p. 632; *Jos.* *Jewish War* 2:8. 4.} notably in Jerusalem, {*Ant.* 13:11.2; 15:10. 5; 17:13.3.} where, indeed, one of the gates was named after them. {*War* 5:4.2.} In these ‘houses’ they lived in common, {*Philo*, u.s. p. 632.} under officials of their own. The affairs of ‘the order’ were administered by a tribunal of at least a hundred members. {*War* 2:8.9.} wore a common dress, engaged in common labor, united in common prayers, partook of common meals, and devoted themselves to works of charity, for which each had liberty to draw from the common treasury at his own discretion, except in the case of relatives. {*War* 2:8. 6.} It scarcely needs mention that they extended fullest hospitality to strangers belonging to the order; in fact, a special official was appointed for this purpose in every city. {u. s. sections 4.} Everything was of the simplest character, and intended to purify the soul by the greatest possible avoidance, not only of what was sinful, but of what was material. Rising at dawn, no profane word was spoken till they had offered their prayers. These were addressed towards, if not to, the rising sun — probably, as they would have explained it, as the emblem of the Divine Light, but implying invocation, if not adoration, of the sun. ^{f795} After that they were dismissed by their officers to common work. The morning meal was preceded by a lustration, or bath. Then they put on their ‘festive’ linen garments, and entered, purified, the common hall as their Sanctuary. For each meal was sacrificial, in fact, the only sacrifices which they acknowledged. The ‘baker,’ who was really their priest — and naturally so, since he prepared the sacrifice — set before each bread, and the cook a mess of vegetables. The meal began with prayer by the presiding priest, for those who presided at these ‘sacrifices’ were also ‘priests,’ although in neither case probably of Aaronic descent, but consecrated by themselves. {*Jos.* *War* 2:8.5; *Ant.* 18:1. 5.} The sacrificial meal was again concluded by prayer, when they put off their sacred dress, and returned to their labor. The evening meal was of exactly the same description, and partaken of with the same rites as that of the morning.

Although the Essenes, who, with the exception of a small party among them, repudiated marriage, adopted children to train them in the principles of their sect,^{f796} yet admission to the order was only granted to adults, and after a novitiate which lasted three years. On entering, the novice received the three symbols of purity: an axe, or rather a *spade*, with which to dig a pit, a foot deep, to cover up the excrements; an *apron*, to bind round the loins in bathing; and a *white dress*, which was always worn, the festive garment at meals being of linen. At the end of the first year the novice was admitted to the lustrations. He had now entered on the second grade, in which he remained for another year. After its lapse, he was advanced to the *third* grade, but still continued a novice, until, at the close of the third year of his probation, he was admitted to the *fourth* grade — that of full member when, for the first time, he was admitted to the sacrifice of the common meals. The mere touch of one of a lower grade in the order defiled the Essene, and necessitated the lustration of a bath. Before admission to full membership, a terrible oath was taken. As, among other things, it bound to the most absolute secrecy, we can scarcely suppose that its form, as given by Josephus, {War 2:8.7.} contains much beyond what was generally allowed to transpire. Thus the long list given by the Jewish historian of moral obligations which the Essenes undertook, is probably only a rhetorical enlargement of some simple formula. More credit attaches to the alleged undertaking of avoidance of all vanity, falsehood, dishonesty, and unlawful gains. The last parts of the oath alone indicate the peculiar vows of the sect, that is, so far as they could be learned by the outside world, probably chiefly through the practice of the Essenes. They bound each member not to conceal anything from his own sect, nor, even on peril of death, to disclose their doctrines to others; to hand down their doctrines exactly as they had received them; to abstain from robbery;^{f797} and *to guard the books belonging to their sect, and the names of the Angels.*

It is evident that, while all else was intended as safeguards of a rigorous sect of purists, and with the view of strictly keeping it a secret order, the last-mentioned particulars furnish significant indications of their peculiar doctrines. Some of these may be regarded as only exaggerations of Judaism, though not of the Pharisaic kind.^{f798} Among them we reckon the extravagant reverence for the name of their legislator (presumably Moses), whom to blaspheme was a capital offence; their rigid abstinence from all prohibited food; and their exaggerated Sabbath-observance, when, not only no food was prepared, but not a vessel moved, nay — not even nature eased.

^{f799} But this latter was connected with their fundamental idea of inherent impurity in the body, and, indeed, in all that is material. Hence, also, their asceticism, their repudiation of marriage, and their frequent lustrations in clean water, not only before their sacrificial meals, but upon contact even with an Essene of a lower grade, and after attending to the calls of nature. Their undoubted *denial of the resurrection of the body* seems only the logical sequence from it. If the soul was a substance of the subtlest ether, drawn by certain natural enticement into the body, which was its prison, a state of perfectness could not have consisted in the restoration of that which, being material, was in itself impure. And, indeed, what we have called the exaggerated Judaism of the sect — its rigid abstinence from all forbidden food, and peculiar Sabbath-observance — may all have had the same object, that of tending towards an external purism, which the Divine legislator would have introduced, but the ‘carnally-minded’ could not receive. Hence, also, the strict separation of the order, its grades, its rigorous discipline, as well as its abstinence from wine, meat, and all ointments, from every luxury, even from trades which would encourage this, or any vice. This aim after external purity explains many of their outward arrangements, such as that their labor was of the simplest kind, and the commonality of all property in the order; perhaps, also, what may seem more ethical ordinances, such as the repudiation of slavery, their refusal to take an oath, and even their scrupulous care of truth. The white garments, which they always wore, seem to have been but a symbol of that purity which they sought. For this purpose they submitted, not only to strict asceticism, but to a discipline which gave the officials authority to expel all offenders, even though in so doing they virtually condemned them to death by starvation, since the most terrible oaths had bound all entrants into the order not to partake of any food other than that prepared by their ‘priests.’

In such a system there would, of course, be *no place for either an Aaronic priesthood, or bloody sacrifices*. In fact, they repudiated both. Without formally rejecting the Temple and its services, there was no room in their system for such ordinances. They sent, indeed, thank offerings to the Temple, but what part had they in bloody sacrifices and an Aaronic ministry, which constituted the main business of the Temple? Their ‘priests’ were their bakers and presidents; their sacrifices those of fellowship, their sacred meals of purity. It is quite in accordance with this tendency when we learn from Philo that, in their diligent study of the

Scriptures, they chiefly adopted the allegorical mode of interpretation. {Ed. *Mang* 2 p. 458.}

We can scarcely wonder that such Jews as Josephus and Philo, and such heathens as Pliny, were attracted by such an unworldly and lofty sect. Here were about 4,000 men, who deliberately separated themselves, not only from all that made life pleasant, but from all around; who, after passing a long and strict novitiate, were content to live under the most rigid rule, obedient to their superiors; who gave up all their possessions, as well as the earnings of their daily toil in the fields, or of their simple trades; who held all things for the common benefit, entertained strangers, nursed their sick, and tended their aged as if their own parents, and were charitable to all men; who renounced all animal passions, eschewed anger, ate and drank in strictest moderation, accumulated neither wealth nor possessions, wore the simplest white dress till it was no longer fit for use; repudiated slavery, oaths, marriage; abstained from meat and wine, even from the common Eastern anointing with oil; used mystic lustrations, had mystic rites and mystic prayers, an esoteric literature and doctrines; whose every meal was a sacrifice, and every act one of self-denial; who, besides, were strictly truthful, honest, upright, virtuous, chaste, and charitable — in short, whose life meant, positively and negatively, a continual purification of the soul by mortification of the body. To the astonished onlookers this mode of life was rendered even more sacred by doctrines, a literature, and magic power known only to the initiated. Their mysterious conditions made them cognizant of the names of Angels, by which we are, no doubt, to understand a theosophic knowledge, fellowship with the Angelic world, and the power of employing its ministry. Their constant purifications, and the study of their prophetic writings, gave them the power of prediction; {*Jos.* War 2:8, 12; comp. *Ant.* 13:11. 2; 15:10. 5; 17:13.3.} the same mystic writings revealed the secret remedies of plants and stones for the healing of the body, ^{f800} as well as what was needed for the cure of souls.

It deserves special notice that this intercourse with Angels, this secret traditional literature, and its teaching concerning mysterious remedies in plants and stones, are not unfrequently referred to in that Apocalyptic literature known as the ‘Pseudepigraphic Writings.’ Confining ourselves to undoubtedly Jewish and pre-Christian documents, ^{f801} we know what development the doctrine of Angels received both in the Book of Enoch (alike in its earlier and in its later portion {ch. 31.}) and in the Book of Jubilees, ^{f802}) and how the ‘seers’ received Angelic instruction and

revelations. The distinctively Rabbinic teaching on these subjects is fully set forth in another part of this work.^{f803} Here we would only specially notice that in the Book of Jubilees {Chapter 10} Angels are represented as teaching Noah all ‘herbal remedies’ for diseases, {Comp. also the Sepher Noach in *Jellinek’s* Beth. ha-Midr. part 3 pp. 155, 156.} while in the later Pirque de R. Eliezer {c. 48.} this instruction is said to have been given to Moses. These two points (relation to the Angels, and knowledge of the remedial power of plants, not to speak of visions and prophecies) seem to connect the secret writings of the Essenes with that ‘outside’ literature which in Rabbinic writings is known as *Sepharim haChitsonim*, ‘outside writings.’^{f804} The point is of greatest importance, as will presently appear.

It needs no demonstration, that a system which proceeded from a contempt of the body and of all that is material; in some manner identified the Divine manifestation with the Sun; denied the Resurrection, the Temple-priesthood, and sacrifices; preached abstinence from meats and from marriage; decreed such entire separation from all around that their very contact defiled, and that its adherents would have perished of hunger rather than join in the meals of the outside world; which, moreover, contained not a trace of Messianic elements — indeed, had no room for them — could have had no internal connection with the origin of Christianity. Equally certain is it that, in respect of doctrine, life, and worship, it really stood *outside* Judaism, as represented by either Pharisees or Sadducees. The question whence the foreign elements were derived, which were its distinctive characteristics, has of late been so learnedly discussed, that only the conclusions arrived at require to be stated. Of the two theories, of which the one traces Essenism to Neo-Pythagorean,^{f805} the other to Persian sources,^{f806} the latter seems fully established — without, however, wholly denying at least the possibility of Neo-Pythagorean influences. To the grounds which have been so conclusively urged in support of the Eastern origin of Essenism,^{f807} in its distinctive features, may be added this, that Jewish Angelology, which played so great a part in the system, was derived from Chaldee and Persian sources, and perhaps also the curious notion, that the knowledge of medicaments, originally derived by Noah from the angels, came to the Egyptians chiefly through the magic books of the Chaldees. {Sepher Noach ap. *Jellinek* 3 p. 156.}^{f808}

It is only at the conclusion of these investigations that we are prepared to enter on the question of the origin and meaning of the name *Essenes*, important as this inquiry is, not only in itself, but in regard to the relation of

the sect to orthodox Judaism. The eighteen or nineteen proposed explanations of a term, which must undoubtedly be of Hebrew etymology, all proceed on the idea of its derivation from something which implied praise of the sect, the two least objectionable explaining the name as equivalent either to ‘the pious,’ or else to ‘the silent ones.’ But against all such derivations there is the obvious objection, that the Pharisees, who had the molding of the theological language, and who were in the habit of giving the hardest names to those who differed from them, would certainly not have bestowed a title implying encomium on a sect which, in principle and practices, stood so entirely *outside*, not only of their own views, but even of the Synagogue itself. Again, if they had given a name of encomium to the sect, it is only reasonable to suppose that they would not have kept, in regard to their doctrines and practices, a silence which is only broken by dim and indirect allusions. Yet, as we examine it, the origin and meaning of the name seem implied in their very position towards the Synagogue. They were the only real *sect*, strictly *outsiders*, and their name Essenes (Ἐσσηνοὶ Ἐσσαιῶται) seems the Greek equivalent for *Chitsonim* (*mynwxyj*), ‘the outsiders.’ Even the circumstance that the axe, or rather spade (ἄξιανάριον), which every novice received, has for its Rabbinic equivalent the word *Chatsina*, is here not without significance. Linguistically, the words *Essenoi* and *Chitsonim* are equivalents, as admittedly are the similar designations *Chasidim* (*myrymj*) and *Asidaioi* (Ἀσιδαῖοι). For, in rendering Hebrew into Greek, the *ch* (*j*) is ‘often entirely omitted, or represented by a *spiritus lenis* in the beginning,’ while ‘in regard to the vowels no distinct rule is to be laid down.’ {Deutsch, Remains, pp. 359, 360.} Instances of a change of the Hebrew *i* into the Greek *ε* are frequent, and of the Hebrew *o* into the Greek *η* not rare. As one instance will suffice, we select a case in which exactly the same transmutation of the two vowel-sounds occurs — that of the Rabbinic Abhginos *mwynygna* for the Greek *εὐγενής* Eugenēs (‘well-born’).^{f809}

This derivation of the name Essenes, which strictly expresses the character and standing of the sect relatively to orthodox Judaism, and, indeed, is the Greek form of the Hebrew term for ‘outsiders,’ is also otherwise confirmed. It has already been said, that no direct statement concerning the Essenes occurs in Rabbinical writings. Nor need this surprise us, when we remember the general reluctance of the Rabbis to refer to their opponents, except in actual controversy; and, that, when traditionalism was reduced to writing, Essenism, as a Jewish sect, had ceased to exist. Some of its

elements had passed into the Synagogue, influencing its general teaching (as in regard to Angelology, magic, etc.), and greatly contributing to that mystic direction which afterwards found expression in what is now known as the *Kabbalah*. But the general movement had passed beyond the bounds of Judaism, and appeared in some forms of the Gnostic heresy. But still there are Rabbinic references to the ‘Chitsonim,’ which seems to identify them with the sect of the Essenes. Thus, in one passage {Megill. 24 b, lines 4 and 5 from bottom.} certain practices of the Sadducees and of the Chitsonim are mentioned together, and it is difficult to see who could be meant by the latter if not the Essenes. Besides, the practices there referred to seem to contain covert allusions to those of the Essenes. Thus, the Mishnah begins by prohibiting the public reading of the Law by those who would not appear in a colored, but only in a *white* dress. Again, the curious statement is made that the manner of the *Chitsonim* was to cover the phylacteries with gold — a statement unexplained in the Gemara, and inexplicable, unless we see in it an allusion to the Essene practice of facing the rising Sun in their morning prayers.^{f810} Again, we know with what bitterness Rabbinism denounced the use of the *externe writings* (the *Sepharim haChitsonim*) to the extent of excluding from eternal life those who studied them. {Sanh. 10:1.} But one of the best ascertained facts concerning the Essenes is that they possessed secret, ‘outside,’ holy writings of their own, which they guarded with special care. And, although it is not maintained that the *Sepharim haChitsonim* were exclusively Essene writings,^{f811} the latter must have been included among them. We have already seen reason for believing, that even the so-called Pseudepigraphic literature, notably such works as the Book of Jubilees, was strongly tainted with Essene views; if, indeed, in perhaps another than its present form, part of it was not actually Essene. Lastly, we find what seems to us yet another covert allusion {In Sanh. 10:1.} to Essene practices, similar to that which has already been noticed. {Meg. 24 b.} For, immediately after consigning to destruction all who denied that there was proof in the Pentateuch for the Resurrection (evidently the Sadducees), those who denied that the Law was from heaven (the *Minim* or heretics — probably the Jewish Christians), and all ‘Epicureans’^{f812} (materialists), the same punishment is assigned to those ‘who read *externe writings*’ (*Sepharim haChitsonim*) and ‘who whispered’ (a magical formula) ‘over a wound.’^{f813} Both the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmud {Sanh. 101 a; Jer. Sanh. p. 28 b.} offer a strange explanation of this practice; perhaps, because they either did not, or else would not, understand the allusion. But

to us it seems at least significant that as, in the first quoted instance, the mention of the *Chitsonim* is conjoined with a condemnation of the exclusive use of white garments in worship, which we know to have been an Essene peculiarity, so the condemnation of the use of *Chitsonim* writings with that of magical cures.^{f814} At the same time, we are less bound to insist on these allusions as essential to our argument, since those, who have given another derivation than ours to the name *Essenes*, express themselves unable to find in ancient Jewish writings any trustworthy reference to the sect.

On one point, at least, our inquiry into the three ‘parties’ can leave no doubt. The Essenes could never have been drawn either to the person, or the preaching of John the Baptist. Similarly, the Sadducees would, after they knew its real character and goal, turn contemptuously from a movement which would awaken no sympathy in them, and could only become of interest when it threatened to endanger their class by awakening popular enthusiasm, and so rousing the suspicions of the Romans. To the Pharisees there were questions of dogmatic, ritual, and even national importance involved, which made the barest possibility of what John announced a question of supreme moment. And, although we judge that the report which the earliest Pharisaic hearers of John {St. ~~CHR~~ Matthew 3:7.} brought to Jerusalem — no doubt, detailed and accurate — and which led to the despatch of the deputation, would entirely predispose them against the Baptist, yet it behooved them, as leaders of public opinion, to take such cognizance of it, as would not only finally determine their own relation to the movement, but enable them effectually to direct that of others also.

CHAPTER 3

THE TWOFOLD TESTIMONY OF JOHN — THE FIRST SABBATH OF JESUS' MINISTRY — THE FIRST SUNDAY — THE FIRST DISCIPLES.

(St. ~~✠~~⁸¹⁵ John 1:15-51.)

THE forty days, which had passed since Jesus had first come to him, must have been to the Baptist a time of soul-quickenings, of unfolding understanding, and of ripened decision. We see it in his more emphasized testimony to the Christ; in his fuller comprehension of those prophecies which had formed the warrant and substance of his Mission; but specially in the yet more entire self-abnegation, which led him to take up a still lowlier position, and acquiescingly to realize that his task of heralding was ending, and that what remained was to point those nearest to him, and who had most deeply drunk of his spirit, to Him Who had come. And how could it be otherwise? On first meeting Jesus by the banks of Jordan, he had felt the seeming incongruity of baptizing One of Whom he had rather need to be baptized. Yet this, perhaps, because he had beheld himself by the Brightness of Christ, rather than looked at the Christ Himself. What he needed was not to be baptized, but to learn that it became the Christ to fulfil all righteousness. This was the first lesson. The next, and completing one, came when, after the Baptism, the heavens opened, the Spirit descended, and the Divine Voice of Testimony pointed to, and explained the promised sign. ^{f815} It told him, that the work, which he had begun in the obedience of faith, had reached the reality of fulfilment. The first was a lesson about the Kingdom; the second about the King. And then Jesus was parted from him, and led of the Spirit into the wilderness.

Forty days since then — with these events, this vision, those words ever present to his mind! It had been the mightiest impulse; nay, it must have been a direct call from above, which first brought John from his life-preparation of lonely communing with God to the task of preparing Israel for that which he knew was preparing for them. He had entered upon it, not only without illusions, but with such entire self-forgetfulness, as only deepest conviction of the reality of what he announced could have wrought. He knew those to whom he was to speak — the preoccupation,

the spiritual dulness, the sins of the great mass; the hypocrisy, the unreality, the inward impenitence of their spiritual leaders; the perverseness of their direction; the hollowness and delusiveness of their confidence as being descended from Abraham. He saw only too clearly their real character, and knew the near end of it all: how the axe was laid to the barren tree, and how terribly the fan would sift the chaff from the wheat. And yet he preached and baptized; for, deepest in his heart was the conviction, that there was a Kingdom at hand, and a King coming. As we gather the elements of that conviction, we find them chiefly in the Book of Isaiah. His speech and its imagery, and, especially, the burden of his message, were taken from those prophecies. ^{f816} Indeed, his mind seems saturated with them; they must have formed his own religious training; and they were the preparation for his work. This gathering up of the Old Testament rays of light and glory into the burning-glass of Evangelic prophecy had set his soul on fire. No wonder that, recoiling equally from the externalism of the Pharisees, and the merely material purism of the Essenes, he preached quite another doctrine, of inward repentance and renewal of life.

One picture was most brightly reflected on those pages of Isaiah. It was that of the Anointed, Messiah, Christ, the Representative Israelite, the Priest, King, and Prophet, { ²³⁰⁶Isaiah 9:6 etc.; 11; 42; 52:13 etc.; 41.} in Whom the institution and sacramental meaning of the Priesthood, and of Sacrifices, found their fulfilment. { ²⁸⁰¹Isaiah 53.} In his announcement of the Kingdom, in his call to inward repentance, even in his symbolic Baptism, that Great Personality always stood out before the mind of John, as the One all-overtopping and overshadowing Figure in the background. It was the Isaiah-picture of 'the King in His beauty,' the vision of 'the land of far distances' { ²³³⁷Isaiah 33:17.} ^{f817} — to him a reality, of which Sadducee and Essene had no conception, and the Pharisee only the grossest misconception. This also explains how the greatest of those born of women was also the most humble, the most retiring, and self-forgetful. In a picture such as that which filled his whole vision, there was no room for self. By the side of such a Figure all else appeared in its real littleness, and, indeed, seemed at best but as shadows cast by its light. All the more would the bare suggestion on the part of the Jerusalem deputation, that he might be the Christ, seem like a blasphemy, from which, in utter self-abasement, he would seek shelter in the scarce-ventured claim to the meanest office which a slave could discharge. He was not Elijah. Even the fact that Jesus afterwards, in significant language, pointed to the possibility of his

becoming such to Israel (St. ^{f814}Matthew 11:14), proves that he claimed it not; ^{f818}not 'that prophet'; not even a prophet. He professed not visions, revelations, special messages. All else was absorbed in the great fact: he was only the voice of one that cried, 'Prepare ye the way!' Viewed especially in the light of those self-glorious times, this reads not like a fictitious account of a fictions mission; nor was such the profession of an impostor, an associate in a plot, or an enthusiast. There was deep reality of all-engrossing conviction which underlay such self-denial of mission.

And all this must have ripened during the forty days of probably comparative solitude, ^{f819}only relieved by the presence of such 'disciples' as, learning the same hope, would gather around him. What he had seen and what he had heard threw him back upon what he had expected and believed. It not only fulfilled, it transfigured it. Not that, probably, he always maintained the same height which he then attained. It was not in the nature of things that it should be so. We often attain, at the outset of our climbing, a glimpse, afterwards hid from us in our laborious upward toil till the supreme height is reached. Mentally and spiritually we may attain almost at a bound results, too often lost to us till again secured by long reflection, or in the course of painful development. This in some measure explains the fulness of John's testimony to the Christ as 'the Lamb of God, Which taketh away the sin of the world,' when at the beginning we find ourselves almost at the goal of New Testament teaching. It also explains that last strife of doubt and fear, when the weary wrestler laid himself down to find refreshment and strength in the shadow of those prophecies, which had first called him to the contest. But during those forty days, and in the first meetings with Jesus which followed, all lay bathed in the morning-light of that heavenly vision, and that Divine truth wakened in him the echoes of all those prophecies, which these thirty years had been the music of his soul.

And now, on the last of those forty days, simultaneously with the final great Temptation of Jesus ^{f820}which must have summed up all that had preceded it in the previous days, came the hour of John's temptation by the deputation from Jerusalem. ^{f821}Very gently it came to him, like the tempered wind that fans the fire into flame, not like that keen, desolating storm-blast which swept over the Master. To John, as now to us, it was only the fellowship of His sufferings, which he bore in the shelter of that great Rock over which its intenseness had spent itself. Yet a very real temptation it was, this provoking to the assumption of successively lower

grades of self-assertion, where only entire self-abnegation was the rightful feeling. Each suggestion of lower office (like the temptations of Christ) marked an increased measure of temptation, as the human in his mission was more and more closely neared. And greatest temptation it was when, after the first victory, came the not unnatural challenge of his authority for what he said and did. This was, of all others, the question which must at all times, from the beginning of his mission to the hour of his death, have pressed most closely upon him, since it touched not only his conscience, but the very ground of his mission, nay — of his life. That it was such temptation is evidenced by the fact that, in the hour of his greatest loneliness and depression it formed his final contest, in which he temporarily paused, like Jacob in his Israel-struggle, though, like him, he failed not in it. For what was the meaning of that question which the disciples of John brought to Jesus: ‘Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?’ other than doubt of his own warrant and authority for what he had said and done? But in that first time of his trial at Bethabara he overcame — the first temptation by the humility of his intense sincerity, the second by the absolute simplicity of his own experimental conviction; the first by what he had seen, the second by what he had heard concerning the Christ at the banks of Jordan. And so, also, although perhaps ‘afar off,’ it must ever be to us in like temptation.

Yet, as we view it, and without needlessly imputing malice prepense to the Pharisaic deputation, their questions seemed but natural. After his previous emphatic disclaimer at the beginning of his preaching (St. ^{f815}Luke 3:15), of which they in Jerusalem could scarcely have been ignorant, the suggestion of his Messiahship — not indeed expressly made, but sufficiently implied to elicit what the language of St. John ^{f822} shows to have been the most energetic denial — could scarcely have been more than tentative. It was otherwise with their question whether he was ‘Elijah’? Yet, bearing in mind what we know of the Jewish expectations of Elijah, and how his appearance was always readily recognized, ^{f823} this also could scarcely have been meant in its full literality — but rather as ground for the further question after the goal and warrant of his mission. Hence also John’s disavowing of such claims is not satisfactorily accounted for by the common explanation, that he denied being Elijah in the sense of not being what the Jews expected of the Forerunner of the Messiah: the real, identical Elijah of the days of Ahab; or else, that he denied being such in the sense of the peculiar Jewish hopes attaching to his reappearance in the

‘last days.’ There is much deeper truth in the disclaimer of the Baptist. It was, indeed, true that, as foretold in the Angelic announcement, {St. ^{<0117>}Luke 1:17} he was sent ‘in the spirit and power of Elias,’ that is, with the same object and the same qualifications. Similarly, it is true what, in His mournful retrospect of the result of John’s mission, and in the prospect of His own end, the Savior said of him, ‘Elias is indeed come,’ but ‘they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed.’ {St. ^{<0093>}Mark 9:13; St. ^{<0172>}Matthew 17:12} But on this very recognition and reception of him by the Jews depended his being to them Elijah — who should ‘turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just,’ and so ‘restore all things.’ Between the Elijah of Ahab’s reign, and him of Messianic times, lay the wide cleft of quite another dispensation. The ‘spirit and power of Elijah’ could ‘restore all things,’ because it was the dispensation of the Old Testament, in which the result was outward, and by outward means. But ‘the spirit and power’ of the Elijah of the New Testament, which was to accomplish the inward restoration through penitent reception of the Kingdom of God in its reality, could only accomplish that object if ‘they received it’ — if ‘they knew him.’ And as in his own view, and looking around and forward, so also in very fact the Baptist, though Divinely such, was *not* really Elijah *to Israel* — and this is the meaning of the words of Jesus: ‘And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come.’ {St. ^{<0114>}Matthew 11:14.}

More natural still — indeed, almost quite truthful, seems the third question of the Pharisees, whether the Baptist was ‘that prophet.’ The reference here is undoubtedly to ^{<0185>}Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. Not that the reappearance of Moses as lawgiver was expected. But as the prediction of the eighteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, especially when taken in connection with the promise {^{<0181>}Jeremiah 31:31 etc.} of a ‘new covenant’ with a ‘new law’ written in the hearts of the people, implied a change in this respect, it was but natural that it should have been expected in Messianic days by the instrumentality of ‘that prophet.’ ^{f824} Even the various opinions broached in the Mishnah, {Eduy. 8:7.} as to what were to be the reformatory and legislative functions of Elijah, prove that such expectations were connected with the Forerunner of the Messiah.

But whatever views the Jewish embassy might have entertained concerning the abrogation, renewal, or renovation of the Law ^{f825} in Messianic times, the Baptist repelled the suggestion of his being ‘that prophet’ with the same energy as those of his being either the Christ or Elijah. And just as we

notice, as the result of those forty days' communing, yet deeper humility and self-abnegation on the part of the Baptist, so we also mark increased intensity and directness in the testimony which he now bears to the Christ before the Jerusalem deputies. {St. ^{<602>}John 1:22-28.} 'His eye is fixed on the Coming One.' He is as a voice not to be inquired about, but heard; and its clear and unmistakable, but deeply reverent utterance is: 'The Coming One has come.' ^{f826}

The reward of his overcoming temptation — yet with it also the fitting for still fiercer conflict (which two, indeed, are always conjoined), was at hand. After His victorious contest with the Devil, Angels had come to minister to Jesus in body and soul. But better than Angels' vision came to refresh and strengthen His faithful witness John. On the very day of the Baptist's temptation Jesus had left the wilderness. On the morrow after it, 'John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold, the Lamb of God, Which taketh away the sin of the world!' We cannot doubt, that the thought here present to the mind of John was the description of 'The Servant of Jehovah,' {^{<2573>}Isaiah 52:13.} as set forth in Isaiah 53. If all along the Baptist had been filled with Isaiah-thoughts of the Kingdom, surely in the forty days after he had seen the King, a new 'morning' must have risen upon them, {^{<2380>}Isaiah 8:20.} and the halo of His glory shone around the well-remembered prophecy. It must always have been Messianically understood; {^{<2573>}Isaiah 52:13:53.} it formed the groundwork of Messianic thought to the New Testament writers {Comp. St. ^{<4187>}Matthew 8:17; St. ^{<6227>}Luke 22:37; ^{<4182>}Acts 8:32; ^{<4122>}1 Peter 2:22.} — nor did the Synagogue read it otherwise, till the necessities of controversy diverted its application, not indeed from the times, but from the *Person* of the Messiah. ^{f827} But we can understand how, during those forty days, this greatest height of Isaiah's conception of the Messiah was the one outstanding fact before his view. And what he believed, that he spake, when again, and unexpectedly, he saw Jesus.

Yet, while regarding his words as an appeal to the prophecy of Isaiah, two other references must not be excluded from them: those to the Paschal Lamb, and to the Daily Sacrifice. These are, if not directly pointed to, yet implied. For the Paschal Lamb was, in a sense, the basis of all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, not only from its saving import to Israel, but as that which really made them 'the Church,' ^{f828} and people of God. Hence the institution of the Paschal Lamb was, so to speak, only enlarged and applied in the daily sacrifice of a Lamb, in which this twofold idea of redemption

and fellowship was exhibited. Lastly, the prophecy of Isaiah 53 was but the complete realization of these two ideas in the Messiah. Neither could the Paschal Lamb, with its completion in the Daily Sacrifice, be properly viewed without this prophecy of Isaiah, nor yet that prophecy properly understood without its reference to its two great types. And here one Jewish comment in regard to the Daily Sacrifice (not previously pointed out) is the more significant, that it dates from the very time of Jesus. The passage reads almost like a Christian interpretation of sacrifice. It explains how the morning and evening sacrifices were intended to atone, the one for the sins of the night, the other for those of the day, so as ever to leave Israel guiltless before God; and it expressly ascribes to them the efficacy of a *Paraclete* — that being the word used. {Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 61 *b*; comp. more fully in Yalkut p. 248 *d*.} Without further following this remarkable Rabbinic commentation, {In 1 p. 249 *a*.} which stretches back its view of sacrifices to the Paschal Lamb, and, beyond it, to that offering of Isaac by Abraham which, in the Rabbinic view, was the *substratum* of all sacrifices, we turn again to its teaching about the Lamb of the Daily Sacrifice. Here we have the express statement, that both the school of Shammai and that of Hillel — the latter more fully — insisted on the symbolic import of this sacrifice in regard to the forgiveness of sin. ‘Kebhasim’ (the Hebrew word for ‘lambs’), explained the school of Shammai, ‘because, according to ³³⁷¹⁹Micah 7:19, they suppress our iniquities (the Hebrew word *Kabhash* meaning he who suppresseth).’ ^{f829} Still more strong is the statement of the school of Hillel, to the effect that the sacrificial lambs were termed *Kebhasim* (from *kabhas*, ‘to wash’), ‘because they wash away the sins of Israel.’ {And this with special reference to ²⁰¹⁸Isaiah 1:18.} The quotation just made gains additional interest from the circumstance, that it occurs in a ‘meditation’ (if such it may be called) for the new moon of the Passover-month (Nisan). In view of such clear testimony from the time of Christ, less positiveness of assertion might, not unreasonably, be expected from those who declare that the sacrifices bore no reference to the forgiveness of sins, just as, in the face of the application made by the Baptist and other New Testament writers, more exegetical modesty seems called for on the part of those who deny the Messianic references in Isaiah.

If further proof were required that, when John pointed the bystanders to the Figure of Jesus walking towards them, with these words: ‘Behold, the Lamb of God,’ he meant more than His gentleness, meekness, and humility,

it would be supplied by the qualifying explanation, 'Which taketh away the sin of the world.' We prefer rendering the expression 'taketh away' instead of 'beareth,' because it is in that sense that the LXX. uniformly use the Greek term. Of course, as *we* view it, the taking away presupposes the taking upon Himself of the sin of the world. But it is not necessary to suppose that the Baptist clearly understood that manner of His Saviorship, which only long afterwards, and reluctantly, came to the followers of the Lamb. ^{f830} That he understood the application of His ministry to the whole world, is only what might have been expected of one taught by Isaiah; and what, indeed, in one or another form, the Synagogue has always believed of the Messiah. What was distinctive in the words of the Baptist, seems his view of *sin* as a totality, rather than sins: implying the removal of that great barrier between God and man, and the triumph in that great contest indicated in ^{<OUBIS} Genesis 3:15, which Israel after the flesh failed to perceive. Nor should we omit here to notice an undesigned evidence of the Hebraic origin of the fourth Gospel; for an Ephesian Gospel, dating from the close of the second century, would not have placed in its forefront, as the first public testimony of the Baptist (if, indeed, it would have introduced him at all), a quotation from Isaiah — still less a sacrificial reference.

The motives which brought Jesus back to Bethabara must remain in the indefiniteness in which Scripture has left them. So far as we know, there was no personal interview between Jesus and the Baptist. Jesus had then and there nothing further to say to the Baptist; and yet on the day following that on which John had, in such manner, pointed Him out to the bystanders, He was still there, only returning to Galilee the next day. Here, at least, a definite object becomes apparent. This was not merely the calling of His first disciples, but the necessary Sabbath rest; for, in this instance, the narrative supplies the means of ascertaining the days of the week on which each event took place. We have only to assume, that the marriage in Cana of Galilee was that of a maiden, not a widow. The great festivities which accompanied it were unlikely, according to Jewish ideas, in the case of a widow; in fact, the whole *mise en scene* of the marriage renders this most improbable. Besides, if it had been the marriage of a widow, this (as will immediately appear) would imply that Jesus had returned from the wilderness on a Saturday, which, as being the Jewish Sabbath, could not have been the case. For uniform custom fixed the marriage of a maiden on Wednesdays, that of a widow on Thursday. ^{f831} Counting backwards from the day of the marriage in Cana, we arrive at the following results. The

interview between John and the Sanhedrin-deputation took place on a *Thursday*. ‘The next day,’ *Friday*, Jesus returned from the wilderness of the Temptation, and John bore his first testimony to ‘the Lamb of God.’ The following day, when Jesus appeared a second time in view, and when the first two disciples joined Him, was the *Saturday*, or Jewish Sabbath. It was, therefore, only the following day, or *Sunday*, {St. ~~John~~^{f832} John 1:43.} that Jesus returned to Galilee, calling others by the way. ‘And the third day’ after it {St. ~~John~~^{f833} John 2:1.} — that is, on the *Wednesday* — was the marriage in Cana.

If we group around these days the recorded events of each, they almost seem to intensify in significance. The *Friday* of John’s first pointing to Jesus as the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world, recalls that other Friday, when the full import of that testimony appeared. The *Sabbath* of John’s last personal view and testimony to Christ is symbolic in its retrospect upon the old economy. It seems to close the ministry of John, and to open that of Jesus; it is the leave-taking of the nearest disciples of John from the old, their search after the new. And then on the first *Sunday* — the beginning of Christ’s active ministry, the call of the first disciples, the first preaching of Jesus.

As we picture it to ourselves: in the early morning of that *Sabbath* John stood, with the two of his disciples who most shared his thoughts and feelings. One of them we know to have been *Andrew* (verse 40); the other, unnamed one, could have been no other than John himself, the beloved disciple.^{f834} They had heard what their teacher had, on the previous day, said of Jesus. But then He seemed to them but as a passing Figure. To hear more of Him, as well as in deepest sympathy, these two had gathered to their Teacher on that Sabbath morning, while the other disciples of John were probably engaged with that, and with those, which formed the surroundings of an ordinary Jewish Sabbath.^{f835} And now that Figure once more appeared in view. None with the Baptist but these two. He is not teaching now, but learning, as the intensity and penetration of his gaze^{f836} calls from him the now worshipful repetition of what, on the previous day, he had explained and enforced. There was no leave-taking on the part of these two — perhaps they meant not to leave John. Only an irresistible impulse, a heavenly instinct, bade them follow His steps. It needed no direction of John, no call from Jesus. But as they went in modest silence, in the dawn of their rising faith, scarce conscious of the *what* and the *why*, He turned Him. It was not because He discerned it not, but just because He

knew the real goal of their yet unconscious search, and would bring them to know *what* they sought, that He put to them the question, ‘What seek ye?’ which elicited a reply so simple, so real, as to carry its own evidence. He is still to them the Rabbi — the most honored title they can find — yet marking still the strictly Jewish view, as well as their own standpoint of ‘*What* seek ye?’ They wish, yet scarcely dare, to say what was their object, and only put it in a form most modest, suggestive rather than expressive. There is strict correspondence to their view in the words of Jesus. Their very Hebraism of ‘Rabbi’ is met by the equally Hebraic ‘Come and see;’ ^{f837} their unspoken, but half-conscious longing by what the invitation implied (according to the most probable reading, ‘Come and ye shall see’ ^{f838}).

It was but early morning — ten o’clock. ^{f839} What passed on that long Sabbath-day we know not save from what happened in its course. From it issued the two, not learners now but teachers, bearing what they had found to those nearest and dearest. The form of the narrative and its very words convey, that the two had gone, each to search for his brother — Andrew for Simon Peter, and John for James, though here already, at the outset of this history, the haste of energy characteristic of the sons of Jona outdistanced the more quiet intenseness of John: {v. 41.} ‘He (Andrew) first findeth his own brother.’ ^{f840} But Andrew and John equally brought the same announcement, still markedly Hebraic in its form, yet filled with the new wine, not only of conviction, but of joyous apprehension: ‘We have found the Messias.’ ^{f841} This, then, was the outcome of them of that day — He was the Messiah; and this the goal which their longing had reached, ‘We have found Him.’ Quite beyond what they had heard from the Baptist; nay, what only personal contact with Jesus can carry to any heart.

And still this day of first marvellous discovery had not closed. It almost seems, as if this ‘Come and see’ call of Jesus were emblematic, not merely of all that followed in His own ministry, but of the manner in which to all time the ‘What seek ye?’ of the soul is answered. It could scarcely have been but that Andrew had told Jesus of his brother, and even asked leave to bring him. The searching, penetrating glance ^{f842} of the Savior now read in Peter’s inmost character his future call and work: ‘Thou art Simon, the son of John’ ^{f843} — thou shalt be called ^{f844} Cephas, which is interpreted (Grecianized) Peter.’ ^{f845}

It must not, of course, be supposed that this represents all that had passed between Jesus and Peter, any more than that the recorded expression was all that Andrew and John had said of Jesus to their brothers. Of the interview between John and James his brother, the writer, with his usual self-reticence, forbears to speak. But we know its result; and, knowing it, can form some conception of what passed on that holy evening between the new-found Messiah and His first four disciples: of teaching manifestation on His part, and of satisfied heart-peace on theirs. As yet they were only followers, learners, not yet called to be Apostles, with all of entire renunciation of home, family, and other calling which this implied. This, in the course of proper development, remained for quite another period. Alike their knowledge and their faith for the present needed, and could only bear, the call to personal attachment. ^{f846}

It was Sunday morning, the first of Christ's Mission-work, the first of His Preaching. He was purposing to return to Galilee. It was fitting He should do so: for the sake of His new disciples; for what He was to do in Galilee; for His own sake. The first Jerusalem-visit must be prepared for by them all; and He would not go there till the right time — for the Paschal Feast. It was probably a distance of about twenty miles from Bethabara to Cana. By the way, two other disciples were to be gained — this time not brought, but called, where, and in what precise circumstances, we know not. But the notice that Philip was a fellow-townsmen of Andrew and Peter, seems to imply some instrumentality on their part. Similarly, we gather that, afterwards, Philip was somewhat in advance of the rest, when he found his acquaintance Nathanael, and engaged in conversation with him just as Jesus and the others came up. But here also we mark, as another characteristic trait of John, that he, and his brother with him, seem to have clung close to the Person of Christ, just as did Mary afterwards in the house of her brother. It was this intense exclusiveness of fellowship with Jesus which traced on his mind that fullest picture of the God-Man, which his narrative reflects.

The call to Philip from the lips of the Savior met, we know not under what circumstances, immediate responsive obedience. Yet, though no special obstacles had to be overcome, and hence no special narrative was called for, it must have implied much of learning, to judge from what he did, and from what he said to Nathanael. There is something special about Nathanael's conquest by Christ — rather implied, perhaps, than expressed — and of which the Lord's words gives significant hints. They seem to

point to what had passed in his mind just before Philip found him. Alike the expression ‘an Israelite in truth, in whom is no guile’ {v. 47.} — looking back on what changed the name of Jacob into Israel — and the evident reference to the full realization of Jacob’s vision in Bethel, {v. 51.} may be an indication that this very vision had engaged his thoughts. As the Synagogue understood the narrative, its application to the then state of Israel and the Messianic hope would most readily suggest itself. Putting aside all extravagances, the Synagogue thought, in connection with it, of the rising power of the Gentiles, but concluded with the precious comfort of the assurance, in ^{2811b}Jeremiah 30:11, of Israel’s final restoration. {Tanchuma on the passage, ed. Warsh. p. 38 *a, b.*} *Nathanael* (Theodore, ‘the gift of God,’) had, as we often read of Rabbis, ^{f847}rested for prayer, meditation, or study, in the shadow of that wide-spreading tree so common in Palestine, the fig-tree. ^{f848}The approaching Passover-season, perhaps mingling with thoughts of John’s announcement by the banks of Jordan, would naturally suggest the great deliverance of Israel in ‘the age to come;’ {So in Tan chuma.} all the more, perhaps, from the painful contrast in the present. Such a verse as that with which, in a well-known Rabbinic work, {Pesiqta.} the meditation for the New Moon of Nisan, the Passover month, closes: ‘Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help,’ {^{2815b}Psalm 146:5; Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 62 *a.*} would recur, and so lead back the mind to the suggestive symbol of Jacob’s vision, and its realization in ‘the age to come.’ {Tanchuma, u. s.}

There are, of course, only suppositions; but it might well be that Philip had found him while still busy with such thoughts. Possibly their outcome, and that quite in accordance with Jewish belief at the time, may have been, that all that was needed to bring that happy ‘age to come’ was, that Jacob should become Israel in truth. In such case he would himself have been ripening for ‘the Kingdom’ that was at hand. It must have seemed a startling answer to his thoughts, this announcement, made with the freshness of new and joyous conviction: ‘We have found Him of Whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, did write.’ But this addition about the Man of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph, ^{f849}would appear a terrible anti-climax. It was so different from anything that he had associated either with the great hope of Israel, or with the Nazareth of his own neighborhood, that his exclamation, without implying any special imputation on the little town which he knew so well, seems not only natural, but, psychologically, deeply true. There was but one answer to this — that which Philip made,

which Jesus had made to Andrew and John, and which has ever since been the best answer to all Christian inquiry: ‘Come and see.’ And, despite the disappointment, there must have been such moving power in the answer which Philip’s sudden announcement had given to his unspoken thoughts, that he went with him. And now, as ever, when in such spirit we come, evidences irrefragable multiplied at every step. As he neared Jesus, he heard Him speak to the disciples words concerning him, which recalled, truly and actually, what had passed in his soul. But could it really be so, that Jesus knew it all? The question, intended to elicit it, brought such proof that he could not but burst into the immediate and full acknowledgment: ‘Thou art the Son of God,’ ‘Who hast read my inmost being; ‘Thou art the King of Israel,’ ‘Who dost meet its longing and hope. And is it not ever so, that the faith of the heart springs to the lips, as did the water from the riven rock at the touch of the God-gifted rod? It needs not long course of argumentation, nor intricate chain of evidences, welded link to link, when the secret thoughts of the heart are laid bare, and its inmost longings met. Then, as in a moment, it is day, and joyous voice of song greets its birth.

And yet that painful path of slower learning to enduring conviction must still be trodden, whether in the sufferings of the heart, or the struggle of the mind. This it is which seems implied in the half-sad question of the Master, {v. 50 comp. the words to Peter in St. ~~John~~ John 13:36-38; and to the disciples, St. ~~John~~ John 16:31, 32.} yet with full view of the final triumph (‘thou shalt see greater things than these’), and of the true realization in it of that glorious symbol of Jacob’s vision. {v. 51.}

And so Nathanael, ‘the God-given’ — or, as we know him in after-history, Bartholomew, ‘the son of Telamyon’ ^{f850} — was added to the disciples. Such was on that first Sunday the small beginning of the great Church Catholic; these the tiny springs that swelled into the mighty river which, in its course, has enriched and fertilized the barrenness of the far-off lands of the Gentiles.

CHAPTER 4

THE MARRIAGE FEAST IN CANA OF GALILEE — THE MIRACLE THAT IS ‘A SIGN.’

(St. ~~ROM~~ John 2:1-12.)

AT the close of His Discourse to Nathanael, His first sermon, Jesus had made use of an expression which received its symbolic fulfilment in His first deed. His first testimony about Himself had been to call Himself the ‘Son of Man.’ {St. ~~ROM~~ John 1:51.} ^{f851} We cannot but feel that this bore reference to the confession of Nathanael: ‘Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel.’ It is, as if He would have turned the disciples from thoughts of His being the Son of God and King of Israel to the voluntary humiliation of His Humanity, as being the necessary basis of His work, without knowledge of which that of His Divinity would have been a barren, speculative abstraction, and that of His Kingship a Jewish fleshly dream. But it was not only knowledge of His humiliation in His Humanity. For, as in the history of the Christ humiliation and glory are always connected, the one enwrapped in the other as the flower in the bud, so here also His humiliation as the Son of Man is the exaltation of humanity, the realization of its ideal destiny as created in the likeness of God. It should never be forgotten, that such teaching of His exaltation and Kingship through humiliation and representation of humanity was needful. It was the teaching which was the outcome of the Temptation and of its victory, the very teaching of the whole Evangelic history. Any other real learning of Christ would, as we see it, have been impossible to the disciples — alike mentally, as regards foundation and progression, and spiritually. A Christ: God, King, and not primarily ‘the Son of Man,’ would not have been the Christ of Prophecy, nor the Christ of Humanity, nor the Christ of salvation, nor yet the Christ of sympathy, help, and example. A Christ, God and King, Who had suddenly risen like the fierce Eastern sun in midday brightness, would have blinded by his dazzling rays (as it did Saul on the way to Damascus), not risen ‘with kindly light’ to chase away darkness and mists, and with genial growing warmth to woo life and beauty into our barren world. And so, as ‘it became Him,’ for the carrying out of the work, ‘to make the Captain of Salvation perfect through sufferings,’ {~~ROM~~ Hebrews 2:10.} so it was needful for them that He should veil, even

from their view who followed Him, the glory of His Divinity and the power of His Kingship, till they had learned all that the designation 'Son of Man' implied, as placed below 'Son of God' and 'King of Israel.

This idea of the 'Son of Man,' although in its full and prophetic meaning, seems to furnish the explanation of the miracle at the marriage of Cana. We are now entering on the Ministry of 'The Son of Man,' first and chiefly in its contrast to the preparatory call of the Baptist, with the asceticism symbolic of it. We behold Him now as freely mingling with humanity, sharing its joys and engagements, entering into its family life, sanctioning and hallowing all by His Presents and blessing; then as transforming the 'water of legal purification' into the wine of the new dispensation, and, more than this, the water of our felt want into the wine of His giving; and, lastly, as having absolute power as the 'Son of Man,' being also 'the Son of God' and 'the King of Israel.' Not that it is intended to convey, that it was the primary purpose of the miracle of Cana to exhibit the contrast between His own Ministry and the asceticism of the Baptist, although greater could scarcely be imagined than between the wilderness and the supply of wine at the marriage-feast. Rather, since this essential difference really existed, it naturally appeared at the very commencement of Christ's Ministry.^{f852} And so in regard to the other meaning, also, which this history carries to our minds.

At the same time it must be borne in mind, that marriage conveyed to the Jews much higher thoughts than merely those of festivity and merriment. The pious fasted before it, confessing their sins. It was regarded almost as a Sacrament. Entrance into the married state was thought to carry the forgiveness of sins. {Yalkut on ~~<BIBLE>~~ 1 Samuel 13:1 vol. 2 p. 16 d.}^{f853} It almost seems as if the relationship of Husband and Bride between Jehovah and His people, so frequently insisted upon, not only in the Bible, but in Rabbinic writings, had always been standing out in the background. Thus the bridal pair on the marriage-day symbolized the union of God with Israel.^{f854} Hence, though it may in part have been national pride, which considered the birth of every Israelite as almost outweighing the rest of the world, it scarcely wholly accounts for the ardent insistence on marriage, from the first prayer at the circumcision of a child, onwards through the many and varied admonitions to the same effect. Similarly, it may have been the deep feeling of brotherhood in Israel, leading to sympathy with all that most touched the heart, which invested with such sacredness participation in the gladness of marriage,^{f855} and the Angelic choir sang the

wedding hymn. {Ab. deR. Nath. 4.} So also He had shown the example of visiting the sick (in the case of Abraham), comforting the mourners (in that of Isaac), and burying the dead (in that of Moses). {Sot. 14 a.} Every man who met it, was bound to rise and join the marriage procession, or the funeral march. It was specially related of King Agrippa that he had done this, and a curious Haggadah sets forth that, when Jezebel was eaten of dogs, her hands and feet were spared, {~~1198~~ 2 Kings 9:35.} because, amidst all her wickedness, she had been wont to greet every marriage-procession by clapping of hands, and to accompany the mourners a certain distance on their way to the burying. {Yalkut on ~~1198~~ 2 Kings 9:35, vol. 2 p. 36 a and b.} And so we also read it, that, in the burying of the widow's son of Nain, 'much people of the city was with her.' {St. ~~1172~~ Luke 7:12.}

In such circumstances, we would naturally expect that all connected with marriage was planned with care, so as to bear the impress of sanctity, and also to wear the aspect of gladness. ^{f856} A special formality, that of 'betrothal' (*Erusin Qiddushin*), preceded the actual marriage by a period varying in length, but not exceeding a twelvemonth in the case of a maiden. ^{f857} At the betrothal, the bridegroom, personally or by deputy, handed to the bride a piece of money or a letter, it being expressly stated in each case that the man thereby espoused the woman. From the moment of betrothal both parties were regarded, and treated in law (as to inheritance, adultery, need of formal divorce), as if they had been actually married, except as regarded their living together. A legal document (the *Shitre Erusin*) fixed the dowry which each brought, the mutual obligations, and all other legal points. ^{f858} Generally a festive meal closed the ceremony of betrothal — *but not in Galilee*, where, habits being more simple and pure, that which sometimes ended in sin was avoided.

On the evening of the actual marriage (*Nissuin, Chathnuth*), the bride was led from her paternal home to that of her husband. First came the merry sounds of music; then they who distributed among the people wine and oil, and nuts among the children; next the bride, covered with the bridal veil, her long hair flowing, surrounded by her companions, and led by 'the friends of the bridegroom,' and 'the children of the bride-chamber.' All around were in festive array; some carried torches, or lamps on poles; those nearest had myrtle-branches and chaplets of flowers. Every one rose to salute the procession, or join it; and it was deemed almost a religious duty to break into praise of the beauty, the modesty, or the virtues of the bride. Arrived at her new home, she was led to her husband. Some such

formula as ‘Take her according to the Law of Moses and of Israel,’ {Jer. Yeb. Md.} would be spoken, and the bride and bridegroom crowned with garlands. ^{f859} Then a formal legal instrument, called the *Kethubah*, was signed, {Comp. Tob. 7:14.} which set forth that the bridegroom undertook to work for her, to honor, keep, and care for her, ^{f860} as is the manner of the men of Israel; that he promised to give his maiden-wife at least two hundred *Zuz* ^{f861} (or more it might be), ^{f862} and to increase her own dowry (which, in the case of a poor orphan, the authorities supplied) by at least one half, and that he also undertook to lay it out for her to the best advantage, all his own possessions being guarantee for it. ^{f863} Then, after the prescribed washing of hands and benediction, the marriage-supper began — the cup being filled, and the solemn prayer of bridal benediction spoken over it. And so the feast lasted, it might be more than one day — while each sought to contribute, sometimes coarsely, ^{f864} sometimes wisely, to the general enjoyment, {Comp. Ber. 6 *b*.} till at last ‘the friends of the bridegroom’ led the bridal pair to the *Cheder* and the *Chuppah*, or the bridal chamber and bed. Here it ought to be specially noticed, as a striking evidence that the writer of the fourth Gospel was not only a Hebrew, but intimately acquainted with the varying customs prevailing in Galilee and in Judaea, that at the marriage of Cana no ‘friend of the bridegroom,’ or ‘groomsman’ (*Shoshebhayna*), is mentioned, while he *is* referred to in St. ~~400~~ John 3:29, where the words are spoken outside the boundaries of Galilee. For among the simpler and purer Galileans the practice of having ‘friends of the bridegroom,’ which must so often have led to gross impropriety, {Comp. Kethub. 12 *a*; Jer. Kethub, 1 p. 25 *a*.} did not obtain, ^{f865} though all the invited guests bore the general name of ‘children of the bridechamber’ (*bene Chuppah*). {Comp. St. ~~400~~ Matthew 9:15.}

It was the marriage in Cana of Galilee. All connected with the account of it is strictly Jewish — the feast, the guests, the invitation of the stranger Rabbi, and its acceptance by Jesus. Any Jewish Rabbi would have gone, but how differently from Him would he have spoken and acted! Let us first think of the scenic details of the narrative. Strangely, we are not able to fix with certainty the site of the little town of Cana. ^{f866} But if we adopt the most probable identification of it with the modern pleasant village of *Kefr Kenna*, ^{f867} a few miles north-east of Nazareth, on the road to the Lake of Galilee, we picture it to ourselves as on the slope of a hill, its houses rising terrace upon terrace, looking north and west over a large plain (that of Battauf), and south upon a valley, beyond which the hills rise that separate

it from Mount Tabor and the plain of Jezreel. As we approach the little town through that smiling valley, we come upon a fountain of excellent water, around which the village gardens and orchards clustered, that produced in great abundance the best pomegranates in Palestine. Here was the home of Nathanael-Bartholomew, and it seems not unlikely, that with him Jesus had passed the time intervening between His arrival and 'the marriage,' to which His Mother had come — the omission of all mention of Joseph leading to the supposition, that he had died before that time. The inquiry, what had brought Jesus to Cana, seems almost worse than idle, remembering what had passed between Him and Nathanael, and what was to happen in the first 'sign,' which was to manifest His glory. It is needless to speculate, whether He had known beforehand of 'the marriage.' But we can understand the longing of the 'Israelite indeed' to have Him under his roof, though we can only imagine what the Heavenly Guest, would now teach him, and those others who accompanied Him. Nor is there any difficulty in understanding, that on His arrival He would hear of this 'marriage,' of the presence of His Mother in what seems to have been the house of a friend if not a relative; that Jesus and His disciples would be bidden to the feast; and that He resolved not only to comply with the request) but to use it as a leave-taking from home and friends — similar, though also far other, than that of Elisha, when he entered on his mission. Yet it seems deeply significant, that the 'true Israelite' should have been honored to be the first host of 'Israel's King.'

And truly a leave-taking it was for Christ from former friends and home — a leave-taking also from His past life. If one part of the narrative — that of His dealing with His Mother — has any special meaning, it is that of leave-taking, or rather of leaving home and family, just as with this first 'sign' He took leave of all the past. When he had returned from His first Temple-visit, it had been in the self-exinanition of voluntary humility: to 'be subject to His Parents' That period was now ended, and a new one had begun — that of active consecration of the whole life to His 'Father's business.' And what passed at the marriage-feast marks the beginning of this period. We stand on the threshold, over which we pass from the old to the new — to use a New Testament figure: to the marriage-supper of the Lamb.

Viewed in this light, what passed at the marriage in Cana seems like taking up the thread, where it had been dropped at the first manifestation of His Messianic consciousness. In the Temple at Jerusalem He had said in answer to the misapprehensive *question* of His Mother: 'Wist ye not that I must be

about My Father's business?' and now when about to take in hand that 'business,' He tells her so again, and decisively, in reply to her misapprehensive *suggestion*. It is a truth which we must ever learn, and yet are ever slow to learn in our questionings and suggestings, alike as concerns His dealings with ourselves and His rule of His Church, that the highest and only true point of view is 'the Father's business,' not our personal relationship to Christ. This thread, then, is taken up again at Cana in the circle of friends, as immediately afterwards in His public manifestation, in the purifying of the Temple. What He had first uttered as a Child, on His first visit to the Temple, that He manifested forth when a Man, entering on His active work, negatively, in His reply to His Mother; positively, in the 'sign' He wrought. It all meant: 'Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?' And, positively and negatively, His first appearance in Jerusalem {St. ^{¶123} John 2:13-17, and vv. 18-23.} meant just the same. For, there is ever deepest unity and harmony in that truest Life, the Life of Life.

As we pass through the court of that house in Cana, and reach the covered gallery which opens on the various rooms, in this instance, particularly, on the great reception room, all is festively adorned. In the gallery the servants move about, and there the 'water-pots' are ranged, 'after the manner of the Jews,' for purification, for the washing not only of hands before and after eating, but also of the vessels used. {Comp. St. ^{¶100} Mark 7:1-4.} How detailed Rabbinic ordinances were in these respects, will be shown in another connection. 'Purification' was one of the main points in Rabbinic sanctity. By far the largest and most elaborate ^{¶868} of the six books into which the Mishnah is divided, is exclusively devoted to this subject (the '*Seder Tohoroth*,' purifications). Not to speak of references in other parts of the Talmud, we have two special tractates to instruct us about the purification of 'Hands' (*Yadayim*) and of 'Vessels' (*Kelim*). The latter is the most elaborate in all the Mishnah, and consists of not less than thirty chapters. Their perusal proves, alike the strict accuracy of the Evangelic narratives, and the justice of Christ's denunciations of the unreality and gross hypocrisy of this elaborateness of ordinances. ^{¶869} This the more so, when we recall that it was actually vaunted as a special qualification for a seat in the Sanhedrin, to be so acute and learned as to know how to prove clean creeping things (which were declared unclean by the Law). {Sanh. 17 a.} And the mass of the people would have regarded neglect of the

ordinances of purification as betokening either gross ignorance, or daring impiety.

At any rate, such would not be exhibited on an occasion like the present; and outside the reception-room, as St. John with graphic minuteness of details relates, six of those stone pots, which we know from Rabbinic writings, ^{f870} were ranged. Here it may be well to add, as against objectors, that it is impossible to state with certainty the exact measure represented by the 'two or three firkins apiece.' For, although we know that the term *metretes* (A.V. 'firkin') was intended as an equivalent for the Hebrew 'bath,' {*Jos. Ant.* 8:2. 9.} yet three different kinds of 'bath' were at the time used in Palestine: the common Palestinian or 'wilderness' bath, that of Jerusalem, and that of Sepphoris. ^{f871} The common Palestinian 'bath' was equal to the Roman *amphora*, containing about 5 1/4 gallons, while the Sepphoris 'bath' corresponded to the Attic *metretes*, and would contain about 8 1/2 gallons. In the former case, therefore, each of these pots might have held from 10 1/2 to 15 3/4 gallons; in the latter, from 17 to 25 1/2. Reasoning on the general ground that the so-called Sepphoris measurement was common in Galilee, the larger quantity seems the more likely, though by no means certain. It is almost like trifling on the threshold of such a history, and yet so many cavils have been raised, that we must here remind ourselves, that neither the size, nor the number of these vessels has anything extraordinary about it. For such an occasion the family would produce or borrow the largest and handsomest stone-vessels that could be procured; nor is it necessary to suppose that they were filled to the brim; nor should we forget that, from a Talmudic notice, {*Shabb.* 77 *b.* So Lightfoot in *loc.*} it seems to have been the practice to set apart some of these vessels exclusively for the use of the bride and of the more distinguished guests, while the rest were used by the general company.

Entering the spacious, lofty dining-room, ^{f872} which would be brilliantly lighted with lamps and candlesticks, the guests are disposed round tables on couches, soft with cushions or covered with tapestry, or seated on chairs. The bridal blessing has been spoken, and the bridal cup emptied. The feast is proceeding — not the common meal, which was generally taken about even, according to the Rabbinic saying, {*Pas.* 18 *b.*} that he who postponed it beyond that hour was as if he swallowed a stone — but a festive evening meal. If there had been disposition to those exhibitions of, or incitement to, indecorous and light merriment, ^{f873} such as even the more earnest Rabbis deprecated, surely the presence of Jesus would have

restrained it. And now there must have been a painful pause, or something like it, when the Mother of Jesus whispered to Him that ‘the wine failed.’ ^{f874} There could, perhaps, be the less cause for reticence on this point towards her Son, not merely because this failure may have arisen from the accession of guests in the persons of Jesus and his disciples, for whom no provision had been originally made, but because the gift of wine or oil on such occasions was regarded a meritorious work of charity. {Baba B 9.}

But all this still leaves the main incidents in the narrative untouched. How are we to understand the implied request of the Mother of Jesus? how His reply? and what was the meaning of the miracle? It seems scarcely possible to imagine that, remembering the miraculous circumstances connected with His Birth, and informed of what had passed at Jordan, she now anticipated, and by her suggestion wished to prompt, this as His Royal Messianic manifestation. ^{f875} With reverence be it said, such a beginning of Royalty and triumph would have been paltry: rather that of the Jewish miracle-monger than that of the Christ of the Gospels. Not so, if it was only ‘a sign,’ pointing to something beyond itself. Again, such anticipations on the part of Mary seem psychologically untrue — that is, untrue to her history. She could not, indeed, have ever forgotten the circumstances which had surrounded His Birth; but the deeper she ‘kept all these things in her heart,’ the more mysterious would they seem, as time passed in the dull round of the most simple and uneventful country-life, and in the discharge of everyday duties, without even the faintest appearance of anything beyond it. Only twelve years had passed since His Birth, and yet they had not understood His saying in the Temple! How much more difficult would it be after thirty years, when the Child had grown into Youth and Manhood, with still the same silence of Divine Voices around? It is difficult to believe in fierce sunshine on the afternoon of a long, grey day. Although we have no absolute certainty of it, we have the strongest internal reasons for believing, that Jesus had done no miracles these thirty years in the home at Nazareth, ^{f876} but lived the life of quiet submission and obedient waiting. That was the then part of His Work. It may, indeed, have been that Mary knew of what had passed at Jordan; and that, when she saw Him returning with His first disciples, who, assuredly, would make no secret of their convictions — whatever these may have conveyed to outsiders — she felt that a new period in His Life had opened. But what was there in all this to suggest such a miracle? and if it had been suggested, why not ask for it in

express terms, if it was to be the commencement, certainly in strangely incongruous circumstances, of a Royal manifestation?

On the other hand, there was one thing which she had learned, and one thing which she was to unlearn, after those thirty years of the Nazareth-Life. What she had learned — what she must have learned — was absolute confidence in Jesus. What she had to unlearn, was the natural, yet entirely mistaken, impression which His meekness, stillness, and long home-submission had wrought on her as to His relationship to the family. It was, as we find from her after-history, a very hard, very slow, and very painful thing to learn it; ^{f877} yet very needful, not only for her own sake, but because it was a lesson of absolute truth. And so when she told Him of the want that had arisen, it was simply in absolute confidence in her Son, probably without any conscious expectancy of a miracle on His part. ^{f878} Yet not without a touch of maternal self-consciousness, almost pride, that He, Whom she could trust to do anything that was needed, was her Son, Whom she could solicit in the friendly family whose guests they were — and if not for her sake, yet at her request. It was a true earth-view to take of their relationship; only, an earth-view which must now for ever cease: the outcome of His misunderstood meekness and weakness, and which yet, strangely enough, the Romish Church puts in the forefront as the most powerful plea for Jesus' acting. But the fundamental mistake in what she attempted is just this, that she spake as His Mother, and placed that maternal relationship in connection with His Work. And therefore it was that as, on the first misunderstanding in the Temple, He had said: 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' so now: 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' With that 'business' earthly relationship, however tender, had no connection. With everything else it had, down to the utter self-forgetfulness of that tenderest commendation of her to John, in the bitterest agonies of the Cross; but not with this. No, not now, nor ever henceforth, with this. As in His first manifestation in the Temple, so in this the first manifestation of His glory, the finger that pointed to 'His hour' was not, and could not be, that of an earthly parent, but of His Father in Heaven. ^{f879} There was, in truth, a twofold relationship in that Life, of which none other but the Christ could have preserved the harmony.

This is one main point — we had almost called it the negative one; the other, and positive one, was the miracle itself. All else is but accidental and circumstantial. No one who either knows the use of the language, ^{f880} or remembers that, when commending her to John on the Cross, He used the

same mode of expression, {St. ^{f895}John 19:26.} will imagine, that there was anything derogatory to her, or harsh on His part, in addressing her as ‘woman’ rather than ‘mother.’ But the language is to us significant of the teaching intended to be conveyed, and as the beginning of this further teaching: ‘Who is My mother? and My brethren? And He stretched forth His hand toward His disciples, and said, Behold My mother and My brethren!’ {St. ^{f826}Matthew 12:46-50.}

And Mary did not, and yet she did, understand Him, when she turned to the servants with the direction, implicitly to follow His behests. What happened is well known: how, in the excess of their zeal, they filled the water-pots to the brim — an accidental circumstance, yet useful, as much that seems accidental, to show that there could be neither delusion nor collusion; how, probably in the drawing of it, the water became best wine — ‘the conscious water saw its God, and blushed;’ then the coarse proverbial joke of what was probably the master of ceremonies and purveyor of the feast, {Ecclus. 32:1 2.} intended, of course, not literally to apply to the present company, and yet in its accidentalness an evidence of the reality of the miracle; after which the narrative abruptly closes with a retrospective remark on the part of him who relates it. What the bridegroom said; whether what had been done became known to the guests, and, if so, what impression it wrought; how long Jesus remained; what His Mother felt — of this and much more that might be asked, Scripture, with that reverent reticence which we so often mark, in contrast to our shallow talkativeness, takes no further notice. And best that it should be so. St. John meant to tell us, what the Synoptists, who begin their account with the later Galilean ministry, have not recorded, ^{f881} of the first of His miracles as a ‘sign,’ ^{f882} pointing to the deeper and higher that was to be revealed, and of the first forth-manifesting of ‘His glory.’ ^{f883} That is all; and that object was attained. Witness the calm, grateful retrospect upon that first day of miracles, summed up in these simple but intensely conscious words: ‘And His disciples believed on Him.’

A sign it was, from whatever point we view its meaning, as previously indicated. For, like the diamond that shines with many colors, it has many meanings; none of them designed, in the coarse sense of the term, but all real, because the outcome of a real Divine Life and history. And a real miracle also, not only historically, but as viewed in its many meanings; the beginning of all others, which in a sense are but the unfolding of this first. A miracle it is, which cannot be explained, but is only enhanced by the

almost incredible platitudes to which negative criticism has sunk in its commentation,^{f884} for which there assuredly exists no legendary basis, either in Old Testament history, or in contemporary Jewish expectation;^{f885} which cannot be sublimated into nineteenth-century idealism;^{f886} least of all can be conceived as an after-thought of His disciples, invented by an Ephesian writer of the second century.^{f887} But even the allegorical illustration of St. Augustine, who reminds us that in the grape the water of rain is ever changed into wine, is scarcely true, save as a bare illustration, and only lowers our view of the miracle. For *miracle* it is,^{f888} and will ever remain; not, indeed, magic,^{f889} nor arbitrary power, but power with a moral purpose, and that the highest.^{f890} And we believe it, because this ‘sign’ is the first of all those miracles in which the Miracle of Miracles gave ‘a sign,’ and manifested forth His glory — the glory of His Person, the glory of His Purpose, and the glory of His Work.

CHAPTER 5

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE, — 'THE SIGN,' WHICH IS NOT A SIGN.

(St. ~~<1013>~~ John 2:13-25.)

IT has been said that Mary understood, and yet did not understand Jesus. And of this there seems fresh evidence in the circumstance that, immediately after the marriage of Cana, she and the 'brethren of Jesus' went with Him, or followed Him, to Capernaum, which henceforth became 'His own city,' {St. ~~<1013>~~ Matthew 4:13; ~~<1001>~~ 9:1; St. ~~<1011>~~ Mark 2:1.} during His stay by the Lake of Galilee. The question, whether He had first returned to Nazareth, seems almost trifling. It may have been so, and it may be that His brothers had joined Him there, while His 'sisters,' being married, remained at Nazareth. {St. ~~<1003>~~ Mark 6:3.} For the departure of the family from Nazareth many reasons will, in the peculiar circumstances, suggest themselves. And yet one feels, that their following Jesus and His disciples to their new home had something to do with their understanding, and yet not understanding, of Him, which had been characteristic of Mary's silent withdrawal after the reply she had received at the feast of Cana, and her significant direction to the servants, implicitly to do what He bade them. Equally in character is the willingness of Jesus to allow His family to join Him — not ashamed of their humbleness, as a Jewish Messiah might have been, nor impatient of their ignorance: tenderly near to them, in all that concerned the humanness of His feelings; sublimely far from them, in all connected with His Work and Mission.

It is almost a relief to turn from the long discussion (to which reference has already been made): whether those who bore that designation were His 'brothers' and 'sisters' in the real sense, or the children of Joseph by an earlier marriage, or else His cousins, and to leave it in the indefiniteness which rests upon it. ^{f891} But the observant reader will probably mark, in connection with this controversy, that it is, to say the least, strange that 'brothers' of Jesus should, without further explanation, have been introduced in the fourth Gospel, if it was an Ephesian production, if not a fiction of spiritualistic tendency; strange also, that the fourth Gospel alone should have recorded the removal to Capernaum of the 'mother and

brothers' of Jesus, in company with Him. But this by the way, and in reference to recent controversies about the authorship of the fourth Gospel.

If we could only feel quite sure — and not merely deem it most probable — that the *Tell Hum* of modern exploration marks the site of the ancient *Capernaum*, *Kephar Nachum*, or *Tanchumin* (the latter, perhaps, 'village of consolation'), with what solemn interest would we wander over its ruins. ^{f892} We know it from New Testament history, and from the writings of *Josephus*. {*Jewish War* 3:10. 8; *Life* 72.} A rancorous notice and certain vile insinuations ^{f893} of the Rabbis, {*Midr. on* ²⁰⁰⁸ *Ecclesiastes* 1:8. and ²⁰⁷⁶ *7:26*. ed. Warsh. vol. 3 p. 80 *a* and 97 *a*.} connecting it with 'heresy,' presumably that of Christianity, seem also to point to *Kephar Nachum* as the home of Jesus, where so many of His miracles were done. At the time it could have been of only recent origin, since its Synagogue had but lately been reared, through the friendly liberality of that true and faithful Centurion. {*St.* ⁴¹⁸⁵ *Matthew* 8:5, etc.} But already its importance was such, that it had become the station of a garrison, and of one of the principal custom-houses. Its soft, sweet air, by the glorious Lake of Galilee, with snow-capped Hermon full in view in the North, from a distance, like Mount Blanc over the Lake of Geneva; ^{f894} the fertility of the country — notably of the plain of Gennesaret close by; and the merry babble, and fertilizing proximity of a spring which, from its teeming with fish like that of the Nile, was popularly regarded as springing from the river of Egypt — this and more must have made Capernaum one of the most delightful places in these 'Gardens of Princes,' as the Rabbis interpreted the word 'Gennesaret,' by the 'cither-shaped lake' of that name. ^{f895} The town lay quite up on its north-western shore, only two miles from where the Jordan falls into the lake. As we wander over that field of ruins, about half a mile in length by a quarter in breadth, which in all probability mark the site of ancient Capernaum, we can scarcely realize it, that the desolateness all around has taken the place of the life and beauty of eighteen centuries ago. Yet the scene is the same, though the breath of judgement has long swept the freshness from its face. Here lies in unruffled stillness, or wildly surges, lashed by sudden storms, the deep blue lake, 600 or 700 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. We can look up and down its extent, about twelve miles, or across it, about six miles. Right over on the other side from where we stand — somewhere there, is the place where Jesus miraculously fed the five thousand. Over here came the

little ship, its timbers still trembling, and its sides and deck wet with the spray of that awful night of storm, when He came to the weary rowers, and brought with Him calm. Up that beach they drew the boat. Here, close by the shore, stood the Synagogue, built of white limestone on dark basalt foundation. North of it, up the gentle slopes, stretched the town. East and south is the lake, in almost continuous succession of lovely small bays, of which more than seventeen may be counted within six miles, and in one of which nestled Capernaum. All its houses are gone, and in one of which nestled Capernaum. All its house, are gone, scarce one stone left on the other: the good Centurion's house, that of Matthew the publican, {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲉⲥ~~ Mark 2:15; comp. 3:20, 31.} that of Simon Peter, {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲧⲧⲏ~~ Matthew 8:14.} the temporary home which first sheltered the Master and His loved ones. All are unrecognizable — a confused mass of ruins — save only that white Synagogue in which He taught. From its ruins we can still measure its dimensions, and trace its fallen pillars; nay, we discover over the lintel of its entrance the device of a pot of manna, which may have lent its form to His teaching there {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲙⲁⲧⲧⲏ~~ John 6:49, 59.} — a device different from that of the seven-branched candlestick, or that other most significant one of the Paschal Lamb, which seem to have been so frequent over the Synagogues in Galilee. ^{f896}

And this then, is Capernaum — the first and the chief home of Jesus, when He had entered on His active work. But, on this occasion, He 'continued there not many days.' For, already, 'the Jews' Passover was at hand,' and He must needs keep that feast in Jerusalem. If our former computations are right, and, in the nature of things, it is impossible to be absolutely certain about exact dates — and John began his preaching in the autumn of the year 779 from the building of Rome, or in 26 of our present reckoning, while Jesus was baptized in the early winter following, {A.D. 27.} ^{f897} then this Passover must have taken place in the spring (about April) of the same year. {780 A.U.C. or 27 A.D.} The preparations for it had, indeed, commenced a month before. Not to speak of the needful domestic arrangements for the journey of pilgrims to Jerusalem, the whole land seemed in a state of preparation. A month before the feast (on the 15th Adar) bridges and roads were put in repair, and sepulchers whitened, to prevent accidental pollution to the pilgrims. Then, some would select this out of the three great annual feasts for the tithing of their flocks and herds, which, in such case, had to be done two weeks before the Passover; while others would fix on it as the time for going up to Jerusalem before the feast

‘to purify themselves’ {St. ^{<B15>}John 11:55.} — that is, to undergo the prescribed purification in any case of Levitical defilement. But what must have appealed to every one in the land was the appearance of the ‘money-changers’ (*Shulchanim*), who opened their stalls in every country-town on the 15th of Adar (just a month before the feast). They were, no doubt, regularly accredited and duly authorized. For, all Jews and proselytes — women, slaves, and minors excepted — had to pay the annual Temple-tribute of half a shekel, according to the ‘sacred’ standard, equal to a common Galilean shekel (two denars), or about 1s. 2 *d.* of our money. From this tax many of the priests — to the chagrin of the Rabbis — claimed exemption, on the ingenious plea that in ^{<B23>}Leviticus 6:23 (A.V.) every offering of a priest was ordered to be burnt, and not eaten; while from the Temple-tribute such offerings were paid for as the two wave loaves and the shewbread, which were afterwards eaten by priests. Hence, it was argued, their payment of Temple-tribute would have been incompatible with ^{<B23>}Leviticus 6:23!

But to return. This Temple-tribute had to be paid in exact half-shekels of the Sanctuary, or ordinary Galilean shekels. When it is remembered that, besides strictly Palestinian silver and especially copper coin, ^{f898} Persian, Tyrian, Syrian, Egyptian, Grecian, and Roman money circulated in the country, it will be understood what work these ‘money-changers’ must have had. From the 15th to the 25th Adar they had stalls in every country-town. On the latter date, which must therefore be considered as marking the first arrivals of festive pilgrims in the city, the stalls in the country were closed, and the money-changers henceforth sat within the precincts of the Temple. All who refused to pay the Temple-tribute (except priests) were liable to distraint of their goods. The ‘money-changers’ made a statutory fixed charge of a *Maah*, or from 1 1/2*d.* to 2*d.* ^{f899} (or, according to others, of half a *Maah*) on every half-shekel. This was called *qolbon*. But if a person tendered a *Sela* (a four-denar piece, in value two half-shekels of the Sanctuary, or two Galilean shekels), he had to pay double *qolbon*; one for his half-shekel of tribute-money, the other for his change. Although not only priests, but all other non-obligatory officers, and those who paid for their poorer brethren, were exempted from the charge of *qolbon*, it must have brought in an immense revenue, since not only many native Palestinians might come without the statutory coin, but a vast number of foreign Jews presented themselves on such occasions in the Temple. Indeed, if we compute the annual Temple-tribute at about 75,000*l.*, the

bankers' profits may have amounted to from 8,000*l.* to 9,000*l.*, an immense sum in the circumstances of the country.^{f900}

But even this does not represent all the facts of the case. We have already seen, that the 'money-changers' in the Temple gave change, when larger amounts than were equivalent to the Temple-tribute were proffered. It is a reasonable, nay — an almost necessary inference, that many of the foreign Jews arriving in Jerusalem would take the opportunity of changing at these tables their foreign money, and for this, of course, fresh charges would be made. For, there was a great deal to be bought within the Temple-area, needful for the feast (in the way of sacrifices and their adjuncts), or for purification, and it would be better to get the right money from the authorized changers, than have disputes with the dealers. We can picture to ourselves the scene around the table of an Eastern money-changer — the weighing of the coins, deductions for loss of weight, arguing, disputing, bargaining — and we can realize the terrible truthfulness of our Lord's charge that they had made the Father's House a mart and place of traffic. But even so, the business of the Temple money-changers would not be exhausted. Through their hands would pass the immense votive offerings of foreign Jews, or of proselytes, to the Temple; indeed, they probably transacted all business matters connected with the Sanctuary. It is difficult to realize the vast accumulation of wealth in the Temple-treasury. But some idea of it may be formed from the circumstance that, despite many previous spoliations, the value of the gold and silver which Crassus {54-53 B.C.} carried from the Temple-treasury amounted to the enormous sum of about two and a half millions sterling. Whether or not these Temple money-changers may have transacted other banking business, given drafts, or cashed those from correspondents, received and lent money at interest — all which was common at the time — must remain undetermined.

Readers of the New Testament know, that the noisy and incongruous business of an Eastern money-lender was not the only one carried on within the sacred Temple-enclosure. It was a great accommodation, that a person bringing a sacrifice might not only learn, but actually obtain, in the Temple from its officials what was required for the meat, and drink-offering. The prices were fixed by tariff every month, and on payment of the stated amount the offerer received one of four counterfoils, which respectively indicated, and, on handing it to the proper official, procured the prescribed complement of his sacrifice.^{f901} The Priests and Levites in charge of this made up their accounts every evening, and these (though

necessary) transactions must have left a considerable margin of profit to the treasury. This would soon lead to another kind of traffic. Offerers might, of course, bring their sacrificial animals with them, and we know that on the Mount of Olives there were four shops, specially for the sale of pigeons and other things requisite for sacrificial purposes. {Jer. Taan 4:8.}

^{f902} But then, when an animal was brought, it had to be examined as to its Levitical fitness by persons regularly qualified and appointed. Disputes might here arise, due to the ignorance of the purchaser, or the greed of the examiner. A regularly qualified examiner was called *mumcheh* (one approved), and how much labor was given to the acquisition of the requisite knowledge appears from the circumstance, that a certain teacher is said to have spent eighteen months with a farmer, to learn what faults in an animal were temporary, and which permanent. {Sanh. 5b.} Now, as we are informed that a certain *mumcheh* of firstlings had been authorized to charge for his inspection from four to six *Isar* (1 1/4 *d.* to about 2 *d.*), according to the animal inspected, {Bekhor. 4:5.} it is but reasonable to suppose that a similar fee may have been exacted for examining the ordinary sacrificial animals. But all trouble and difficulty would be avoided by a regular market within the Temple-enclosure, where sacrificial animals could be purchased, having presumably been duly inspected, and all fees paid before being offered for sale. ^{f903} It needs no comment to show how utterly the Temple would be profaned by such traffic, and to what scenes it might lead. From Jewish writings we know, that most improper transactions were carried on, to the taking undue advantage of the poor people who came to offer their sacrifices. Thus we read, {Ker. 1:7.} that on one occasion the price of a couple of pigeons was run up to the enormous figure of a gold denar (a Roman gold denar, about 15s. 3*d.*), when, through the intervention of Simeon, the grandson of the great Hillel, it was brought down before night to a quarter of a silver denar, or about 2*d.* each. Since Simeon is represented as introducing his resolve to this effect with the adjuration, 'by the Temple,' it is not unfair to infer that these prices had ruled within the sacred enclosure. It was probably not merely controversial zeal for the peculiar teaching of his master Shammai, but a motive similar to that of Simeon, which on another occasion induced Baba ben Buta (well known as giving Herod the advice of rebuilding the Temple), when he found the Temple-court empty of sacrificial animals, through the greed of those who had 'thus desolated the House of God,' to bring in no less than three thousand sheep, so that the people might offer sacrifices. {Jerus. Chag. 78 *a.*} ^{f904}

This leads up to another question, most important in this connection. The whole of this traffic — money-changing, selling of doves, and market for sheep and oxen — was in itself, and from its attendant circumstances, a terrible desecration; it was also liable to gross abuses. But was there about the time of Christ anything to make it specially obnoxious and unpopular? The priesthood must always have derived considerable profit from it — of course, not the ordinary priests, who came up in their ‘orders’ to minister in the Temple, but the permanent priestly officials, the resident leaders of the priesthood, and especially the High-Priestly family. This opens up a most interesting inquiry, closely connected, as we shall show, with Christ’s visit to the Temple at this Passover. But the materials here at our command are so disjointed, that, in attempting to put them together, we can only suggest what seems most probable, not state what is absolutely certain. What became of the profits of the money-changers, and who were the real owners of the Temple-market?

To the first of these questions the Jerusalem Talmud {Jer. Sheq. 1:7, last 4 lines, p. 46 *b*.} gives no less than five different answers, showing that there was no fixed rule as to the employment of these profits, or, at least, that it was no longer known at that time. Although four of these answers point to their use for the public service, yet that which seems most likely assigns the whole profits to the money-changers themselves. But in that case it can scarcely be doubted, that they had to pay a considerable rental or percentage to the leading Temple-officials. The profits from the sale of meat- and drink-offerings went to the Temple-treasury. But it can hardly be believed, that such was the case in regard to the Temple-market. On the other hand, there can be little doubt, that this market was what in Rabbinic writings is styled ‘the Bazaars of the sons of Annas’ (*Chanuyoth beney Chanan*), the sons of that High-Priest Annas, who is so infamous in New Testament history. When we read that the Sanhedrin, forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, transferred its meeting-place from ‘the Hall of Hewn Stones’ (on the south side of the Court of the Priest, and therefore partly within the Sanctuary itself) to ‘the Bazaars,’ and then afterwards to the City, {Rosh haSh. 31 *a*, *b*.} the inference is plain, that these Bazaars were those of the sons of Annas the High-Priest, and that they occupied part of the Temple-court; in short, that the Temple-market and the Bazaars of the sons of Annas are identical.

If this inference, which is in accordance with received Jewish opinion, be admitted, we gain much light as regards the purification of the Temple by

Jesus, and the words which He spake on that occasion. For, our next position is that, from the unrighteousness of the traffic carried on in these Bazaars, and the greed of their owners, the 'Temple-market' was at the time most unpopular. This appears, not only from the conduct and words of the patriarch Simeon and of Baba ben Buta (as above quoted), but from the fact that popular indignation, three years before the destruction of Jerusalem, swept away the Bazaars of the family of Annas, {Siphre on Deuteronomy section 105, end. ed. *Friedmann*, p. 95 b; Jer. Peah 1:6.} and this, as expressly stated, on account of the sinful greed which characterized their dealings. And if any doubt should still linger in the mind, it would surely be removed by our Lord's open denunciation of the Temple-market as 'a den of robbers.' {St. ~~4112~~ Matthew 21:12.} Of the avarice and corruption of this High-Priestly family, alike Josephus and the Rabbis give a most terrible picture. Josephus describes Annas (or Ananus), the son of the Annas of the New Testament, as 'a great hoarder up of money,' very rich, and as despoiling by open violence the common priests of their official revenues. {Ant. 20:9. 2-4.} The Talmud also records the curse which a distinguished Rabbi of Jerusalem (Abba Shaul) pronounced upon the High-Priestly families (including that of Annas), who were 'themselves High-Priests, their sons treasurers (Gizbarin), their sons-in-law assistant-treasurers (Ammarkalin), while their servants beat the people with sticks.' {Pes. 57 a.} What a comment this passage offers on the bearing of Jesus, as He made a scourge to drive out the very servants who 'beat the people with sticks,' and upset their unholy traffic! It were easy to add from Rabbinic sources repulsive details of their luxuriousness, wastefulness, gluttony, and general dissoluteness. No wonder that, in the figurative language of the Talmud, the Temple is represented as crying out against them: 'Go hence, ye sons of Eli, ye defile the Temple of Jehovah!' {Pes. u.s.} These painful notices of the state of matters at that time help us better to understand what Christ did, and who they were that opposed His doing.

These Temple-Bazaars, the property, and one of the principal sources of income, of the family of Annas, were the scene of the purification of the Temple by Jesus; and in the private locale attached to these very Bazaars, where the Sanhedrin held its meetings at the time, the final condemnation of Jesus may have been planned, if not actually pronounced. All this has its deep significance. But we can now also understand why the Temple officials, to whom these Bazaars belonged, only challenged the authority of Christ in thus purging the Temple. The unpopularity of the whole traffic, if

not their consciences, prevented their proceeding to actual violence. Lastly, we can also better perceive the significance, alike of Christ's action, and of His reply to their challenge, spoken as it was close to the spot where He was so soon to be condemned by them. Nor do we any longer wonder that no resistance was offered by the people to the action of Jesus. and that even the remonstrances of the priests were not direct, but in the form of a perplexing question.

For it is in the direction just indicated, and in no other, that objections have been raised to the narrative of Christ's first public act in Jerusalem: the purgation of the Temple. Commentators have sufficiently pointed out the differences between this and the purgation of the Temple at the close of His Ministry. {St. ^{<412>}Matthew 21:12, etc.; St. ^{<4111>}Mark 11:11, etc.; St. ^{<295>}Luke 19:45 etc.} ^{f905} Indeed, on comparison, these are so obvious, that every reader can mark them. Nor does it seem difficult to understand, rather does it seem not only fitting, but almost logically necessary, that, if any such event had occurred, it should have taken place both at the beginning and at the close of His public ministry in the Temple. Nor yet is there anything either 'abrupt' or 'tactless' in such a commencement of his Ministry. It is not only profane, but unhistorical, to look for calculation and policy in the Life of Jesus. Had there been such, He would not have died on the Cross. And 'abrupt' it certainly was not. Jesus took up the thread where he had dropped it on His first recorded appearance in the Temple, when he had spoken His wonder, that those who knew Him should have been ignorant, that He must be about His Father's business. He was now about His Father's business, and, as we may so say, in the most elementary manner. To put an end to this desecration of His Father's House, which, by a nefarious traffic, had been made a place of mart, nay — 'a den of robbers,' was, what all who knew His Mission must have felt, a most suitable and almost necessary beginning of His Messianic Work.

And many of those present must have known Jesus. The zeal of His early disciples, who, on their first recognition of Him, proclaimed the new-found Messiah, could not have given place to absolute silence. The many Galilean pilgrims in the Temple could not but have spread the tidings, and the report must soon have passed from one to the other in the Temple-courts, as He first entered their sacred enclosure. They would follow Him, and watch what He did. Nor were they disappointed. He inaugurated His Mission by fulfilling the prediction concerning Him Who was to be Israel's refiner and purifier (^{<490>}Malachi 3:1-3). Scarce had He entered the Temple-porch, and

trod the Court of the Gentiles, than He drove thence what profanely defiled it. ^{f906} There was not a hand lifted, not a word spoken to arrest Him, as He made the scourge of small cords (even this not without significance) and with it drove out of the Temple both the sheep and the oxen; not a word said, nor a hand raised, as He poured into their receptacles the changers' money, and overthrew their tables. ^{f907} His Presence awed them, His words awakened even their consciences; they knew, only too well, how true His denunciations were. And behind Him was gathered the wondering multitude, that could not but sympathise with such bold, right royal, and Messianic vindication of Temple sanctity from the nefarious traffic of a hated, corrupt, and avaricious Priesthood. It was a scene worth witnessing by any true Israelite, a protest and an act which, even among a less emotional people, would have gained Him respect, approbation, and admiration, and which, at any rate, secured his safety. ^{f908}

For when 'the Jews,' by which here, as in so many other places, we are to understand the rulers of the people — in this instance, the Temple officials — did gather courage to come forward, they ventured not to lay hands on Him. It was not yet the time for it. In presence of that multitude they would not then have dared it, even if policy had not dictated quietness within the Temple-enclosure, when the Roman garrison so close by, in Fort Antonia, kept jealous watch for the first appearance of a tumult. {~~4213~~ Acts 21:31, 32.} Still more strangely, they did not even reprove Him for what He had done, as if it had been wrong or improper. With infinite cunning, as appealing to the multitude, they only asked for 'a sign' which would warrant such assumption of authority. But this question of challenge marked two things: the essential opposition between the Jewish authorities and Jesus, and the manner in which they would carry on the contest, which was henceforth to be waged between Him and the rulers of the people. That first action of Jesus determined their mutual positions; and with and in that first conflict its end was already involved. The action of Jesus as against the rulers must develop into a life-opposition; their first step against Him must lead on to the last in His condemnation to the Cross.

And Jesus then and there knew it all, foresaw, or rather saw it all. His answer told it. It was — as all His teaching to those who seeing do not see, and hearing do not hear, whose understanding is darkened and heart hardened — in parabolic language, which only the after-event would make clear. {St. ~~4213~~ Matthew 13:11-15; St. ~~4041~~ Mark 4:11, 12.} As for 'the sign,' then and ever again sought by an 'evil and adulterous generation' — evil in

their thoughts and ways and adulterous to the God of Israel — He had then, as afterwards, {St. ~~4128~~ Matthew 12:38-40.} only one ‘sign’ to give: ‘Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.’ Thus He met their challenge for a sign by the challenge of a sign: Crucify Him, and He would rise again; let them suppress the Christ, He would triumph. ^{f909} A sign this which they understood not, but misunderstood, and by making it the ground of their false charge in His final trial, themselves unwittingly fulfilled.

And yet to all time this is the sign, and the only sign, which the Christ has given, which He still gives to every ‘evil and adulterous generation,’ to all sin-lovers and God-forsakers. They will destroy, so far as their power reaches, the Christ, crucify Him, give His words the lie, suppress, sweep away Christianity — and they shall not succeed: He shall triumph. As on that first Easter-day, so now and ever in history, He raises up the Temple, which they break down. This is the ‘sign,’ the evidence, the only ‘sign,’ which the Christ gives to His enemies; a sign which, as an historical fact, has been patent to all men, and seen by them; which might have been evidence, but being of the nature of miracle, not explicable by natural agencies, they have misunderstood, viewing ‘the Temple’ merely as a building, of which they fully know the architecture, manner, and time of construction, ^{f910} but of whose spiritual character and upbuilding they have no knowledge nor thought. And thus, as to that generation, so to all which have followed, this is still the ‘sign,’ if they understand it — the only sign, the Great Miracle, which, as they only calculate from the visible and to them ascertained, these ‘despisers behold, and wonder, and perish,’ for He worketh ‘a work in their days, a work which they shall in no wise believe. {~~4131~~ Acts 13:41.}

CHAPTER 6

THE TEACHER COME FROM GOD AND THE TEACHER FROM JERUSALEM — JESUS AND NICODEMUS

(St. ~~John~~ John 3:1-21.)

BUT there were those who beheld, and heard His words, and did in some measure understand them. Even before Jesus had spoken to the Temple-officials, His disciples, as silently they watched Him, saw an old Scripture-saying kindled into light by the halo of His glory. It was that of the suffering, self-forgotten, God-dedicated Servant of Jehovah, as His figure stood out against the Old Testament sky, realizing in a hostile world only this, as the deepest element of His being and calling: entire inward and outward consecration to God, a burnt-offering, such as Isaac would have been. Within their minds sprang up unbidden, as when the light of the Urim and Thummim fell on the letter graven on the precious stones of the High-Priest's breastplate, those words of old: 'The zeal of Thine house eateth me up. { ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 69:9. } Thus, even in those days of their early learning, Jesus purging the Temple in view of a hostile rulership was the full realization of that picture, which must be prophetic, since no mere man ever bore those lineaments: that of the ideal Nazarite, whom the zeal of God's house was consuming. And then long afterwards, after His Passion and Death, after those dark days of loneliness and doubt, after the misty dawn of the first recognition — this word, which He had spoken to the rulers at the first, came to them, with all the convincing power of prediction fulfilled by fact, as an assured conviction, which in its strong grasp held not only the past, but the present, because the present is ever the *fulfilment* of the past: 'When therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He had said this unto them; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.'

Again, as we think of the meaning of His refusing 'a sign' to the rulers of Israel — or rather think of the only 'sign' which He did give them — we see nothing incompatible with it in the fact that, at the same feast, He did many 'signs' ^{f911} in sight of the people. For it was only the rulers who had entered on that conflict, of which, from the character and aims of the two parties engaged, the beginning involved the terrible end as its logical

sequence. In presence of such a foe only one 'sign' could be given: that of reading their inmost hearts, and in them their real motives and final action, and again of setting forth His own final triumph, a predictive description, a 'no sign' that was, and is, a sign to all time. But neither challenge nor hostile demand for a sign had been addressed to Him by the people. Indeed even at the last, when incited by their rulers, and blindly following them, 'they knew not what they did.' And it was to them that Jesus now, on the morning of His Work, spoke by 'signs.'

The Feast of the Passover commenced on the 15th Nisan, dating it, of course, from the preceding evening. But before that — before the slaying of the Paschal Lamb, on the afternoon of the 14th Nisan — the visitor to the Temple would mark something peculiar.^{f912} On the evening of the 13th Nisan, with which the 14th, or 'preparation-day,' commenced, the head of each household would, with lighted candle and in solemn silence, search out all leaven in his house, prefacing his search with solemn thanksgiving and appeal to God, and closing it by an equally solemn declaration that he had accomplished it, so far as within his knowledge, and disavowing responsibility for what lay beyond it. And as the worshippers went to the Temple, they would see prominently exposed, on a bench in one of the porches, two desecrated cakes of some thankoffering, indicating that it was still lawful to eat of that which was leavened. At ten, or at latest eleven o'clock, one of those cakes was removed, and then they knew that it was no longer lawful to eat of it. At twelve o'clock the second cake was removed, and this was the signal for solemnly burning all the leaven that had been gathered. Was it on the eve of the 14th, when each head of a house sought for and put aside the leaven, or else as the people watched these two cakes, and then the removal of the last of them, which marked that all leaven was to be 'purged out,' that Jesus, in real fulfilment of its national meaning, 'cleansed' the Temple of its leaven?

We can only suggest the question. But the 'cleansing of the Temple' undoubtedly preceded the actual festive Paschal week. {St. John ii.} To those who were in Jerusalem it was a week such as had never been before, a week when 'they saw the signs which He did,' and when, stirred by a strange impulse, 'they believed in His Name' as the Messiah. 'A milk-faith,' as Luther pithily calls it, which fed on, and required for its sustenance, 'signs.' And like a vision it passed with the thing seen. Not a faith to which the sign was only the fingerpost, but a faith of which the sign, not the thing signified, was the substance; a faith which dazzled the

mental sight, but reached not down to the heart. And Jesus, Who with heart-searching glance saw what was in man, Who needed not any to tell Him, but with immediateness knew all, did not commit Himself to them. They were not like His first Galilean disciples, true of heart and in heart. The Messiah Whom these found, and He Whom those saw, met different conceptions. The faith of the Jerusalem sign-seers would not have compassed what the Galileans experienced; it would not have understood nor endured, had He committed Himself to them. And yet He did, in wondrous love, condescend and speak to them in the only language they could understand, in that of 'signs.' Nor was it all in vain.

Unrecorded as these miracles are — because the words they spoke were not recorded on many hearts — it was not only here and there, by this or that miracle, that their power was felt. Their grand general effect was, to make the more spiritually minded and thoughtful feel that Jesus was indeed 'a teacher come from God.' In thinking of the miracles of Jesus, and generally of the miraculous in the New Testament, we are too apt to overlook the principal consideration in the matter. We regard it from our present circumstances, not from those of the Jews and people of that time; we judge it from our standpoint, not from theirs. And yet the main gist of the matter lies here. We would not expect to be convinced of the truth of religion, nor converted to it, by outward miracles; we would not expect them at all. Not but that, if a notable miracle really did occur, its impression and effect would be overwhelming; although, unless a miracle submitted itself to the strictest scientific tests, when in the nature of things it would cease to be a miracle, it would scarcely find general credence. Hence, truth to say, the miraculous in the New Testament constitutes to modern thought not its strong, but its weak point; not its convincing evidence, but its point of attack and difficulty. Accordingly, treating of, or contemplating the miracles of the New Testament, it is always their moral, not their natural (or supranatural), aspect which has its chief influence upon us. But what is this but to say that ours is *modern*, not ancient thought, and that the evidential power of Christ's miracles has given place to the age and dispensation of the Holy Ghost? With us the process is the reverse of what it was with them of old. They approached the moral and spiritual through the miraculous; we the miraculous through the moral and spiritual. His Presence, that one grand Presence is, indeed, ever the same. But God always adapts His teaching to our learning; else it were not teaching at all, least of all Divine teaching. Only what carries it now to us is not the same

as what carried it to them of old: it is no more the fingerpost of 'signs,' but the finger of the Spirit. To them the miraculous was the *expected* — that miraculous which to us also is so truly and Divinely miraculous, just because it applies to all time, since it carries to us the *moral*, as to them the *physical*, aspect of the miracle; in each case, Divine reality Divinely conveyed. It may therefore safely be asserted, that to the men of that time no teaching of the new faith would have been real without the evidence of miracles.

In those days, when the idea of the miraculous was, so to speak, fluid — passing from the natural into the supernatural — and men regarded all that was above their view-point of nature as supernatural, the idea of the miraculous would, by its constant recurrence, always and prominently suggest itself. Other teachers also, among the Jews at least, claimed the power of doing miracles, and were popularly credited with them. But what an obvious contrast between theirs and the 'signs' which Jesus did! In thinking of this, it is necessary to remember, that the Talmud and the New Testament alike embody teaching Jewish in its form, and addressed to Jews, and, at least so far as regards the subject of miracles — at periods not far apart, and brought still nearer by the singular theological conservatism of the people. If, with this in our minds, we recall some of the absurd Rabbinic pretensions to miracles — such as the creation of a calf by two Rabbis every Sabbath eve for their Sabbath meal, {*Sanh. 65 b.*} or the repulsive, and in part blasphemous, account of a series of prodigies in testimony of the subtleties of some great Rabbi {*Baba Mez. 59 b.*} — we are almost overwhelmed by the evidential force of the contrast between them and the 'signs' which Jesus did. We seem to be in an entirely new world, and we can understand the conclusion at which every earnest and thoughtful mind must have arrived in witnessing them, that He was, indeed, 'a Teacher from God.'

Such an observer was Nicodemus (*Naqdimon*), ^{f913} one of the Pharisees and a member of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin. And, as we gather from his mode of expression, ^{f914} not he only, but others with him. From the Gospel-history we know him to have been cautious by nature and education, and timid of character; yet, as in other cases, it was the greatest offence to his Jewish thinking, the Cross, which at last brought him to the light of decision, and the vigor of bold confession. {*St. ~~John~~ John 19:39.*} And this in itself would show the real character of his inquiry, and the effect of what Jesus had first taught him. It is, at any rate, altogether rash to speak of the

manner of his first approach to Christ as most commentators have done. We can scarcely realize the difficulties which he had to overcome. It must have been a mighty power of conviction, to break down prejudice so far as to lead this old Sanhedrist to acknowledge a Galilean, untrained in the Schools, as a Teacher come from God, and to repair to Him for direction on, perhaps, the most delicate and important point in Jewish theology. But, even so, we cannot wonder that he should have wished to shroud his first visit in the utmost possible secrecy. It was a most compromising step for a Sanhedrist to take. With that first bold purgation of the Temple a deadly feud between Jesus and the Jewish authorities had begun, of which the sequel could not be doubtful. It was involved in that first encounter in the Temple, and it needed not the experience and wisdom of an aged Sanhedrist to forecast the end.

Nevertheless, Nicodemus came. If this is evidence of his intense earnestness, so is the bearing of Jesus of His Divine Character, and of the truth of the narrative. As he was not depressed by the resistance of the authorities, nor by the ‘milk-faith’ of the multitude, so He was not elated by the possibility of making such a convert as a member of the great Sanhedrin. There is no excitement, no undue deference, nor eager politeness; no compromise, nor attempted persuasiveness; not even accommodation. Nor, on the other hand, is there assumed superiority, irony, or dogmatism. There is not even a reference to the miracles, the evidential power of which had wrought in His visitor the initial conviction, that He was a Teacher come from God. All is calm, earnest, dignified, if we may reverently say it, as became the God-Man in the humiliation of His personal teaching. To say that it is all un-Jewish were a mere truism: it is Divine. No fabricated narrative would have invented such a scene, nor so represented the actors in it. ^{f915}

Dangerous as it may be to indulge the imagination, we can almost picture the scene. The report of what passed reads, more than almost any other in the Gospels, like notes taken at the time by one who was present. We can almost put it again into the form of brief notes, by heading what each said in this manner, *Nicodemus*: — or, *Jesus*:. They are only the outlines of the conversation, given, in each case, the really important gist, and leaving abrupt gaps between, as would be the manner in such notes. Yet quite sufficient to tell us all that is important for us to know. We can scarcely doubt that it was the narrator, John, who was the witness that took the notes. His own reflections upon it, or rather his afterlook upon it, in the

light of later facts, and under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, is described in the verses with which the writer follows his account of what had passed between Jesus and Nicodemus (St. ~~RR6~~ John 3:16-21). In the same manner he winds up with similar reflections (ib. vv. 31-36) the reported conversation between the Baptist and his disciples. In neither case are the verses to which we refer, part of what either Jesus or John said at the time, but what, in view of it, John says in name of, and to the Church of the New Testament. ^{f916}

If from St. ~~RR7~~ John 19:27 we might infer that St. John had 'a home' in Jerusalem itself — which, considering the simplicity of living at the time, and the cost of houses, would not necessarily imply that he was rich — the scene about to be described would have taken place under the roof of him who has given us its record. In any case, the circumstances of life at the time are so well known, that we have no difficulty in realizing the surroundings. It was night, one of the nights in that Easter week so full of marvels. Perhaps we may be allowed to suppose that, as so often in analogous circumstances, the spring-wind, sweeping up the narrow streets of the City, had suggested the comparison, {St. ~~RR8~~ John 3:8.} ^{f917} which was so full of deepest teaching of Nicodemus. Up in the simply furnished *Aliyah* — the guest-chamber on the roof, the lamp was still burning, and the Heavenly Guest still busy with thought and words. There was no need for Nicodemus to pass through the house, for an outside stair led to the upper room. It was night, when Jewish superstition would keep men at home; a wild, gusty spring night, when loiterers would not be in the streets; and no one would see him as at that hour he ascended the outside steps that led up to the *Aliyah*. His errand was soon told: one sentence, that which admitted the Divine Teachership of Jesus, implied all the questions he could wish to ask. Nay, his very presence there spoke them. Or, if otherwise, the answer of Jesus spoke them. Throughout, Jesus never descended the standpoint of Nicodemus, but rather sought to lift him to His own. It was all about 'the Kingdom of God,' ^{f918} so connected with that Teacher come from God, that Nicodemus would inquire.

And yet, through Christ never descended to the standpoint of Nicodemus, we must bear in mind what his views as a Jew would be, if we would understand the interview. Jesus took him straight to whence alone that 'Kingdom' could be seen. 'Except a man be born from above,' ^{f919} he cannot see the Kingdom of God.' It has been thought by commentators, that there is here an allusion to a Jewish mode of expression in regard to

proselytes, who were viewed as ‘new-born.’ But in that case Nicodemus would have understood it, and answered differently, or, rather, not expressed his utter inability to understand it. It is indeed, true that a Gentile on becoming a proselyte — though not, as has been suggested, an ordinary penitent ^{f920} — was likened to a child just born. {Yebam. 62 *a*.} It is also true, that persons in certain circumstances, the bridegroom on his marriage, the Chief of the Academy on his promotion, the king on his enthronement — were likened to those newly born. {Yalkut on 1 Samuel 13.} The expression, therefore, was not only common, but, so to speak, fluid; only, both it and what it implied must be rightly understood. In the first place, it was only a simile, and never meant to convey a real regeneration (*‘as a child’*). So far as proselytes were concerned, it meant that, having entered into a new relation to God, they also entered into new relationship to man, just as if they had at that moment been newly born. All the old relations had ceased — a man’s father, brother, mother, sister were no longer his nearest of kin: he was a new and another man. Then, secondly, {As in Yalkut.} it implied a new state, when all a man’s past was past, and his sins forgiven him as belonging to that past. It will now be perceived, how impossible it was for Nicodemus to understand the teaching of Jesus, and yet how all-important to him was that teaching. For, even if he could have imagined that Jesus pointed to repentance, as that which would give him the figurative standing of ‘born from above,’ or even ‘born anew,’ it would not have helped him. For, first, this second birth was only a *simile*. Secondly, according to the Jewish view, this second birth was the *consequence* of having taken upon oneself ‘the Kingdom;’ not, as Jesus put it, the *cause* and condition of it. The proselyte had taken upon himself ‘the Kingdom,’ and therefore he was ‘born’ anew, while Jesus put it that he must be born again in order to see the Kingdom of God. Lastly, it was ‘a birth from above’ to which reference was made. Judaism could understand a new relationship towards God and man, and even the forgiveness of sins. But it had no conception of a moral renovation, a spiritual birth, as the initial condition for reformation, far less as that for seeing the Kingdom of God. And it was because it had no idea of such ‘birth from above,’ of its reality or even possibility, that Judaism could not be the Kingdom of God.

Or, to take another view of it, for Divine truth is many-sided — perhaps some would say, to make ‘Western’ application of what was first spoken to the Jew — in one respect Nicodemus and Jesus had started from the same premise: *The Kingdom of God*. But how different were their conceptions

of what constituted that Kingdom, and of what was its door of entrance! What Nicodemus had seen of Jesus had not only shaken the confidence which his former views on these subjects had engendered in him, but opened dim possibilities, the very suggestion of which filled him with uneasiness as to the past, and vague hopes as to the future. And so it ever is with us also, when, like Nicodemus, we first arrive at the conviction that Jesus is the Teacher come from God. What He teaches is so entirely different from what Nicodemus, or any of us could, from any other standpoint than that of Jesus, have learned or known concerning the Kingdom and entrance into it. The admission, however reached, of the Divine Mission of this Teacher, implies, unspoken, the grand question about the Kingdom. It is the opening of the door through which the Grand Presence will enter in. To such a man, as to us in like unspoken questioning, Jesus ever has but one thing to say: 'Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.' The Kingdom is other, the entrance to it is other, than you know or think. That which is of the flesh is flesh. Man may rise to high possibilities — mental, even moral: self-development, self-improvement, self-restraint, submission to a grand idea or a higher law, refined moral egotism, aesthetic even moral altruism. But to see the *Kingdom of God*: to understand what means the absolute rule of God, the one high calling of our humanity, by which a man becomes a child of God — to perceive this, not as an improvement upon our present state, but as the submission of heart, mind, and life to Him as our Divine King, an existence which is, and which means, proclaiming unto the world the Kingship of God: this can only be learned from Christ, and needs even for its perception a kinship of spirit — for that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. To *see* it, needs the birth from above; to *enter* it, the double baptismal birth of what John's Baptism had meant, and of what Christ's Baptism was.

Accordingly, all this sounded quite strange and unintelligible to Nicodemus. He could understand how a man might *become* other, and so ultimately *be* other; but how a man could first *be* other in order to *become* other — more than that, needed to be 'born from above,' in order to 'see the Kingdom of God' — passed alike his experience and his Jewish learning. Only one possibility of *being* occurred to him: that given him in his natural disposition, or as a Jew would have put it, in his original innocency when he first entered the world. And this — so to express ourselves — he thought aloud. {ver. 4.} But there was another world of

being than that of which Nicodemus thought. That world was the 'Kingdom of God' in its essential contrariety to the Kingdom of this world, whether in the general sense of that expression, or even in the special Judaistic sense attaching to the 'Kingdom' of the Messiah. There was only one gate by which a man could pass into that Kingdom of God — for that which was of the flesh could ever be only fleshly. Here a man might strive, as did the Jews, by outward conformity to *become*, but he would never attain to *being*. But that 'Kingdom' was *spiritual*, and here a man must be in order to *become*. How was he to attain that new being? The Baptist had pointed it out in its negative aspect of repentance and putting away the old by his Baptism of water; and as regarded its positive aspect he had pointed to Him Who was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. This was the gate of *being* through which a man must enter into the Kingdom, which was of the Messiah, because it was of God and the Messiah was of God, and in *that* sense 'the Teacher come from God' — that is, being sent of God, He taught of God by bringing to God. This but a few who had gone to the Baptist had perceived, or indeed could perceive, because the Baptist could in his Baptism only convey the negative, not the positive, aspect of it. And it needed that positive aspect — the being born from above — in order to see the Kingdom of God. But as to the mystery of this *being* in order to *become* — hark! did he hear the sound of that wind as it swept past the *Aliyah*? He heard its voice; but he neither knew whence it came, nor whither it went. So was every one that was born of the Spirit. You heard the voice of the Spirit Who originated the new being, but the origination of that new being, or its further development into all that it might and would become, lay beyond man's observation.

Nicodemus now understood in some measure *what* entrance into the Kingdom meant; but its *how* seemed only involved in greater mystery. That it was such a mystery, unthought and unimagined in Jewish theology, was a terribly sad manifestation of what the teaching in Israel was. Yet it had all been told them, as of personal knowledge, by the Baptist and by Jesus; nay, if they could only have received it, by the whole Old Testament. He wanted to know the *how* of these things before he believed them. He believed them not, though they passed on earth, because he knew not their *how*. How then could he believe that how, of which the agency was unseen and in heaven? To that spring of being no one could ascend but He that had come down from heaven,^{f921} and Who, to bring to us that spring of being, had appeared as 'the Son of Man,' the Ideal Man, the embodiment of the

Kingdom of Heaven, and thus the only true Teacher come from God. Or did Nicodemus think of another Teacher, hitherto their only Teacher, Moses — whom Jewish tradition generally believed to have ascended into the very heavens, in order to bring the teaching unto them? ^{f922} Let the history of Moses, then, teach them! They thought they understood his teaching, but there was one symbol in his history before which tradition literally stood dumb. They had heard what Moses had taught them; they had seen ‘the earthly things’ of God in the Manna which had rained from heaven, and, in view and hearing of it all, they had not believed, but murmured and rebelled. Then came the judgment of the fiery serpents, and, in answer to repentant prayer, the symbol of new being, a life restored from death, as they looked on their no longer living but dead death lifted up before them. A symbol this, showing forth two elements: negatively, the putting away of the past in their dead death (the serpent no longer living, but a brazen serpent); and positively, in their look of faith and hope. Before this symbol, as has been said, tradition has stood dumb. It could only suggest one meaning, and draw from it one lesson. Both these were true, and yet both insufficient. The meaning which tradition attached to it was, that Israel lifted up their eyes, not merely to the serpent, but rather to their Father in heaven, and had regard to His mercy. This, ^{f923} as St. John afterwards shows (ver. 16), was a true interpretation; but it left wholly out of sight the Antitype, in gazing on Whom our hearts are uplifted to the love of God, Who gave His only-begotten Son, and we learn to know and love the Father in His Son. And the lesson which tradition drew from it was, that this symbol taught, the dead would live again; for, as it is argued, {Yalkut, vol. 1 p. 240.} ‘behold, if God made it that, through the similitude of the serpent which brought death, the dying should be restored to life, how much more shall He, Who is Life, restore the dead to life.’ And here lies the true interpretation of what Jesus taught. If the uplifted serpent, as symbol, brought life to the believing look which was fixed upon the giving, pardoning love of God, then, in the truest sense, shall the uplifted Son of Man give true life to everyone that believeth, looking up in Him to the giving and forgiving love of God, which His Son came to bring, to declare, and to manifest. ‘For as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth should in Him have eternal life.’ ^{f924}

With this final and highest teaching, which contains all that Nicodemus, or, indeed, the whole Church, could require or be able to know, He explained

to him and to us the *how* of the new birth — alike the source and the flow of its spring. Ours it is now only to ‘believe,’ where we cannot further know, and, looking up to the Son of Man in His perfected work, to perceive, and to receive the gift of God’s love for our healing. In this teaching it is not the serpent and the Son of Man that are held side by side, though we cannot fail to see the symbolic reference of the one to the other, but the uplifting of the one and the other — the one by the sin, the other through the sin of the people: both on account of it — the forthgoing of God’s pardoning mercy, the look of faith, and the higher recognition of God’s love in it all.

And so the record of this interview abruptly closes. It tells all, but no more than the Church requires to know. Of Nicodemus we shall hear again in the sequel, not needlessly, nor yet to complete a biography, were it even that of Jesus; but as is necessary for the understanding of this History. What follows {St. ~~RB6~~ John 3:16-21.} are not the words of Christ, but of St. John. In them, looking back many years afterwards in the light of completed events, the Apostle takes his stand, as becomes the circumstances, where Jesus had ended His teaching of Nicodemus — under the Cross. In the Gift, unutterable in its preciousness, he now sees the Giver and the Source of all. {ver. 16.} Then, following that teaching of Jesus backward, he sees how true it has proved concerning the world, that ‘that which is of the flesh is flesh;’ how true, also concerning the Spirit-born, and what need there is to us of ‘this birth from above.’

But to all time, through the gusty night of our world’s early spring, flashes, as the lamp in that *Aliyah* through the darkened streets of silent Jerusalem, that light; sounds through its stillness, like the Voice of the Teacher come from God, this eternal Gospel-message to us and to all men: ‘God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.’

CHAPTER 7

IN JUDEA AND THROUGH SAMARIA, —A SKETCH OF SAMARITAN HISTORY AND THEOLOGY — JEWS AND SAMARITANS.

(St. ~~ROM~~ John 4:1-4.)

WE have no means of determining how long Jesus may have tarried in Jerusalem after the events recorded in the previous two chapters. The Evangelic narrative {St. ~~ROM~~ John 3:22.} only marks an indefinite period of time, which, as we judge from internal probability, cannot have been protracted. From the city He retired with His disciples to ‘the country,’ which formed the province of Judaea. There He taught and His disciples baptized. {St. ~~ROM~~ John 6:2.} ^{f925} From what had been so lately witnessed in Jerusalem, as well as from what must have been known as to the previous testimony of the Baptist concerning Him, the number of those who professed adhesion to the expected new Kingdom, and were consequently baptized, was as large, in that locality, as had submitted to the preaching and Baptism of John — perhaps even larger. An exaggerated report was carried to the Pharisaic authorities: ^{f926} ‘Jesus maketh and baptizeth more disciples than John.’ {St. ~~ROM~~ John 4:1.} From which, at least, we infer, that the opposition of the leaders of the party to the Baptist was now settled, and that it extended to Jesus; and also, what careful watch they kept over the new movement.

But what seems at first sight strange is the twofold circumstance, that Jesus should for a time have established Himself in such apparently close proximity to the Baptist, and that on this occasion, and on this only, He should have allowed His disciples to administer the rite of Baptism. That the latter must be not be confounded with Christian Baptism, which was only introduced after the Death of Christ, {~~ROM~~ Romans 4:3.} or, to speak more accurately, after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, needs no special explanation. But our difficulties only increase, as we remember the essential difference between them, grounded on that between the Mission of John and the Teaching of Jesus. In the former, the Baptism of repentant preparation for the coming Kingdom had its deepest meaning; not so in presence of that Kingdom itself, and in the teaching of its King. But, even

were it otherwise, the administration of the same rite by John and by the disciples of Jesus in apparently close proximity, seems not only unnecessary, but it might give rise to misconception on the part of enemies, and misunderstanding or jealousy on the part of weak disciples.

Such was actually the case when, on one occasion, a discussion arose 'on the part of John's disciples with a Jew,' ^{f927} on the subject of purification. {St. ~~John~~ John 3:25.} We know not the special point in dispute, nor does it seem of much importance, since such 'questions' would naturally suggest themselves to a caviller or opponent ^{f928} who encountered those who were administering Baptism. What really interests us is, that somehow this Jewish objector must have connected what he said with a reference to the Baptism of Jesus' disciples. For, immediately afterwards, the disciples of John, in their sore zeal for the honor of their master, brought him tidings, in the language of doubt, if not of complaint, of what to them seemed interference with the work of the Baptist, and almost presumption on the part of Jesus. While fully alive to their grievous error, perhaps in proportion as we are so, we cannot but honor and sympathise with this loving care for their master. The toilsome mission of the great Ascetic was drawing to its close, and that without any tangible success so far as he was concerned. Yet, to souls susceptible of the higher, to see him would be to be arrested; to hear him, to be convinced; to know, would be to love and venerate him. Never before had such deep earnestness and reality been witnessed, such devotedness, such humility and self-abnegation, and all in that great cause which set every Jewish heart on fire. And then, in the high-day of his power, when all men had gathered around him and hung on his lips; when all wondered whether he would announce himself as the Christ, or, at least, as His Forerunner, or as one of the great Prophets; when a word from him would have kindled that multitude into a frenzy of enthusiasm — he had disclaimed everything for himself, and pointed to Another! But this 'Coming One,' to whom he had borne witness, had hitherto been quite other than their Master. And, as if this had not been enough, the multitudes, which had formerly come to John, now flocked around Jesus; nay, He had even usurped the one distinctive function still left to their master, humble as it was. It was evident that, hated and watched by the Pharisees; watched, also, by the ruthless jealousy of a Herod; overlooked, if not supplanted, by Jesus, the mission of their master was nearing its close. It had been a life and work of suffering and self-denial; it was about to end in loneliness and sorrow. They said nothing

expressly to complain of Him to Whom John had borne witness, but they told of what He did, and how all men came to Him.

The answer which the Baptist made, may be said to mark the high point of his life and witness. Never before was he so tender, almost sad; never before more humble and self-denying, more earnest and faithful. The setting of his own life-sun was to be the rising of One infinitely more bright; the end of his Mission the beginning of another far higher. In the silence, which was now gathering around him, he heard but one Voice, that of the Bridegroom, and he rejoiced in it, though he must listen to it in stillness and loneliness. For it he had waited and worked. Not his own, but this had he sought. And now that it had come, he was content; more than content: his 'joy was now fulfilled.' 'He must increase, but I must decrease.' It was the right and good order. With these as his last words publicly spoken,^{f929} this Aaron of the New Testament unrobed himself ere he lay down to die. Surely among those born of women there was not one greater than John.

That these were his last words, publicly spoken and recorded, may, however, explain to us why on this exceptional occasion Jesus sanctioned the administration by His disciples of the Baptism of John. It was not a retrogression from the position He had taken in Jerusalem, nor caused by the refusal of His Messianic claims in the Temple.^{f930} There is no retrogression, only progression, in the Life of Jesus. And yet it was only on this occasion that the rite was administered under His sanction. But the circumstances were exceptional. It was John's last testimony to Jesus, and it was preceded by this testimony of Jesus to John. Far divergent, almost opposite, as from the first their paths had been, this practical sanction on the part of Jesus of John's Baptism, when the Baptist was about to be forsaken, betrayed, and murdered, was Christ's highest testimony to him. Jesus adopted his Baptism, ere its waters for ever ceased to flow, and thus He blessed and consecrated them. He took up the work of His Forerunner, and continued it. The baptismal rite of John administered with the sanction of Jesus, was the highest witness that could be borne to it.

There is no necessity for supposing that John and the disciples of Jesus baptized at, or quite close to, the same place. On the contrary, such immediate juxtaposition seems, for obvious reasons, unlikely. Jesus was within the boundaries of the province of Judaea, while John baptized at AEnon (the springs), near to Salim. The latter site has not been identified.

But the oldest tradition, which places it a few miles to the south of Bethshean (Scythopolis), on the border of Samaria and Galilee, has this in its favor, that it locates the scene of John's last public work close to the seat of Herod Antipas, into whose power the Baptist was so soon to be delivered. ^{f931} But already there were causes at work to remove both Jesus and His Forerunner from their present spheres of activity. As regards Christ, we have the express statement, {St. ~~<100>~~ John 4:1.} that the machinations of the Pharisaic party in Jerusalem led Him to withdraw into Galilee. And, as we gather from the notice of St. John, the Baptist was now involved in this hostility, as being so closely connected with Jesus. Indeed, we venture the suggestion that the imprisonment of the Baptist, although occasioned by his outspoken rebuke of Herod, was in great part due to the intrigues of the Pharisees. Of such a connection between them and Herod Antipas, we have direct evidence in a similar attempt to bring about the removal of Jesus from his territory. {St. ~~<103>~~ Luke 13:31, 32.} It would not have been difficult to rouse the suspicions of a nature so mean and jealous as that of Antipas, and this may explain the account of Josephus, {Ant. 18:5. 2.} who attributes the imprisonment and death of the Baptist simply to Herod's suspicious fear of John's unbounded influence with the people. ^{f932}

Leaving for the present the Baptist, we follow the footsteps of the Master. They are only traced by the disciple who best understood their direction, and who alone has left us a record of the beginning of Christ's ministry. For St. Matthew and St. Mark expressly indicate the imprisonment of the Baptist as their starting-point, {St. ~~<1014>~~ Mark 1:14; 4:12.} and, though St. Luke does not say this in so many words, he characteristically commences with Christ's public Evangelic teaching in the Synagogues of Galilee. Yet the narrative of St. Matthew {See specially St. ~~<1013>~~ Matthew 4:13 to end.} reads rather like a brief summary; ^{f933} that of St. Mark seems like a succession of rapid sketches; and even that of St. Luke, though with deeper historic purpose than the others, outlines, rather than tells, the history. St. John alone does not profess to give a narrative at all in the ordinary sense; but he selects incidents which are characteristic as unfolding the meaning of that Life, and records discourses which open its inmost teaching; {St. ~~<1010>~~ John 20:30, 31; 21:25.} and he alone tells of that early Judæan ministry and the journey through Samaria, which preceded the Galilean work.

The shorter road from Judaea to Galilee led through Samaria; {*Jos.* Life, 52.} and this, if we may credit Josephus, {*Ant.* 20:6. 1.} was generally taken by the Galileans on their way to the capital. On the other hand, the Judaeans seem chiefly to have made a *detour* through Peraea, in order to avoid hostile and impure Samaria. It lay not within the scope of our Lord to extend His personal Ministry, especially at its commencement, beyond the boundaries of Israel, {St. ^{<4005>}Matthew 10:5.} and the expression, ‘He must needs go through Samaria,’ {St. ^{<8004>}John 4:4.} can only refer to the advisability in the circumstances of taking the most direct road, ^{f934} or else to the wish of avoiding Peraea as the seat of Herod’s government. ^{f935} Such prejudices in regard to Samaria, as those which affected the ordinary Judaeans, would, of course, not influence the conduct of Jesus. But great as these undoubtedly were, they have been unduly exaggerated by modern writers. misled by one-sided quotations from Rabbinic works. ^{f936}

The Biblical history of that part of Palestine which bore the name of Samaria need not here be repeated. {Comp. ^{<1132>}1 Kings 13:32; ^{<1162>}16:24 etc.; Tiglath-Pileser, ^{<1259>}2 Kings 15:29; Shalmaneser, 17:3-5; 18:9-11; Sargon. 17:6, etc.} Before the final deportation of Israel by Shalmaneser, or rather Sargon, ^{f937} the ‘Samaria’ to which his operations extended must have considerably shrunk in dimensions, not only owing to previous conquests, but from the circumstance that the authority of the kings of Judah seems to have extended over a considerable portion of what once constituted the kingdom of Israel. {^{<4701>}2 Chronicles 30:1-26; 34:6.} Probably the Samaria of that time included little more than the city of that name, together with some adjoining towns and villages. It is of considerable interest to remember that the places, to which the inhabitants of Samaria were transported, {^{<1276>}2 Kings 17:6.} have been identified with such clearness as to leave no reasonable doubt, that at least some of the descendants of the ten tribes, whether mixed or unmixed with Gentiles, must be sought among what are now known as the Nestorian Christians. ^{f938}

On the other hand, it is of no practical importance for our present purpose to ascertain the exact localities, whence the new ‘Samaritans’ were brought to take the place of the Israelitish exiles. {^{<1274>}2 Kings 17:24-26; comp. ^{<1502>}Ezra 4:2, 10.} Suffice it, that one of them, perhaps that which contributed the principal settlers, *Cuthah*, furnished the name *Cuthim*, by which the Jews afterwards persistently designated the Samaritans. It was intended as a term of reproach, {St. ^{<888>}John 8:48.} to mark that they were of foreign race, {St. ^{<2716>}Luke 17:16.} ^{f939} and to

repudiate all connection between them and the Jews. Yet it is impossible to believe that, at least in later times, they did not contain a considerable admixture of Israelitish elements. It is difficult to suppose, that the original deportation was so complete as to leave behind no traces of the original Israelitish inhabitants. {Comp. ^{<4816>}2 Chronicles 34:6, 9 ^{<4117>}Jeremiah 12:5; ^{<1018>}Amos 5:3.} Their number would probably be swelled by fugitives from Assyria, and by Jewish settlers in the troublous times that followed. Afterwards, as we know, they were largely increased by apostates and rebels against the order of things established by Ezra and Nehemiah. {*Jos.* Ant. 11:8, 2, 6, 7.} Similarly, during the period of internal political and religious troubles, which marked the period to the accession of the Maccabees, the separation between Jews and Samaritans could scarcely have been generally observed, the more so that Alexander the Great placed them in close juxtaposition. ^{f940}

The first foreign colonists of Samaria brought their peculiar forms of idolatry with them. {^{<273>}2 Kings 17:30, 31.} But the Providential judgments, by which they were visited, led to the introduction of a spurious Judaism, consisting of a mixture of their former superstitions with Jewish doctrines and rites. {vv. 28-41.} Although this state of matters resembled that which had obtained in the original kingdom of Israel, perhaps just because of this, Ezra and Nehemiah, when reconstructing the Jewish commonwealth, insisted on a strict separation between those who had returned from Babylon and the Samaritans, resisting equally their offers of co-operation and their attempts at hindrance. This embittered the national feeling of jealousy already existing, and led to that constant hostility between Jews and Samaritans which has continued to this day. The religious separation became final when (at a date which cannot be precisely fixed ^{f941}) the Samaritans built a rival temple on Mount Gerizim, and Manasseh, ^{f942} the brother of Jaddua, the Jewish High-Priest, having refused to annul his marriage with the daughter of Sanballat, was forced to flee, and became the High-Priest of the new Sanctuary. Henceforth, by impudent assertion and falsification of the text of the Pentateuch, ^{f943} Gerizim was declared the rightful center of worship, and the doctrines and rites of the Samaritans exhibited a curious imitation and adaptation of those prevalent in Judaea.

We cannot here follow in detail the history of the Samaritans, nor explain the dogmas and practices peculiar to them. The latter would be the more difficult, because so many of their views were simply corruptions of those

of the Jews, and because, from the want of an authenticated ancient literature,^{f944} the origin and meaning of many of them have been forgotten.^{f945} Sufficient, however, must be said to explain the mutual relations at the time when the Lord, sitting on Jacob's well, first spake to the Samaritans of the better worship 'in spirit and truth,' and opened that well of living water which has never since ceased to flow.

The political history of the people can be told in a few sentences. Their Temple,^{f946} to which reference has been made, was built, not in Samaria but at Shechem, probably on account of the position held by that city in the former history of Israel, and on Mount Gerizim, which in the Samaritan Pentateuch was substituted for Mount Ebal in ~~<820>~~ Deuteronomy 27:4. It was Shechem also, with its sacred associations of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph, which became the real capital of the Samaritans. The fate of the city of Samaria under the reign of Alexander is uncertain, one account speaking of the rebellion of the city, the murder of the Macedonian governor, the consequent destruction of Samaria, and the slaughter of part, and transportation of the rest, of its inhabitants to Shechem,^{f947} while Josephus is silent on these events. When, after the death of Alexander, Palestine became the field of battle between the rulers of Egypt and Syria, Samaria suffered even more than other parts of the country. In 320 B. C. it passed from the rule of Syria to that of Egypt (Ptolemy Lagi). Six years later {In 314.} it again became Syrian (Antigonos). Only three years afterwards, {In 311.} Ptolemy reconquered and held it for a very short time. On his retreat, he destroyed the walls of Samaria and of other towns. In 301 it passed again by treaty into the hands of Ptolemy, but in 298 it was once more ravaged by the son of Antigonos. After that it enjoyed a season of quiet under Egyptian rule, till the reign of Antiochus (III.) the Great, when it again passed temporarily, and under his successor, Seleucus IV. (Philopator), {187-175.} permanently under Syrian dominion. In the troublous times of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, {175-164.} the Samaritans escaped the fate of the Jews by repudiating all connection with Israel, and dedicating their temple to Jupiter. {According to *Jos. Ant.* 12:5, 5; ἐλλύνιος according to 2 Macc. 6:2 2, ξένιος} In the contest between Syria and the Maccabees which followed, the Samaritans, as might be expected, took the part of the former. In 130 B. C. John Hyrcanus destroyed the Temple on Mount Gerizim,^{f948} which was never rebuilt. The city of Samaria was taken several years afterwards {Between 113 and 105.}^{f949} by the sons of Hyrcanus (Antigonos and Aristobulus), after a

year's siege, and the successive defeat of Syrian and Egyptian armies of relief. Although the city was now not only destroyed, but actually laid under water to complete its ruin, it was rebuilt by Gabinius shortly before our era, {Ant 14:5. 3.} and greatly enlarged and beautified by Herod, who called it Sebaste in honor of Augustus, to whom he reared a magnificent temple. {Ant. 20:8. 5; Jewish War 1:21. 2.} Under Roman rule the city enjoyed great privileges, had even a Senate of its own. {Ant. 18:4. 2.} By one of those striking coincidences which mark the Rule of God in history. it was the accusation brought against him by that Samaritan Senate which led to the deposition of Pilate. By the side of Samaria, or Sebaste, we have already marked as perhaps more important, and as the religious capital, the ancient Shechem, which, in honor of the Imperial family of Rome, ultimately obtained the name of Flavor Nepalese, which has survived in the modern Nablus. It is interesting to notice that the Samaritans also had colonies, although not to the same extent as the Jews. Among them we may name those of Alexandria, Damascus, in Babylonia, and even some by the shores of the Red Sea.^{f950}

Although not only in the New Testament, but in 1 Macc. 10:30, and in the writings of Josephus, {See specially War 3:3. 4, 5.} Western Palestine is divided into the provinces of Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee, the Rabbis, whose ideas were shaped by the observances of Judaism, ignore this division. For them Palestine consisted only of Judaea, Peraea, and Galilee. {For ex. Baba B. 3:2.} Samaria appears merely as a strip intervening between Judaea and Galilee, being 'the land of the Cuthaeans.' {For ex. Jer. Chag. 3:4.} Nevertheless, it was not regarded like heathen lands, but pronounced clean. Both the Mishnah {Gitt. 7:7.} and Josephus {War 3:3. 4, 5.} mark *Anuath* (yantw[rpk]) as the southern boundary of Samaria (towards Judae). Northward it extended to Ginaea (the ancient En-Gannim) on the south side of the plain of Jezreel; on the east it was bounded by the Jordan; and on the west by the plain of Sharon, which was reckoned as belonging to Judaea. Thus it occupied the ancient territories of Manasseh and Ephraim, and extended about forty-eight miles (north and south) by forty (east and west). In aspect and climate it resembled Judaea, only that the scenery was more beautiful and the soil more fertile. The political enmity and religious separation between the Jews and Samaritans account for their mutual jealousy. On all public occasions the Samaritans took the part hostile to the Jews, while they seized every opportunity of injuring and insulting them. Thus, in the time of Antiochus III. they sold

many Jews into slavery. {Ant. 12:4.1.} Afterwards they sought to mislead the Jews at a distance, to whom the beginning of every month (so important in the Jewish festive arrangements) was intimated by beacon fires, by kindling spurious signals. {Rosh haSh. 2:2.} We also read that they tried to desecrate the Temple on the eve of the Passover; {Ant. 18:2. 2.} and that they waylaid and killed pilgrims on their road to Jerusalem. {Ant. 20:6. 1.} The Jews retaliated by treating the Samaritans with every mark of contempt; by accusing them of falsehood, folly, and irreligion; and, what they felt most keenly, by disowning them as of the same race or religion, and this in the most offensive terms of assumed superiority and self-righteous fanaticism.

In view of these relations, we almost wonder at the candor and moderation occasionally displayed towards the Samaritans in Jewish writings. These statements are of practical importance in this history, since elaborate attempts have been made to show what articles of food the disciples of Jesus might have bought in Samaria, in ignorance that almost all would have been lawful. Our inquiry here is, however, somewhat complicated by the circumstance that in Rabbinic writings, as at present existing, the term *Samaritans* (*Cuthim*^{f951}) has, to avoid the censorship of the press, been often purposely substituted for ‘Sadducees,’ or ‘heretics,’ *i.e.* Christians.^{f952} Thus, when {In Sanh. 90 *b.*} the Samaritans are charged with denying in their books that the Resurrection can be proved from the Pentateuch, the real reference is supposed to have been to Sadducean or Christian heretical writings. Indeed, the terms Samaritans, Sadducees, and heretics are used so interchangeably, that a careful inquiry is necessary, to show in each case which of them is really meant. Still more frequent is the use of the term ‘Samaritan’ (*ytwk*) for ‘stranger’ (*yrkn*), the latter, and not strictly Samaritan descent being meant.^{f953} The popular interchange of these terms casts light on the designation of the Samaritan as ‘a stranger’ by our Lord in St. ^{<21718>}Luke 17:18.

In general it may be said that, while on certain points Jewish opinion remained always the same, the judgment passed on the Samaritans, and especially as to intercourse with them, varied, according as they showed more or less active hostility towards the Jews. Thus the Son of Sirach would correctly express the feeling of contempt and dislike, when he characterized the Samaritans as ‘the foolish people’ which his ‘heart abhorred.’ {Ecclus. 1. 25, 26.} The same sentiment appears in early Christian Pseudepigraphic and in Rabbinic writings. In the so-called

‘Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs’ (which probably dates from the beginning of the second century), ‘Sichem’ is the City of Fools, derided by all men. {Test. Levi. 7} It was only natural, that Jews should be forbidden to respond by an *Amen* to the benediction of Samaritans, at any rate till they were sure it had been correctly spoken, {Ber. 8:8.} since they were neither in practice nor in theory regarded as co-religionists. {Sheq. 1:5.} ^{f954} Yet they were not treated as heathens, and their land, their springs, baths, houses, and roads were declared clean. {Jer. Abhod. Z. 5:4, p. 44 d.}

The question was discussed, whether or not they were to be considered ‘lion-proselytes’ (from fear of the lions), or as genuine converts; {Sanh. 85 b; Chull. 3 b; Kidd, 75 b.} and, again, whether or not they were to be regarded as heathens. {Jer. Sheq. 46 b.} This, and the circumstance that different teachers at different times gave directly opposite replies to these questions, proves that there was no settled principle on the subject, but that opinions varied according to the national bearing of the Samaritans. Thus, we are expressly told, {Jer. Demai 3:4.} that at one time both their testimony and their religious orthodoxy were more credited than at others, and they are not treated as Gentiles, but placed on the same level as an ignorant Jew. A marked difference of opinion here prevails. The older tradition, as represented by Simon the son of Gamaliel, regards them as in every respect like Israelites; {Comp. also Jer. Dem. 6:11; Jer. Ber. 7:1; and Jer. Keth. 27 a.} whilst later authority (Rabbi Jehuda the Holy) would have them considered and treated as heathens. Again, it is expressly stated in the Babylon Talmud, {Ber. 47 b.} that the Samaritans observed the letter of the Pentateuch, while one authority adds, that in that which they observed they were more strict than the Jews themselves. {Comp. Chull. 4 a.} Of this, indeed, there is evidence as regards several ordinances. On the other hand, later authorities again reproach them with falsification of the Pentateuch, charge them with worshipping them with falsification of the Pentateuch, charge them with worshipping a dove, {Chull. 6 a.} and even when, on further inquiry, they absolve them from this accusation, ascribe their excessive veneration for Mount Gerizim to the circumstance that they worshipped the idols which Jacob had buried under the oak at Shechem. To the same hatred, caused by national persecution, we must impute such expressions as {Chull. 104 c.} that he, whose hospitality receives a foreigner, has himself to blame if his children have to go into captivity.

The expression, ‘the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans,’ {St. ~~John~~ John 4:9.} finds its exact counterpart {Megill. 2.} in this: ‘May I never

set eyes on a Samaritan;' or else, 'May I never be thrown into company with him!' A Rabbi in Caesarea explains, as the cause of these changes of opinion, that formerly the Samaritans had been observant of the Law, which they no longer were; a statement repeated in another form to the effect, that their observance of it lasted as long as they were in their own cities. {Jer. Abhod. Zar. 5:4.} Matters proceeded so far, that they were entirely excluded from fellowship. {Chull. 6 a.} The extreme limit of this direction, {Shebhyith 8:10.} if, indeed, the statement applies to the Samaritans, ^{f955} is marked by the declaration, that to partake of their bread was like eating swine's flesh. This is further improved upon in a later Rabbinic work, {Yalkut 2 p. 36 d.} which gives a detailed story of how the Samaritans had conspired against Ezra and Nehemiah, and the ban been laid upon them, so that now not only was all intercourse with them forbidden, but their bread declared like swine's flesh; proselytes were not to be received from them; nor would they have part in the Resurrection of the dead. ^{f956} But there is a great difference between all this extravagance and the opinions prevailing at the time of Jesus. Even in the Rabbinic tractate on the Samaritans {Massecheth Kuthim, in Kirchheim, Septem Libri parvi Talmudici, pp. 31-36.} it is admitted, that in most of their usages they resembled Israelites, and many rights and privileges are conceded to them, from which a heathen would have been excluded. They are to be 'credited' on many points; their meat is declared clean, if an Israelite had witnessed its killing, or a Samaritan ate of it; {Chull. 3 b.} their bread ^{f957} and, under certain conditions, even their wine, are allowed; and the final prospect is held out of their reception into the Synagogue, when they shall have given up their faith in Mount Gerizim, and acknowledged Jerusalem and the Resurrection of the dead. But Jewish toleration went even further. At the time of Christ all their food was declared lawful. {Jer. Abhod. Zar. 5:4.} There could, therefore, be no difficulty as regarded the purchase of victuals on the part of the disciples of Jesus.

It has already been stated, that most of the peculiar doctrines of the Samaritans were derived from Jewish sources. As might be expected, their tendency was Sadducean rather than Pharisaic. ^{f958} Nevertheless, Samaritan 'sages' are referred to. {Gitt. 10 b; Nidd. 33 b.} But it is difficult to form any decided opinion about the doctrinal views of the sect, partly from the comparative lateness of their literature, and partly because the Rabbinist charges against them cannot be absolutely trusted. It seems at least

doubtful, whether they really denied the Resurrection, as asserted by the Rabbis, {Siphre on ^{<04153>}Numbers 15:31; Sanh. 90 *b.*} from whom the Fathers have copied the charge. ^{f959} Certainly, they hold that doctrine at present. They strongly believed in the Unity of God; they held the doctrine of Angels and devils; ^{f960} they received the Pentateuch as of sole Divine authority; ^{f961} they regarded Mount Gerizim as the place chosen of God, maintaining that it alone had not been covered by the flood, as the Jews asserted of Mount Moriah; they were most strict and zealous in what of Biblical or traditional Law they received; and lastly, and most important of all, they looked for the coming of a Messiah, in Whom the promise would be fulfilled, that the Lord God would raise up a Prophet from the midst of them, like unto Moses, in Whom his words were to be, and unto Whom they should hearken. {^{<04185>}Deuteronomy 18:15, 18.} ^{f962} Thus, while, in some respects, access to them would be more difficult than to His own countrymen, yet in others Jesus would find there a soil better prepared for the Divine Seed, or, at least, less encumbered by the thistles and tares of traditionalism and Pharisaic bigotry.

CHAPTER 8

JESUS AT THE WELL OF SYCHAR

(St. ~~401~~ John 4:1-42.)

THERE is not a district in 'the Land of Promise' which presents a scene more fair or rich than the plain of Samaria (the modern *El Mukhna*). As we stand on the summit of the ridge, on the way from Shiloh, the eye travels over the wide sweep, extending more than seven miles northward, till it rests on the twin heights of Gerizim and Ebal, which enclose the valley of Shechem. Following the straight olive-shaded road from the south, to where a spur of Gerizim, jutting south-east, forms the Vale of Shechem, we stand by that 'Well of Jacob' to which so many sacred memories attach. Here, in 'the parcel of ground' afterwards given to Joseph, ^{f963} which Jacob had brought from the people of the land, the patriarch had, at great labor and cost, sunk a well through the limestone rock. At present it is partially filled with rubbish and stones, but originally it must have gone down about 150 feet. ^{f964} as the whole district abounds in springs, the object of the patriarch must have been to avoid occasion of strife with the Amorite herdsmen around. That well marks the boundary of the Great Plain, or rather its extensions bear other names. To the left (westwards), between Gerizim (on the south) and Ebal (on the north), winds the valley of olive-clad Shechem, the modern Nablus, though that town is not in view from the Well of Sychar. Still higher up the same valley, the mud hovels of *Sebastiyeh* mark the site of ancient Samaria, the magnificent Sebaste of Herod. North of the entrance to the Vale of Shechem rises Mount Ebal, which also forms, so to speak, the western wall of the northern extension of the Plain of Samaria. Here it bears the name of *El 'Askar*, from Askar, the ancient Sychar, which nestles at the foot of Ebal, at a distance of about two miles from Shechem. Similarly, the eastern extension of the plain bears the name of the Valley of Shalem, from the hamlet of that name, which probably occupies the site of the ancient city before which Jacob pitched his tent on his return to Canaan. {~~01318~~ Genesis 33:18, 19.}


At 'the Well of Jacob' which, for our present purpose, may be regarded as the center of the scene, several ancient Roman roads meet and part. That southward, to which reference has already been made, leads close by

Shiloh to Jerusalem; that westward traverses the vale of Shechem; that northward brings us to the ancient Sychar, only about half a mile from ‘the Well.’ Eastward there are two ancient Roman roads: one winds south-east, till it merges in the main road; the other strikes first due east, and then descends in a south-easterly direction through *Wady Farah*, which debouches into the Jordan. We can trace it as it crosses the waters of that Wady, and we infer, that its immediate neighborhood must have been the scene where Jesus had taught, and His disciples baptized. It is still in Judaea, and yet sufficiently removed from Jerusalem; and the Wady is so full of springs that one spot near it actually bears the name of ‘*Ainun*, ‘springs,’ like the ancient *AEnon*. But, from the spot which we have indicated, it is about twenty miles, across a somewhat difficult country to Jacob’s Well. It would be a long and toilsome day’s journey thither on a summer day, and we can understand how, at its end, Jesus would rest weary on the low parapet which enclosed the Well, while His disciples went to buy the necessary provisions in the neighboring Sychar.

And it was, as we judge, the evening of a day in early summer, ^{f965} when Jesus, accompanied by the small band which formed His disciples, ^{f966} emerged into the rich Plain of Samaria. Far as the eye could sweep, ‘the fields’ were ‘already white unto the harvest.’ They had reached ‘the Well of Jacob.’ There Jesus waited, while the others went to Sychar on their work of ministry. Probably John remained with the Master. They would scarcely have left Him alone, especially in that place; and the whole narrative reads like that of one who had been present at what passed. ^{f967} More than any other, perhaps, in the Fourth Gospel, it bears the mark, not only of Judaeian, but of contemporary authorship. It seems utterly incompatible with the modern theory of its Ephesian origin at the end of the second century. The location of the scene, not in Sebaste or Shechem, but at Sychar, ^{f968} which in the fourth century at least had so entirely ceased to be Samaritan, that it had become the home of some celebrated Rabbis; ^{f969} the intimate knowledge of Samaritan and Jewish relations, which at the time of Christ allowed the purchase of food, but would certainly not have conceded it two centuries later; even the introduction of such a statement as ‘Salvation is of the Jews,’ wholly inconsistent with the supposed scope of an Ephesian Gospel — these are only some of the facts which will occur to the student of that period, as bearing unsolicited testimony to the date and nationality of the writer.

Indeed, there is such minuteness of detail about the narrative, and with it such charm of simplicity, affectionateness, reverence, and depth of spiritual insight, as to carry not only the conviction of its truthfulness, but almost instinctively to suggest to us ‘the beloved disciple’ as its witness. Already he had taken the place nearest to Jesus and saw and spake as none other of the disciples. Jesus weary, and resting while the disciples go to but food, is not an Ephesian, but a truly Evangelic presentation of the Christ in His human weakness and want.

All around would awaken in the Divinely-attuned soul of the Divine Redeemer the thoughts which so soon afterwards found appropriate words and deeds. He is sitting by Jacob’s Well — the very well which the ancestor of Israel had digged, and left as a memorial of his first and symbolic possession of the land. Yet this was also the scene of Israel’s first rebellion against God’s order, against the Davidic line and the Temple. And now Christ is here, among those who are not of Israel, and who persecute it. Surely this, of all others, would be the place where the Son of David, cast out of Jerusalem and the Temple, would think of the breach, and of what alone could heal it. He is hungry, and those fields are white to the harvest; yet far more hungering for that spiritual harvest which is the food of His soul. Over against Him, sheer up 800 feet, rises Mount Gerizim, with the ruins of the Samaritan rival Temple on it; just as far behind Him, already overhung by the dark cloud of judgment, are that Temple and City which knew not the day of their visitation. The one inquiring woman, and she a Samaritan, and the few only partially comprehending and much misunderstanding disciples; their inward thinking that for the spiritual harvest it was but seed-time, and the reaping yet ‘four months distant,’ while in reality, as even their eyes might see if they but lifted them, the fields were white unto the harvest: all this, and much more, forms a unique background to the picture of this narrative.

To take another view of the varying lights on that picture: Jesus weary and thirsty by Jacob’s Well, and the water of life which was to spring from, and by that Well, with its unfailing supply and its unending refreshment! The spiritual in all this bears deepest symbolic analogy to the outward — yet with such contrasts also, as the woman giving to Christ the one, He to her the other; she unconsciously beginning to learn, He unintentionally (for He had not even entered Sychar) beginning to teach, and that, what He could not yet teach in Judaea, scarcely even to His own disciples; then the complete change in the woman, and the misapprehension {St.  John

4:33.} and non-reception {2:13-6:54.} of the disciples — and over it all the weary form of the Man Jesus, opening as the Divine Christ the well of everlasting life, the God-Man *satisfied* with the meat of doing the Will, and finishing the Work, of Him that sent Him: such are some of the thoughts suggested by the scene.

And still others rise, as we think of the connection in the narrative of St. John of this with what preceded and with what follows. It almost seems as if that Gospel were constructed in cycles, each beginning, or at least connected, with Jerusalem, and leading up to a grand climax. Thus, the first cycle {2:13-6:54.} might be called that of *purification*: first, that of the Temple; then, inward purification by the Baptism from above; next, the symbolic Baptism of water; lastly, the real water of life given by Jesus; and the climax — Jesus the Restorer of life to them that believe. Similarly, the second cycle, {y.-6:3.} beginning with the idea of water in its symbolic application to real worship and life from Jesus, would carry us a stage further; and so onward throughout the Gospel. Along with this we may note, as another peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel, that it seems arranged according to this definite plan of grouping together in each instance the *work* of Christ, as followed by the illustrative *word* of Christ. Thus the fourth would, both externally and internally, be the pre-eminently *Judoean* Gospel, characterized by cyclical *order*, illustrative *conjunction of work and word*, and progressively leading up to the grand climax of Christ's last discourses, and finally of His Death and Resurrection, with the teaching that flows from the one and the other.

It was about six o'clock in the evening,^{f970} when the travel-stained pilgrims reached that 'parcel of ground' which, according to ancient Jewish tradition, Jacob had given to his son Joseph.^{f971} Here (as already stated) by the 'Well of Jacob' where the three roads — south, to Shechem, and to Sychar (Askar) — meet and part, Jesus sat down, while the disciples (probably with the exception of John) went on to the closely adjoining little town of Sychar to buy food. Even this latter circumstance marks that it was evening, since noon was not the time either for the sale of provisions, nor for their purchase by travellers. Once more it is when the true Humanity of Jesus is set before us, in the weakness of His hunger and weariness,^{f972} that the glory of His Divine Personality suddenly shines through it. This time it was a poor, ignorant Samaritan woman,^{f973} who came, not for any religious purpose — indeed, to whom religious thought, except within her own very narrow circle, was almost unintelligible — who

became the occasion of it. She had come — like so many of us, who find the pearl in the field which we occupy in the business of everyday-life — on humble, ordinary duty and work. Men call it *common*; but there is nothing common and unclean that God has sanctified by making use of it, or which His Presence and teaching may transform into a vision from heaven.

There was another well (the ‘*Ain ‘Askar*’), on the east side of the little town, and much nearer to Sychar than ‘Jacob’s Well;’ and to it probably the women of Sychar generally resorted. It should also be borne in mind, that in those days such work no longer devolved, as in early times, on the matrons and maidens of fair degree, but on women in much humbler station. This Samaritaness may have chosen ‘Jacob’s Well,’ perhaps, because she had been at work in the fields close by; or else, because her abode was nearer in that direction, for the *ancient* Sychar may have extended southward; perhaps, because, if her character was what seems implied in verse 18, the concourse of the more common women at the village-well of an evening might scarcely be a pleasant place of resort to one with her history. In any case, we may here mark those Providential leadings in our everyday life, to which we are so often almost as much spiritually indebted, as to grace itself; which, indeed, form part of the dispensation of grace. Perhaps we should note how, all unconsciously to her (as so often to us), poverty and sin sometimes bring to the well by which Jesus sits weary, when on His return from self-righteous Judaea.

But these are only symbols; the barest facts of the narrative are themselves sufficiently full of spiritual interest. Both to Jesus and to the woman, the meeting was unsought, Providential in the truest sense — God-brought. Reverently, so far as the Christ is concerned, we add, that both acted truly — according to what was in them. The request: ‘Give Me to drink,’ was natural on the part of the thirsty traveller, when the woman had come to draw water, and they who usually ministered to Him were away. {ver. 8.} Even if He had not spoken, the Samaritaness would have recognized the Jew by His appearance^{f974} and dress, if, as seems likely, He wore the fringes on the border of His garment.^{f975} His speech would, by its pronunciation, place His nationality beyond doubt.^{f976} Any kindly address, conveying a request not absolutely necessary, would naturally surprise the woman; for, as the Evangelist explanatively adds: ‘Jews have no dealings with Samaritans,’^{f977} or rather, as the expression implies, no needless, friendly, nor familiar intercourse with them — a statement true at all times.

Besides, we must remember that this was an ignorant Samaritaness of the lower order. In the mind of such an one, two points would mainly stand out: that the Jews in their wicked pride would have no intercourse with them; and that Gerizim, not Jerusalem, as the Jews falsely asserted, was the place of rightful worship. It was, therefore, genuine surprise which expressed itself in the question: 'How is it, Thou, being a Jew, of me askest to drink?' It was the first lesson she learned, even before He taught her. Here was a Jew, not like ordinary Jews, not like what she had hitherto thought them: what was the cause of this difference?

Before we mark how the answer of Jesus met this very question, and so as to direct it to spiritual profit, another and more general reflection presses on our minds. Although Jesus may not have come to Sychar with the conscious purpose of that which ensued, yet, given the meeting with the Samaritan woman, what followed seems almost matter of necessity. For it is certain that the Christ, such as the Gospels describe Him, could not have been brought into contact with spiritual ignorance and want, any more than with physical distress, without offering it relief. It was, so to speak, a necessity, alike of His Mission and of His Nature (as the God-Man). In the language of another Gospel, 'power went out from Him;' and this, whether consciously sought, or unconsciously felt after in the stretching forth of the hands of the sightless or in the upward look of the speechless. The Incarnate Son of God could not but bring health and life amidst disease and death; the Savior had come to seek and to save that which was lost.

And so it was, that the 'How is it?' of the Samaritan women so soon, and so fully, found its answer. 'How is it?' In this, that He, Who had spoken to her, was not like what she thought and knew of the Jews. He was what Israel was intended to have become to mankind; what it was the final object of Israel to have been. In Him was God's gift to mankind. Had she but known it, the present relation between them would have been reversed; the Well of Jacob would have been a symbol, yet but a symbol, of the living water, which she would have asked and He given. As always, the seen is to Christ the emblem of the unseen and spiritual; Nature, that in and through which, in manifold and divers coloring, He ever sees the supernatural, even as the light lies in varying hues on the mountain, or glows in changeful coloring on the edge of the horizon. A view this of all things existent, which Hellenism, even in its sublimest poetic conception of creation as the impress of heavenly archetypes, has only materialized and reserved. But to Jesus it all pointed upward, because the God of Nature was the God of

Grace, the One Living and True God in Whom all matter and spirit lives, Whose world is one in design, workmanship, and purpose. And so nature was but the echo of God's heard Voice, which ever, to all and in all, speaks the same, if there be but listening ears. And so He would have it speak to men in parables, that, to them who see, it might be the Jacob's ladder leading from earth to heaven, while they, whose sight and hearing are bound in the sleep of heart-hardening, would see but not perceive, and hear but not understand.

It was with the ignorant woman of Sychar, as it had been with the learned 'Master in Israel.' As Nicodemus had seen, and yet not seen, so this Samaritaness. In the birth of which Jesus spoke, he had failed to apprehend the 'from above' and 'of the Spirit;' she now the thought suggested by the contrast between the cistern in the limerock and the well of living water. The 'How can these things be?' of Nicodemus finds its parallel in the bewilderment of the woman. Jesus had nothing wherewith to draw from the deep well. Whence, then, the 'living water'? To outward appearance there was a physical impossibility. This was one aspect of it. And yet, as Nicodemus' question not only similarly pointed to a physical impossibility, but also indicated dim searching after higher meaning and spiritual reality, so that of the woman: 'No! art Thou greater than our father Jacob?' who, at such labor, had dug this well, finding no other means than this of supplying his own wants and those of his descendants. Nor did the answer of Jesus now differ in spirit from that which He had given to the Rabbi of Jerusalem, though it lacked the rebuke, designed to show how thoroughly the religious system, of which Nicodemus was a teacher, failed in its highest object. But to this woman His answer must be much simpler and plainer than to the Rabbi. And yet, if it be Divine teaching, it cannot be quite plain, but must contain that which will point upward, and lead to further inquiry. And so the Divine Teacher explained, not only the difference between ordinary water and that of which He had spoken, but in a manner to bring her to the threshold of still higher truth. It was not water like that of Jacob's Well which He would give, but 'living water.' In the Old Testament a perennial spring had, in figurative language, been thus designated, { ¹⁰²⁵⁹Genesis 26:19; ¹⁸⁴⁴⁵Leviticus 14:5. } in significant contrast to water accumulated in a cistern. { ³⁴²¹³Jeremiah 2:13. } But there was more than this: it was water which for ever quenched the thirst, by meeting all the inward wants of the soul; water also, which, in him who had drunk of it, became a well, not merely quenching the thirst on this side time, but

‘springing up into everlasting life.’ It was not only the meeting of wants felt, but a new life, and that not essentially different, but the same as that of the future, and merging in it.

The question has sometimes been asked, to what Jesus referred by that well of living water springing up into everlasting life. Of the various strange answers given, that, surely, is almost the worst, which would apply it to the doctrine of Jesus, supporting such explanation by a reference to Rabbinic sayings in which doctrine is compared to ‘water.’ This is one of those not unfrequent instances in which Rabbinic references mislead rather than lead, being insufficiently known, imperfectly understood, or misapplied. It is quite true, that in many passages the teaching of the Rabbis is compared to *water*,^{f978} but never to a ‘well of water springing up.’ The difference is very great. For it is the boast of Rabbinism, that its disciples drink of the waters of their teachers; chief merit lies in receptiveness, not spontaneity, and higher praise cannot be given than that of being ‘a well-plastered cistern, which lets not out a drop of water,’ {Ab. 2:9.} and in that sense to ‘a spring whose waters ever grow stronger.’ But this is quite the opposite of what our Lord teaches. For, it is only true of what man can give when we read this (in Ecclesiastes 24:21): ‘They that drink me shall yet be thirsty.’^{f979} More closely related to the words of Christ is it, when we read {in Bar. 3:12.} of a ‘fountain of wisdom;’ while, in the Targum on ~~2014~~ Song of Solomon 4:14, ‘the words of the Law’ are likened ‘unto a well of living waters.’ The same idea was carried perhaps even further, when, at the Feast of Tabernacles, amidst universal rejoicing, water from Siloam was poured from a golden pitcher on the altar, as emblem of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.^{f980} But the saying of our Lord to the Samaritaness referred to neither to His teaching, nor to the Holy Ghost, nor yet to faith, but to the gift of that new spiritual life in Him, of which faith is but the outcome.

If the humble, ignorant Samaritaness had formerly not seen, though she had imperfectly guessed, that there was a higher meaning in the words of Him Who spake to her, a like mixture of ill-apprehension and rising faith seems to underlie her request for this water, that she might thirst no more, neither again come thither to draw.^{f981} She now believes in the incredible; believes it, because of Him and in Him; believes, also, in a satisfaction through Him of outward wants, reaching up beyond this to the everlasting life. But all these elements are yet in strange confusion. Those who know how difficult it is to lodge any new idea in the mind of uneducated rustics in our own

land, after all our advantages of civilizing contact and education, will understand, how utterly at a loss this Samaritan countrywoman must have been to grasp the meaning of Jesus. But He taught, not as we teach. And thus He reached her heart in that dimly conscious longing which she expressed, though her intellect was incapable of distinguishing the new truth.

Surely, it is a strange mistake to find in her words {ver. 15.} ‘a touch of irony,’ while, on the other hand, it seems an exaggeration to regard them simply as the cry of realized spiritual need. Though reluctantly, a somewhat similar conclusion is forced upon us with reference to the question of Jesus about the woman’s husband, her reply, and the Savior’s rejoinder. It is difficult to suppose, that Christ asked the woman to call her husband with the primary object of awakening in her a sense of sin. This might follow, but the text gives no hint of it. Nor does anything in the bearing of the woman indicate any such effect; indeed, her reply {ver. 19.} and her after-reference to it {ver. 29.} rather imply the contrary. We do not even know for certain, whether the five previous husbands had died or divorced her, and, if the latter, with whom the blame lay, although not only the peculiar mode in which our Lord refers to it, but the present condition of the woman, seem to point to a sinful life in the past. In Judaea a course like hers would have been almost impossible; but we know too little of the social and moral condition of Samaria to judge of what might there be tolerated. On the other hand, we have abundant evidence that, when the Savior so unexpectedly laid open to her a past, which He could only supernaturally have known, the conviction at once arose in her that He was a Prophet, just as in similar circumstances it had been forced upon Nathanael. {St. ~~John~~ John 1:48, 49.} But to be a Prophet meant to a Samaritan that He was the Messiah, since they acknowledged none other after Moses. Whether or not the Messiah was known by the present Samaritan designation of Him as ‘the Converter’ and ‘the Returner’ (Restorer?), is of comparatively small importance, though, if we felt certain of this, the influence of the new conviction on the mind of the woman would appear even more clearly. In any case it was an immense, almost immeasurable, advance, when this Samaritan recognized in the stranger Jew, Who had first awakened within her higher thoughts, and pointed her to spiritual and eternal realities, the Messiah, and this on the strength of evidence the most powerfully convincing to a mind like hers: that of telling

her, suddenly and startlingly, what He could not have known, except through higher than human means of information.

It is another, and much more difficult question, why Jesus should have asked for the presence of her husband. The objection, that to do so, knowing the while that she had no husband, seems unworthy of our Lord, may, indeed, be answered by the consideration, that such ‘proving’ of those who were in His training was in accordance with His mode of teaching, leading upwards by a series of moral questions. {Comp St. ^{<B16}John 6:6.} But perhaps a more simple explanation may offer even a better reply. It seems, as if the answer of verse 15 marked the utmost limit of the woman’s comprehension. We can scarcely form an adequate notion of the narrowness of such a mental horizon as hers. This also explains, at least from one aspect, the reason of His speaking to her about His own Messiahship, and the worship of the future, in words far more plain than He used to His own disciples. None but the plainest statements could she grasp; and it is not unnatural to suppose that, having reached the utmost limits of which she was capable, the Savior now asked for her husband, in order that, through the introduction of another so near to her, the horizon might be enlarged. This is also substantially the view of some of the Fathers.^{f982} But, if Christ was in earnest in asking for the presence of her husband, it surely cannot be irreverent to add, that at that moment the peculiar relationship between the man and the woman did not stand out before His mind. Nor is there anything strange in this. The man was, and was not, her husband. Nor can we be sure that, although unmarried, the relationship involved anything absolutely contrary to the law; and to all intents the man might be known as her husband. The woman’s answer at once drew the attention of the Christ to this aspect of her history, which immediately stood out fully before His Divine knowledge. At the same time her words seemed like a confession — perhaps we should say, a concession to the demands of her own conscience, rather than a confession. Here, then, was the required opportunity, both for carrying further truth to her mind, by proving to her that He Who spake to her was a Prophet, and at the same time for reaching her heart.

But whether or not this view of the history be taken, it is difficult to understand, how any sober interpreter could see in the five husbands of the woman either a symbolical, or a mythical, reference to the five deities whom the ancestors of the Samaritans worshipped, {^{<1734}2 Kings 17:24 etc.} the spurious service of Jehovah representing the husband, yet no

husband, of the woman. It is not worth while discussing this strange suggestion from any other than the mythical standpoint. Those who regard the incidents of the Gospel-narratives as myths, having their origin in Jewish ideas, are put to even greater straits by the whole of this narrative than they who regard this Gospel as of Ephesian authorship. We may put aside the general objections raised by *Strauss*, since none of his successors has ventured seriously to urge them. It is more important to notice, how signally the author of the mythical theory has failed in suggesting any historical basis for this 'myth.' To speak of meetings at the well, such as those with Rebekah or Zipporah, is as much beside the question as an appeal to Jewish expectancy of an omniscient Messiah. Out of these two elements almost any story might be constructed. Again, to say that this story of Jesus' success among the Samaritans was invented, in order to vindicate the later activity of the Apostles among that people, is simply to beg the whole question. In these straits so distinguished a writer as *Keim* ^{f983} has hazarded the statement: 'The meeting with the Samaritaness has, for every one who has eyes, only a symbolical meaning, by the side of which no historical fact exists.' An assertion this, which is perhaps best refuted by being simply quoted. ^{f984} On the other hand, of all the myths likely to enter into Jewish imagination, the most unlikely would be one representing the Christ in familiar converse with a woman, and she a Samaritan, offering to her a well of water springing into everlasting life, and setting before her a spiritual worship of which Jerusalem was not the center. Where both the Ephesian and the mythical theory so signally fail, shall we not fall back upon the natural explanation, borne out by the simplicity and naturalness of the narrative — that the story here related is real and true? And, if so, shall we not all the more thankfully gather its lessons?

The conviction, sudden but firm, that He Who had laid open the past to her was really a Prophet, *was already faith in Him*; and so the goal had been attained — not, perhaps, faith in His Messiahship, about which she might have only very vague notions, but *in Him*. And faith in the Christ, not in anything about Him, but in Himself, *has* eternal life. Such faith also leads to further inquiry and knowledge. As it has been the traditional practice to detect irony in this or that saying of the woman, or else to impute to her spiritual feelings far in advance of her possible experience, so, on the other hand, has her inquiry about the place of proper worship, Jerusalem or Gerizim, been unduly depreciated. It is indeed too true that those, whose

consciences are touched by a presentation of their sin, often seek to turn the conversation into another and quasi-religious channel. But of neither the one nor the other is there evidence in the present case. Similarly, it is also only too true, that their one point of difference is, to narrow-minded sectarians, their all-in-all of religion. But in this instance we feel that the woman has no after-thought, no covert purpose in what she asks. All her life long she had heard that Gerizim was the mount of worship, the holy hill which the waters of the Flood had never covered, ^{f985} and that the Jews were in deadly error. But here was an undoubted Prophet, and He a Jew. Were they then in error about the right place of worship, and what was she to think, and to do? To apply with such a question to Jesus was already to find the right solution, even although the question itself might indicate a lower mental and religious standpoint. It reminds us of the inquiry which the healed Naaman put to Elisha about the Temple of Rimmon, and of his request for a mule's burden of earth from the land of the True God, and for true worship.

Once more the Lord answers her question by leading her far beyond it — beyond all controversy: even on to the goal of all His teaching. So marvellously does He speak to the simple in heart. It is best here to sit at the feet of Jesus, and, realizing the scene, to follow as His Finger points onwards and upwards. 'There cometh an hour, when neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, ye shall worship the Father.' Words of sad warning, these; words of prophecy also, that already pointed to the higher solution in the worship of a common Father, which would be the worship neither of Jews nor of Samaritans, but of children. And yet there was truth in their present differences. 'Ye worship ye know not what: we worship what we know, since salvation is from out of the Jews.' ^{f986} The Samaritan was aimless worship, because it wanted the goal of all the Old Testament institutions, that Messiah 'Who was to be of the seed of David' { ~~ROM~~ Romans 1:3. } — for, of the Jews, 'as concerning the flesh,' was Christ to come. { ~~ROM~~ Romans 9:5. } But only of present interest could such distinctions be; for an hour would come, nay — already was, when the true worshippers would 'worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father also seeketh such for His worshippers. Spirit is God' ^{f987} — and only worship in spirit and in truth could be acceptable to such a God.

Higher or more Christ-like teaching than this could not be uttered. And she who heard, thus far understood it, that in the glorious picture, which was set before her, she saw the coming of the Kingdom of the Messiah. 'I know

that Messiah cometh. ^{f988} When He cometh, He will tell us all things.' It was then that, according to the need of that untutored woman, He told her plainly what in Judaea, and even by His disciples, would have been carnally misinterpreted and misapplied: that He was the Messiah. So true is it, that 'babes' can receive what often must remain long hidden 'from the wise and prudent.'

It was the crowning lesson of that day. Nothing more could be said; nothing more need be said. The disciples had returned from Sychar. That Jesus should converse with a woman, was so contrary to all Judaeen notions of a Rabbi, ^{f989} that they wondered. Yet, in their reverence for Him, they dared not ask any questions. Meanwhile the woman, forgetful of her errand, and only conscious of that new well-spring of life which had risen within her, had left the unfilled waterpot by the Well, and hurried into 'the City.' They were strange tidings which she brought; the very mode for her announcement affording evidence of their truth: 'Come, see a man who told me all that I have done. No — is this the Christ?' We are led to infer, that these strange tidings soon gathered many around her; that infer, that these strange tidings soon gathered many around her; that they questioned, and, as they ascertained from her the indisputable fact of His superhuman knowledge, believed on Him, so far as the woman could set Him before them as object of faith. {vv. 39, 40.} Under this impression 'they went out of the City, and came on their way towards Him. {ver. 30.} ^{f990}

Meantime the disciples had urged the Master to eat of the food which they had brought. But His Soul was otherwise engaged. Thoughts were present of the glorious future, of a universal worship of the Father by those whom He had taught, and of which He had just seen such unexpected earnest. These mingled with feelings of pain at the spiritual dulness of those by whom He was surrounded, who could see in that conversation with a Samaritan woman nothing but a strange innovation on Rabbinic custom and dignity, and now thought of nothing beyond the immediate errand on which they had gone to Sychar. Even His words of rebuke only made them wonder whether, unknown to them, some one had brought Him food. It was not the only, nor the last, instance of their dulness to spiritual realities. {St. ~~416~~ Matthew 16:6, 7.}

Yet with Divine patience He bore with them: 'My meat is, that I may do the Will of Him that sent Me, and that I may accomplish (bring to a perfect end) His work.' To the disciples that work appeared still in the far future.

To them it seemed as yet little more than seed-time; the green blade was only sprouting; the harvest of such a Messianic Kingdom as they expected was still months distant. To correct their mistake, the Divine Teacher, as so often, and as best adapted to His hearers, chose His illustration from what was visible around. To show their meaning more clearly, we venture to reverse the order of the sentences which Jesus spoke: 'Behold, I say unto you, lift up your eyes and look [observantly] at the fields, that they are white to the harvest. [But] do ye not say (viz. in your hearts ^{f991}) that there are yet four months, and the harvest cometh?' The words will appear the more striking, if (with Professor Westcott) we bear in mind that, perhaps at that very moment, the Samaritans, coming to Him from Sychar, were appearing in sight.

But we also regard it as marking the time, when this conversation took place. Generally the words, 'yet four months, and then cometh the harvest,' are regarded either as a proverbial expression, or as indicating, that the Lord spake at the Well of Jacob four months before the harvest-time — that is, about the month of January, if the barley-harvest, or in February, if the wheat-harvest, was meant. The suggestion that it was a proverb may be dismissed, first, because there is not a trace of such a proverb, and then because, to give it even the scantiest meaning, it is necessary to supply: 'Between seed-time and harvest there are four months,' which is not true, since in Palestine about six months intervene between them. On the other hand, for reasons explained in another place, ^{f992} we conclude, that it could not have been January or February. when Jesus was in Sychar. But why not reverse the common theory, and see in the second clause, introduced by the words, 'Behold! lift up your eyes and observe,' a mark of the time and circumstances; while the expression, 'Do ye not say, There are yet four months, and they cometh harvest,' would be understood as parabolically spoken? Admittedly, one of the two clauses is a literal mark of time, and the other is spoken parabolically. But there is no reason why the second clause may not mark the time, while on independent grounds we must conclude, ^{f993} that Christ returned from Judaea to Galilee in the early summer.

Passing from this point, we notice how the Lord further unfolded His own lesson of present harvesting, and their inversion of what was sowing, and what reaping time. 'Already' ^{f994} he that reaped received wages, and gathered fruit unto eternal life (which is the real reward of the Great Reaper, the seeing of the travail of His soul), so that in this instance the

sower rejoiced equally ^{f995} as the reaper. And, in this respect, the otherwise cynical proverb, that one was the sower, another the reaper of his sowing, found a true application. It was indeed so, that the servants of Christ were sent to reap what others had sown, and to enter into their labor. One had sowed, another would reap. And yet, as in this instance of the Samaritans, the sower would rejoice as well as the reaper; nay, both would rejoice together, in the gathered fruit unto eternal life. And so the sowing in tears is on the spiritual field often mingled with the harvest of gladness, and to the spiritual view both are really one. ‘Four months’ do not intervene between them; so that, although one may sow and another reap, yet the sower seeth that harvest for which the harvester gets wages, and rejoices with him in the fruit which is gathered into the eternal storehouse.

It was as Christ had said. The Samaritans, who believed ‘because of the word’ (speech) ‘of the woman as she testified’ of the Christ, ‘when they came’ to that well, ‘asked Him to abide with them. And He abode there two days. And many more believed because of His own word (speech, discourse), and said unto the woman: No longer because of thy speaking ^{f996} do we believe. For we ourselves have heard, and know, that this is truly the Savior of the world.’ ^{f997}

We know not what passed these two days. Apparently no miracles were wrought, but those of His Word only. It was the deepest and purest truth they learned, these simple men of simple faith, who had not learned of man, but listened to His Word only. The sower as well as the reaper rejoiced, and rejoiced together. Seed-time and harvest mingled, when for themselves they knew and confessed, that this was truly the Savior of the world.

CHAPTER 9

THE SECOND VISIT TO CANA — CURE OF THE 'NOBLEMAN'S' SON AT CAPERNAUM

(St. ^{<0412>}Matthew 4:12; St. ^{<0414>}Mark 1:14; St. ^{<0414>}Luke 4:14, 15;
St. ^{<0415>}John 4:43-54.)

THE brief harvest in Samaria was, as Jesus had indicated to His disciples, in another sense also the beginning of sowing-time, or at least that when the green blade first appeared above ground. It formed the introduction to that Galilean ministry, when 'the Galileans received Him, having seen all the things that He did at Jerusalem at the Feast.' {St. ^{<0415>}John 4:45.} Nay, in some respects, it was the real beginning of His Work also, which, viewed as separate and distinct, commenced when the Baptist was cast into prison. ^{f998} Accordingly, this circumstance is specially marked by St. Matthew, {St. ^{<0412>}Matthew 4:12.} and by St. Mark, {St. ^{<0414>}Mark 1:14.} while St. Luke, as if to give greater emphasis to it, abruptly connects this beginning of Christ's sole and separate Work with the history of the Temptation. {St. ^{<0411>}Luke 4:11.} All that intervened seems to him but introductory, that 'beginning' which might be summed up by the words, 'in the power of the Spirit,' with which he describes His return to Galilee. In accordance with this view, Christ is presented as taking up the message of His Forerunner, {St. ^{<0417>}Matthew 4:17.} only with wider sweep, since, instead of adding to His announcement of the Kingdom of Heaven and call to repentance that to a Baptism of preparation, He called those who heard Him to 'believe the Gospel' which He brought them. {St. ^{<0415>}Mark 1:15.}

But here also — as Eusebius had already noted ^{f999} — the Fourth Gospel, in its more comprehensive presentation of the Christ, as adding, not merely in the external succession of events, but in their internal connection, feature to feature in the portraiture of the Divine Redeemer, supplies the gap in the Synoptic narratives, which so often read only like brief historical summaries, with here and there special episodes or reports of teaching inserted. For St. John not only tells us of that early Ministry, which the Synoptists designedly pass over, but while, like them, referring to the captivity of John as the occasion of Christ's withdrawal from the machinations of the Pharisaic party in Judaea, he joins this departure from

Judaea with the return to Galilee by supplying, as connecting link, the brief stay in Samaria with its eventful results. St. John, also, alone supplies the first-recorded event of this Galilean ministry. {St. ~~4048~~ John 4:43-54.} We therefore follow his guidance, simply noting that the various stages of this Galilean residence should be grouped as follows: Cana, {St. ~~4045~~ John 4:45-54.} Nazareth, {St. ~~4046~~ Luke 4:16-30.} and Capernaum, with general itineration from that center. {St. ~~4043~~ Matthew 4:13-17; St. ~~4014~~ Mark 1:14, 15; St. ~~4048~~ Luke 4:31, 32.} The period occupied, by what is thus briefly indicated in the Gospels, was from early summer, say, the beginning of June, to the unnamed 'feast of the Jews.' {St. ~~4048~~ John 5:1.} If it is objected, that the events seem too few for a period of about three months, the obvious answer is, that, during most of this time, Jesus was in great measure unattended, since the call of the Apostles {St. ~~4048~~ Matthew 4:18-22 etc.} only took place *after* the 'unnamed feast,' that, indeed, they had probably returned to their homes and ordinary occupations when Jesus went to Nazareth, {St. ~~4046~~ Luke 4:16.} and that therefore, not having themselves been eye-witnesses of what had passed, they confined themselves to a general summary. At the same time, St. Luke expressly marks that Jesus taught in the various Synagogues of Galilee, {St. ~~4045~~ Luke 4:15.} and also that He made a longer stay in Capernaum. {St. ~~4048~~ Luke 4:31; comp. St. ~~4043~~ Matthew 4:13-16.}

When Jesus returned to Galilee, it was in circumstances entirely different from those under which He had left it. As He Himself said, {St. ~~4044~~ John 4:44.} there had, perhaps naturally, been prejudices connected with the humbleness of His upbringing, and the familiarity engendered by knowledge ^{f1000} of His home-surroundings. These were overcome, when the Galileans had witnessed at the feast in Jerusalem, what He had done. Accordingly, they were now prepared to receive Him with the reverent attention which His Word claimed. We may conjecture, that it was partially for reasons such as these that He first bent His steps to Cana. The miracle, which had there been wrought, {St. ~~4048~~ John 2:1-11.} would still further prepare the people for His preaching. Besides, this was the home of Nathanael, who had probably followed Him to Jerusalem, and in whose house a glad some homage of welcome would now await Him. It was here that the second recorded miracle of His Galilean ministry was wrought, with what effect upon the whole district, may be judged from the expectancies which the fame of it excited even in Nazareth, the city of His early upbringing {St. ~~4043~~ Luke 4:23.}

It appears that the son of one of Herod Antipas' officers, either civil or military,^{f1001} was sick, and at the point of death. When tidings reached the father that the Prophet, or more than Prophet, Whose fame had preceded Him to Galilee, had come to Cana, he resolved, in his despair of other means, to apply to Him for the cure of His child. Nothing can be gained for the spiritual interest of this or any other Biblical narrative, by exaggeration; but much is lost, when the historical demands of the case are overlooked. It is not from any disbelief in the supernatural agency at work, that we insist on the natural and rational sequence of events. And having done so, we can all the more clearly mark, by the side of the natural, the distinctively higher elements at work. Accordingly, we do not assume that this 'court-officer' was actuated by spiritual belief in the Son of God, when applying to Him for help. Rather would we go to almost the opposite extreme, and regard him as simply actuated by what, in the circumstances, might be the views of a devout Jew. Instances are recorded in the Talmud, which may here serve as our guide. Various cases are related in which those seriously ill, and even at the point of death, were restored by the prayers of celebrated Rabbis. One instance is specially illustrative. {Ber. 34 *b*; Jer. Ber. 9 *d*.} We read that, when the son of Rabban Gamaliel was dangerously ill, he sent two of his disciples to one Chanina ben Dosa to entreat his prayers for the restoration of his son. On this, Chanina is said to have gone up to the *Aliyah* (upper chamber) to pray. On his return, he assured the messengers that the young man was restored, grounding his confidence, not on the possession of any prophetic gift, but on the circumstance that he knew his request was answered from the freedom he had in prayer. The messengers noted down the hour, and on their arrival at the house of Gamaliel found, that at that very hour 'the fever left him, and he asked for water.' Thus far the Rabbinic story. Even supposing that it was either invented or colored in imitation of the New Testament, it shows, at least, what a devout Jew might deem lawful to expect from a celebrated Rabbi, who was regarded as having power in prayer.

Having indicated the illustrated part of this story, we may now mark the contrast between it and the event in the Gospels. There restoration is not merely asked, but expected, and that, not in answer to prayer, but by Christ's Personal presence. But the great and vital contrast lies, alike in what was thought of Him Who was instrumental in the cure — performed it — and in the moral effects which it wrought. The history just quoted from the Talmud is immediately followed by another of similar import,

when a celebrated Rabbi accounts on this wise for his inability to do that in which Chanina had succeeded, that Chanina was like ‘a servant of the King,’ who went in and out familiarly, and so might beg favors; while he (the failing Rabbi) was ‘like a lord before the King,’ who would not be accorded mere favors, but discussed matters on a footing of equality. This profane representation of the relation between God and His servants, the utterly unspiritual view of prayer which it displays, and the daring self-exaltation of the Rabbi, surely mark sufficiently an absolute contrast in spirit between the Jewish view and that which underlies the Evangelic narrative.

Enough has been said to show, that the application to Jesus on the part of the ‘royal officer’ did not, in the peculiar circumstances, lie absolutely beyond the range of Jewish ideas. What the ‘court-officer’ exactly expected to be done, is a question secondary to that of his state of receptiveness, as it may be called, which was the moral condition alike of the outward help, and of the inward blessing which he received. One thing, however, it is of importance to notice. We must not suppose, that when, to the request that Jesus would come down to Capernaum to perform the cure, the Master replied, that unless they saw ^{f1002} signs and wonders they would not believe, He meant thereby to convey that his Jewish hearers, in opposition to the Samaritans, required ‘signs and wonders’ in order to believe. For the application of ‘the officer’ was itself an expression of faith, although imperfect. Besides, the cure, which was the object of the application, could not have been performed without a miracle. What the Savior reproved was not the request for a miracle, which was necessary, but the urgent plea that He should come down to Capernaum for that purpose, which the father afterwards so earnestly repeated. {ver. 49.} That request argued ignorance of the real character of the Christ, as if He were either merely a Rabbi endowed with special power, or else a miracle-monger. What He intended to teach this man was, that He, Who had life in Himself, could restore life at a distance as easily as by His Presence; by the word of his Power as readily as by personal application. A lesson this of the deepest importance, as regarded the Person of Christ; a lesson, also, of the widest application to us and for all circumstances, temporal and spiritual. When the ‘court-officer’ had learned this lesson, he became ‘obedient unto the faith,’ and ‘went his way,’ {ver. 50.} presently to find his faith both crowned and perfected. {ver. 53.} And when both ‘he and his house’ had learned that lesson, they would never afterwards think of the

Christ either as the Jews did, who simply witnessed His miracles, or unspiritually. It was the completion of that teaching which had first come to Nathanael, the first believer of Cana. {St. ^{f1006}John 1:6 50, 51.} So, also, is it when we have learned that lesson, that we come to know alike the meaning and the blessedness of believing in Jesus.

Indeed, so far as its moral import is concerned, the whole history turns upon this point. It also marks the fundamental difference between this and the somewhat similar history of the healing of the Centurion's servant in Capernaum. {St. ^{f1005}Matthew 8:5 etc.; St. ^{f1004}Luke 7:1 etc.} Critics have noticed marked divergences in almost every detail of the two narratives, ^{f1003} which some, both orthodox and negative interpreters — have so strangely represented as only different presentations of one and the same event. ^{f1004} But, besides these marked differences of detail, there is also fundamental difference in the substance of the narratives, and in the spirit of the two applicants, which made the Savior in the one instance reprove as the requirement of sight, which by itself could only produce a transitory faith, for which He had in vain looked in Israel. at as greatness of faith, for which He had in vain looked in Israel. The great point in the history of the 'court-officer' is Israel's mistaken view of the Person and Work of the Christ. That in the narrative of the Centurion is the preparedness of a simple faith, unencumbered by Jewish realism, although the outcome of Jewish teaching. The carnal realism of the one, which looks for signs and wonders, is contrasted with the simplicity and straightforwardness of the other. Lastly, the point in the history of the Syro-Phoenician woman, which is sometimes confounded with it, ^{f1005} is the intensity of the same faith which, despite discouragements, nay — seeming improbabilities, holds fast by the conviction which her spiritual instinct had grasped — that such an One as Jesus must be not only the Messiah of the Jews, but the Savior of the world.

We may as well here complete our critical notices, at least as concerns those views which have of late been propounded. The extreme school of negative critics seems here involved in hopeless self-contradiction. For, if this narrative of a Jewish courtier is really only another recension of that of the heathen centurion, how comes it that the 'Jewish' Gospel of St. Matthew makes a *Gentile*, while the so-called 'anti-Jewish,' 'Ephesian' Gospel of St. John makes a Jew, the hero of the story? As signally does the 'mythical' theory break down. For, admittedly, there is no Rabbinic basis for the invention of such a story; and by far the ablest representative of the

negative school ^{f1006} has conclusively shown, that it could not have originated in an imitation of the Old Testament account of Naaman's cure by Elisha the prophet. ^{f1007} But, if Christ had really spoken those words to the courtier, as this critic seems to admit, there remains only, as he puts it, this '*trilemma*:' either He could really work the miracle in question; or, He spoke as a mere fanatic; or else, He was simply a deceiver. It is a relief to find that the two last hypotheses are discarded. But, as negative criticism — may we not say, from the same spirit which Jesus reproved in the courtier — is unwilling to admit that Jesus really wrought this miracle, it is suggested in explanation of the cure, that the sick child, to whom the father had communicated his intended application to Jesus, had been in a state of expectancy which, when the courtier returned with the joyous assurance that the request was granted, issued in actual recovery. ^{f1008} To this there is the obvious answer, that the explanation wants the first requirement — that of an historical basis. There is not a tittle of evidence that the child expected a cure; while, on the other hand, the narrative expressly states that he was cured before his father's return. And, if the narrative may be altered at will to suit the necessities of a groundless hypothesis, it is difficult to see which, or whether any, part of it should be retained. It is not so that the origin of a faith, which has transformed the world, can be explained. But we have here another evidence of the fact, that objections which, when regarded as part of a connected system, seem so formidable to some, utterly break down, when each narrative is carefully examined in detail.

There are other circumstances in this history, which require at least passing consideration. Of these the principal are the time when the servants of the court-officer met him, on his return journey, with the joyful tidings that his son lived; and, connected with it, the time when 'he began to do nicely;' {ver. 52.} ^{f1009} and, lastly, that when the 'court-official' applied to Jesus. The two latter events were evidently contemporaneous. {ver. 53.} The exact time indicated by the servants as the commencement of the improvement is, 'Yesterday, at the seventh hour.' Now, however the Jewish servants may originally have expressed themselves, it seems impossible to assume, that St. John intended any other than the Roman notation of the civil day, or that he meant any other hour than 7 P.M. The opposite view, that it marks Jewish notation of time, or 1 P.M., is beset by almost insurmountable difficulties. ^{f1010} For it must be borne in mind, that, as the distance between Capernaum and Cana is about twenty-five miles, it

would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the courtier, leaving his home that morning, not only to have reached Cana, but to have had the interview with Jesus by 1 P.M. The difficulty is only increased, when we are asked to believe, that after such a journey the courtier had immediately set out on his return. But this is absolutely necessary for the theory, since a Jew would not have set out on such a journey after dusk. But farther, on the above supposition, the servants of the court official must have taken the road immediately, or very soon after, the improvement *commenced*. This is itself unlikely, and, indeed, counter-indicated by the terms of the conversation between the courtier and the servants, which imply that they had waited till they were sure that it was recovery, and not merely a temporary improvement. {ver. 52.} Again, on the theory combated, the servants, meeting the ‘courtier,’ as we must suppose, midway, if not near to Capernaum, would have said, ‘Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him,’ meaning thereby, that, as they spoke in the evening, when another Jewish day had begun, the fever had left him on the afternoon of the same day, although, according to Jewish reckoning, ‘yesterday,’ since 1 P.M. would be reckoned as the previous day. But it may be safely affirmed, that no Jew would have so expressed himself. If, on the evening of a day, they had referred to what had taken place five or six hours previously, at 1 P.M., they would have said: ‘At the seventh hour the fever left him;’ and *not* ‘Yesterday at the seventh hour.’

It is needless to follow the matter further. We can understand how, leaving Capernaum in the morning, the interview with Jesus and the simultaneous cure of the child would have taken place about seven o’clock of the evening. Its result was, not only the restoration of the child, but that, no longer requiring to *see* signs and wonders, ‘the man believed the word which Jesus had spoken unto him.’ In this joyous assurance, which needed no more ocular demonstration, he ‘went his way,’ either to the hospitable home of a friend, or to some near lodging-place on the way, to be next day met by the gladsome tidings, that it had been to him according to his faith. As already noted, the whole *morale* of the history lies in this very matter, and it marks the spiritual receptiveness of the courtier, which, in turn, was the moral condition of his desire being granted. Again, we learn how, by the very granting of his desire, the spiritual object of Christ in the teaching of the courtier was accomplished, how, under certain spiritual conditions in him and upon him, the temporal benefit accomplished its spiritual object. And in this also, as in other points which will occur to the devout reader,

there are lessons of deepest teaching to us, and for all times and circumstances.

Whether this 'royal officer' was *Chuza*, Herod's steward, whose wife, under the abiding impression of this miracle to her child, afterwards humbly, gratefully ministered to Jesus, {St. ~~CHR~~ Luke 8:3.} must remain undermined on this side time. Suffice it, to mark the progress in the 'royal officer' from belief in the power of Jesus to faith in His word, {ver. 50.} and thence to absolute faith in Him, {ver. 53.} with its blessed expansive effect on that whole household. And so are we ever led faithfully and effectually, yet gently, by His benefits, upwards from the lower stage of belief by what we see Him *do*, to that higher faith which is absolute and unseeing trust, springing from experimental knowledge of what He *is*.

CHAPTER 10

THE SYNAGOGUE AT NAZARETH — SYNAGOGUE-WORSHIP AND ARRANGEMENTS.

(St.  Luke 4:16.)

THE stay in Cana, though we have no means of determining its length, was probably of only short duration. Perhaps the Sabbath of the same week already found Jesus in the Synagogue of Nazareth. We will not seek irreverently to lift the veil of sacred silence, which here, as elsewhere, the Gospel-narratives have laid over the Sanctuary of His inner Life. That silence is itself *theopneustic*, of Divine breathing and inspiration; it is more eloquent than any eloquence, a guarantee of the truthfulness of what is said. And against this silence, as the dark background, stands out as the Figure of Light the Person of the Christ. Yet, as we follow Jesus to the city of His Childhood and home of His humility, we can scarcely repress thoughts of what must have stirred His soul, as He once more entered the well-known valley, and beheld the scenes to each of which some early memory must have attached.

Only a few months since He had left Nazareth, but how much that was all-decisive to Him, to Israel, and to the world had passed! As the lengthening shadows of Friday's sun closed around the quiet valley, He would hear the well-remembered double blast of the trumpet from the roof of the Synagogue-minister's house, proclaiming the advent of the holy day. {Shabb. 35 *b.*} Once more it sounded through the still summer-air, to tell all, that work must be laid aside. {Jer. Shabb 17 p. 16 *a.*} Yet a third time it was heard, ere the 'minister' put it aside close by where he stood, not to profane the Sabbath by carrying it; for now the Sabbath had really commenced, and the festive Sabbath-lamp was lit.

Sabbath morn dawned, and early He repaired to that Synagogue where, as a Child, a Youth, a Man, He had so often worshipped in the humble retirement of His rank, sitting, not up there among the elders and the honored, but far back. The old well-known faces were around Him, the old well-remembered words and services fell on His ear. How different they had always been to Him than to them, with whom He had thus mingled in

common worship! And now He was again among them, truly a stranger among His own countrymen; this time, to be looked at, listened to, tested, tried, used or cast aside, as the case might be. It was the first time, ^{f1011} so far as we know, that He taught in a Synagogue, and this Synagogue that of His own Nazareth.

It was, surely, a wondrously linked chain of circumstances, which bound the Synagogue to the Church. Such a result could never have been foreseen, as that, what really was the consequence of Israel's dispersion, and, therefore, indirectly the punishment of their sin, should become the means of fulfilling Israel's world-mission. Another instance this, of how Divine judgment always bears in its bosom larger mercy; another illustration how the dying of Israel is ever life to the world; another manifestation of that supernatural Rule of God, in which all is rule, that is, law and order, and all the supernatural, bringing to pass, in the orderly succession of events, what at the outset would have seemed, and really is, miraculous. For the Synagogue became the cradle of the Church. Without it, as indeed without Israel's dispersion, the Church Universal would, humanely speaking, have been impossible, and the conversation of the Gentiles have required a succession of millennial miracles.

That Synagogues originated during, or in consequence of the Babylonish captivity, is admitted by all. The Old Testament contains no allusion to their existence, ^{f1012} and the Rabbinic attempts to trace them even to Patriarchal times ^{f1013} deserve, of course, no serious consideration. We can readily understand how during the long years of exile in Babylon, places and opportunities for common worship on Sabbaths and feast-days must have been felt almost a necessity. This would furnish, at least, the basis for the institution of the Synagogue. After the return to Palestine, and still more by 'the dispersed abroad,' such 'meeting-houses' (*Batthey Khenesiyoth, domus congregationum, Synagogues*) would become absolutely requisite. Here those who were ignorant even of the language of the Old Testament would have the Scriptures read and 'targumed' to them.

^{f1014} It was but natural that prayers, and, lastly, addresses, should in course of time be added. Thus the regular Synagogue, service would gradually arise; first on Sabbaths and on feast, or fast-days, then on ordinary days, at the same hours as, and with a sort of internal correspondence to, the worship of the Temple. The services on Mondays and Thursdays were special, these being the ordinary market-days, when the country-people came into the towns, and would avail themselves of the opportunity for

bringing any case that might require legal decision before the local Sanhedrin, which met in the Synagogue, and consisted of its authorities. Naturally, these two days would be utilized to afford the country-people, who lived far from the Synagogues, opportunities for worship; {Baba K. 82 *a.*} and the services on those days were of a somewhat more elaborate character. Accordingly, Monday and Thursday were called ‘the days of congregation’ or ‘Synagogue’ (*Yom ha-Kenisah*).

In another place ^{f1015} it has been shown, how rapidly and generally the institution of Synagogues spread among the Jews of the Dispersion in all lands, and what important purposes they served. In Palestine they were scattered over the whole country, though it is only reasonable to suppose, that their number greatly increased after the destruction of the Temple, and this without crediting the Jewish legend as to their extraordinary number in certain cities, such as 480, or 460, in Jerusalem. ^{f1016} In the capital, and probably in some other large cities, there were not only several Synagogues, but these arranged according to nationalities, and even crafts. ^{f1017} At the same time it deserves notice, that even in so important a place as Capernaum there seems either not to have been a Synagogue, or that it was utterly insignificant, till the want was supplied by the pious gentile centurion. {St. ~~Matth.~~ Luke 7:5.} This would seem to dispose of the question whether, as is generally assumed, a Jewish community in a place, if numbering ten heads of families, was obliged to build a Synagogue, and could enforce local taxation for the purpose. Such was undoubtedly the later Rabbinic ordinance, {Maimonides, Hilc. Tephill, 11:1.} but there is no evidence that it obtained in Palestine, or in early times.

Generally, of course, a community would build its own Synagogue, or else depend on the charitable assistance of neighbors, or on private munificence. If this failed, they might meet for worship in a private dwelling, a sort of ‘Synagogue in the house.’ {Comp. Philem. 2.} For, in early times the institution would be much more simple than at a later period. In this, as in other respects, we must remember that later Jewish arrangements afford no evidence of those which prevailed while the Temple stood, nor yet the ordinances of the chiefs of Babylonian Academies of the customs existing in Palestine, and, lastly, that the Rabbinic directions mark rather an ideal than the actual state of things. Thus — to mention an instance of some importance, because the error has been so often repeated as to be generally believed, and to have misled recent explorers in Palestine — there is no evidence that in Palestine

Synagogues always required to be built in the highest situation in a town, or, at least, so as to overtop the other houses. To judge from a doubtful ^{f1018} passage in the Talmud, {Shabb. 11 *a.*} this seems to have been the case in Persia, while a later notice {Tos. Meg. ed. z 4:23.} appeals in support of it to ^{f1019} Proverbs 8:2. But even where the Jews were most powerful and influential, the rule could not have been universally enforced, although later Rabbis lay it down as a principle. {*Maimonides*, Hilc. Tephill. 11:2.} Hence, the inference, that the Galilean Synagogues lately excavated cannot date from an early period, because they are not in prominent positions, is erroneous.

But there were two rules observed, which seem to have been enforced from early times. One of these enjoined, that a Synagogue should not be erected in a place, unless it contained ten *Batlanim*, ^{f1020} or men of leisure, who could devote their time to the Synagogue worship and administration. ^{f1021} This was proved by the consideration, that common worship implied a congregation, which, according to Jewish Law, must consist of at least ten men. ^{f1022} Another, and perhaps more important rule was as to the direction in which Synagogues were to be built, and which worshippers should occupy during prayer. Here two points must be kept in view: 1st. Prayer towards the east was condemned, on the ground of the false worship towards the east mentioned in ^{f1023} Ezekiel 8:16. {Comp. Jer. Ber. 4:5; Baba B. 25 *a.*} 2ndly. The prevailing direction in Palestine was towards the west, as in the Temple. Thus, we read {Tos. Megill. 3:3.} that the entrance into the Synagogue was by the east, as the entrance through the Beautiful Gate into the Sanctuary. This, however, may refer, not to the door, but to the passage (aisle) into the interior of the building. In other places, {Baba B. 25 *a* and *b*; Jer. Ber. 4:5.} the advice is simply given to turn towards Jerusalem, in whatever direction it be. In general, however, it was considered that since the Shekhinah was everywhere in Palestine, direction was not of paramount importance.

If we combine these notices, and keep in view the general desire to conform to the Temple arrangements, the ruined Synagogues lately excavated in the north of Galilee seem, in a remarkable manner, to meet the Talmudic requirements. With the exception of one (at 'Irbid, which has its door to the east), they all have their entrances on the south. We conjecture that the worshippers, imitating in this the practice in the Temple, made a circuit, either completely to the north, or else entered at the middle of the eastern aisle, where, in the ground-plan of the Synagogue at Capernaum,

which seems the most fully preserved ruin, two pillars in the colonnade are wanting.^{f1023} The so-called ‘Ark’ would be at the south end; the seats for the elders and honorable in front of it, facing the people, and with their back to the Ark. {Tos. Meg. 3:3.} Here two pillars are wanting in the Synagogue at Capernaum. The lectern of the reader would be in the center, close to where the entrance was into the double colonnade which formed the Synagogue, where, at present, a single pillar is marked in the plan of the Capernaum Synagogue; while the women’s gallery was at the north end, where two columns and pillars of peculiar shape, which may have supported the gallery, are traceable. For it is a mistake to suppose that the men and women sat in opposite aisles, separated by a low wall. *Philo* notices, indeed, this arrangement in connection with the *Therapeutae*; {*De Vit. Contempl.* 3 and 9, ed. Mang. 2 pp. 476, 482.} but there is no indication that the practice prevailed in the Synagogues, or in Palestine.

We can now, with the help given by recent excavations, form a conception of these ancient Synagogues. The Synagogue is built of the stone of the country. On the lintels over the doors there are various ornamentations — a seven-branched candlestick, an open flower between two Paschal lambs, or vine-leaves with bunches of grapes, or, as at Capernaum, a pot of manna between representations of Aaron’s rod. Only glancing at the internal decorations of moldings or cornice, we notice that the inside plan is generally that of two double colonnades, which seem to have formed the body of the Synagogue, the aisles east and west being probably used as passages. The intercolumnar distance is very small, never greater than 9 1/2 feet.^{f1024} The ‘two corner columns at the northern end invariably have their two exterior faces square like pillars, and the two interior ones formed by half-engaged pillars.’ Here we suppose the women’s gallery to have risen. The flooring is formed of slabs of white limestone;^{f1025} the walls are solid (from 2 even to 7 feet in thickness), and well built of stones, rough in the exterior, but plastered in the interior. The Synagogue is furnished with sufficient windows to admit light. The roof is flat, the columns being sometimes connected by blocks of stone, on which massive rafters rest.

Entering by the door at the southern end, and making the circuit to the north, we take our position in front of the women’s gallery. These colonnades form the body of the Synagogue.^{f1026} At the south end, facing north, is a movable ‘Ark,’ containing the sacred rolls of the Law and the Prophets. It is called the Holy Chest or Ark, *Aron haqqodesh* (to call it simply ‘*aron*’ was sinful), {*Shabb.* 32.} but chiefly the *Tebhah*, Ark.^{f1027} It

was made movable, so that it might be carried out, as on public fasts. {Megill. 26 *b*; Taan. 15 *a*.} Steps generally led up to it (the or *Saphsel*). In front hangs (this probably from an early period) the *Vilon* or curtain. But the Holy Lamp is never wanting, in imitation of the undying light in the Temple. {~~Exodus~~ Exodus 27:20.} Right before the Ark, and facing the people, are the seats of honor, for the rulers of the Synagogue and the honorable. {St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 23:6; Tos. Megill. ed. Z. 4:21.} The place for him who leads the devotion of the people is also in front of the Ark, either elevated, or else, to mark humility, lowered.^{f1028} In the middle of the Synagogue (so generally) is the *Bima*,^{f1029} or elevation, on which there is the *Luach*, or desk, {Megill. 32 *a*.} from which the Law is read. This is also called the *Kurseya*, chair, or throne, {Megill. 26 *b*.} or *Kisse*, and *Pergulah*. Those who are to read the Law will stand, while he who is to preach or deliver an address will sit. Beside them will be the *Methurgeman*, either to interpret, or to repeat aloud, what is said.

As yet the Synagogue is empty, and we may therefore call to mind what we ought to think, and how to bear ourselves. To neglect attendance on its services would not only involve personal guilt, but bring punishment upon the whole district. Indeed, to be effectual, prayer must be offered in the Synagogue. {Comp. Ber. 6 *a* and *b*; 8 *a*.} At the same time, the more strict ordinances in regard to the Temple, such as, that we must not enter it carrying a staff, nor with shoes, nor even dust on the feet, nor with scrip or purse, do not apply to the Synagogue, as of comparatively inferior sanctity. {Ber. 63 *a*.} However, the Synagogue must not be made a thoroughfare. We must not behave lightly in it. {Tos. Megill. ed. Z. 3:7.} We may not joke, laugh, eat, talk, dress, nor resort there for shelter from sun or rain. Only Rabbis and their disciples, to whom so many things are lawful, and who, indeed, must look upon the Synagogue as if it were their own dwelling, may eat, drink, perhaps even sleep there. Under certain circumstances, also, the poor and strangers may be fed there. {Pes. 101 *a*.} But in general, the Synagogue must be regarded as consecrated to God. Even if a new one be built, care must be taken not to leave the old edifice till the other is finished. Money collected for the building may, in cases of necessity, be used for other purposes, but things dedicated for it are inalienable by sale. A Synagogue may be converted into an Academy, because the latter is regarded as more sacred, but not *vice versa*. Village Synagogues may be disposed of, under the direction of the local Sanhedrin, provided the *locale* be not afterwards used for incongruous purposes, such

as public baths, a wash-house, a tannery, etc. But town Synagogues are inalienable, because strangers may have contributed to them; and, even if otherwise, they have a right to look for some place of worship. At the same time, we must bear in mind that this rule had its exceptions; notably that, at one time, the guild of coppersmiths in Jerusalem sold their Synagogue. {Megill. 26a.}

All this, irrespective of any Rabbinic legends, shows with what reverence these 'houses of congregation' were regarded. And now the weekly Sabbath, the pledge between Israel and God, had once more come. To meet it as a bride or queen, each house was adorned on the Friday evening. The Sabbath lamp was lighted; the festive garments put on; the table provided with the best which the family could afford; and the *Qiddush*, or benediction, spoken over the cup of wine, which, as always, was mixed with water.^{f1030} And as Sabbath morning broke, they hastened with quick steps to the Synagogue; for such was the Rabbinic rule in going, while it was prescribed to return with slow and lingering steps. Jewish punctiliousness defined every movement and attitude in prayer.

If those rules were ever observed in their entirety, devotion must have been crushed under their weight. But we have evidence that, in the time of our Lord, and even later, there was much personal freedom left;^{f1031} for, not only was much in the services determined by the usage of each place, but the leader of the devotions might preface the regular service by free prayer, or insert such between certain parts of the liturgy.

We are now in the Nazareth Synagogue. The officials are all assembled. The lowest of these is the *Chazzan*, or minister, {St. ~~4:20~~ Luke 4:20.} who often acts also as schoolmaster. For this reason, and because the conduct of the services may frequently devolve upon him, great care is taken in his selection. He must be not only irreproachable, but, if possible, his family also. Humility, modesty, knowledge of the Scriptures, distinctness and correctness in pronunciation, simplicity and neatness in dress, and an absence of self-assertion, are qualities sought for, and which, in some measure, remind us of the higher qualifications insisted on by St. Paul in the choice of ecclesiastical officers. Then there are the elders (*Zezenim*), or rulers ἄρχοντες, whose chief is the *Archisynagogos*, or *Rosh ha-Keneseth*. These are the rulers (*Parnasim*) or shepherds ποιμένες. There can be no question (from the inscriptions on the Jewish tombstones in Rome), that the *Archisynagogos*^{f1032} {Comp. *Schurer*, *Gemeind. Verfass. in Rom*, pp.

27 etc.} was *chief* among the rulers, and that, whether or not there was, as in the community at Rome, and probably also among the dispersed in the West, besides him, a sort of political chief of the elders, or *Gerousiarch*. {*Schurer*, U.S., pp. 18-20.} All the rulers of the Synagogue were duly examined as to their knowledge, and ordained to the office. They formed the local Sanhedrin or tribunal. But their election depended on the choice of the congregation; and absence of pride, as also gentleness and humility, are mentioned as special qualifications. {*Sanh.* 92 *a*; *Chag.* 5 *b*.} Sometimes the office was held by regular teachers. {*Gitt.* 60 *a*.}

If, as in Rome, there was an apparently unordained eldership (*Gerousia*), it had probably only the charge of outward affairs, and acted rather as a committee of management. Indeed, in foreign Synagogues, the rulers seem to have been chosen, sometimes for a specified period, at others for life. But, although it may be admitted that the *Archisynagogos*, or chief ruler of the Synagogue, was only the first among his equals, there can be no doubt that the virtual rule of the Synagogue devolved upon him. He would have the superintendence of Divine service, and, as this was not conducted by regular officials, he would in each case determine who were to be called up to read from the Law and the Prophets, who was to conduct the prayers, and act as *Sheliach Tsibbur*, or messenger of the congregation, and who, if any, was to deliver an address. He would also see to it that nothing improper took place in the Synagogue, {*St.* ~~2134~~ Luke 13:14.} and that the prayers were properly conducted. In short, the supreme care, both of the services and of the building, would devolve upon him. To these regular officials we have to add those who officiated during the service, the *Sheliach Tsibbur*, or delegate of the congregation — who, as its mouthpiece, conducted the devotions — the Interpreter or *Methurgeman*, and those who were called on to read in the Law and the Prophets, or else to preach.

We are now in some measure prepared to follow the worship on that Sabbath in Nazareth. On His entrance into the Synagogue, or perhaps before that, the chief ruler would request Jesus to act for that Sabbath as the *Sheliach Tsibbur*. For according to the Mishnah, {*Megill.* 5:5.} the person who read in the Synagogue the portion from the Prophets, was also expected to conduct the devotions, at least in greater part. ^{f1033} If this rule was enforced at that time, then Jesus would ascend the *Bima*, and standing at the lectern, begin the service by two prayers, which in their most ancient

form, as they probably obtained in the time of our Lord, were as follows:

I. ‘Blessed be Thou, O Lord, King of the world, Who formest the light and createst the darkness, Who makest peace, and createst everything; Who, in mercy, givest light to the earth, and to those who dwell upon it, and in Thy goodness, day by day, and every day, renewest the works of creation. Blessed be the Lord our God for the glory of His handiworks, and for the light-giving lights which He has made for His praise. Selah. Blessed be the Lord our God, Who has formed the lights.’

II. ‘With great love hast Thou loved us, O Lord our God, and with much overflowing pity hast Thou pitied us, our Father and our King. For the sake of our fathers who trusted in Thee, and Thou taughtest them the statutes of life, have mercy upon us, and teach us. Enlighten our eyes in Thy Law; cause our hearts to cleave to Thy commandments; unite our hearts to love and fear Thy Name, and we shall not be put to shame, world without end. For Thou art a God Who preparest salvation, and us hast Thou chosen from among all nations and tongues, and hast in truth brought us near to Thy great Name — Selah — that we may lovingly praise Thee and Thy Unity. Blessed be the Lord, Who in love chose His people Israel.’

After this followed what may be designated as the Jewish Creed, called the *Shema*, from the word ‘*shema*,’ or ‘hear,’ with which it begins. It consisted of three passages from the Pentateuch, {~~DEUT~~ Deuteronomy 6:4-9; ~~PS~~ 11:13-21; ~~NUM~~ Numbers 15:37-41.} so arranged, as the Mishnah notes, {Ber. 2:2.} that the worshipper took upon himself first the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven, and only after it the yoke of the commandments; and in the latter, again, first those that applied to night and day, and then those that applied to the day only. They were probably but later determinations, conceived in a spirit of hostility to what was regarded as the heresy of Christianity, which insisted that, as the first sentence in the *Shema*, asserting the Unity of God, was the most important, special emphasis should be laid on certain words in it. The recitation of the *Shema* was followed by this prayer: —

‘True it is that Thou art Jehovah, our God, and the God of our fathers, our King, and the King of our fathers, our Savior, and the Savior of our fathers, our Creator, the Rock of our Salvation, our Help and our Deliverer. Thy Name is from everlasting, and there is no God beside Thee. A new song did they that were delivered sing to Thy Name by the sea-

shore; together did all praise and own Thee King, and say, Jehovah shall reign, world without end! Blessed be the God Who saveth Israel.'

This prayer finished, he who officiated took his place before the Ark, and there repeated what formed the prayer in the strictest sense, or certain 'Eulogies' or Benedictions. These are eighteen, or rather nineteen, in number, and date from different periods. But as on Sabbaths only the three first and the three last of them, which are also those undoubtedly of greatest age, were repeated, and between them certain other prayers inserted, only these six, with which the series respectively began and ended, need here find a place. The first Benediction was said with bent body. It was as follows: —

I. 'Blessed be the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; the Great, the Mighty, and the Terrible God, the Most High God, Who showeth mercy and kindness. Who createth all things, Who remembereth the gracious promises to the fathers, and bringeth a Savior to their children's children, for His own Name's sake, in love. O King, Helper, Savior, and Shield! Blessed art Thou, O Jehovah, the Shield of Abraham.'

II. 'Thou O Lord, art mighty for ever; Thou. Who quickenest the dead, art mighty to save. In Thy mercy Thou preservest the living, Thou quickenest the dead; in Thine abundant pity Thou bearest up those who fall, and healest those who are diseased, and loosest those who are bound, and fulfillst Thy faithful word to those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord of strength, and who can be compared to Thee, Who killest and makest alive, and causest salvation to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to give life to the dead. Blessed art Thou, Jehovah, Who quickenest the dead!'

III. 'Thou art Holy, and Thy name is Holy. Selah. Blessed art Thou Jehovah God, the Holy One.'

After this, such prayers were inserted as were suited to the day. And here it may be noticed that considerable latitude was allowed. For, although {According to Ber. 34 *a.*} it was not lawful to insert any petition in the three first or the three last Eulogies, but only in the intermediate Benedictions, in practice this was certainly not observed. Thus, although, by the rubric, prayer for rain and dew was to be inserted up to the season of the Passover in the ninth Benediction, yet occasionally reference to this

seems also to have been made in the second Benediction, as connected with the quickening of that which is dead. {Ber. 33 *a*.} Nay, some Rabbis went so far as to recommend a brief summary of the eighteen Eulogies, while yet another (R. Eliezer) repudiated all fixed forms of prayer. ^{f1034} But gradually, and especially after the insertion of the well-known prayer against the heretics or rather Christian converts (Eulogy XI. ^{f1035}), the present order of the eighteen Eulogies (*Amidah*) seems to have been established. Both the Jerusalem {Jer. Ber. 4:3 to end.} and the Babylon Talmud {Ber. 33 *a* etc.} contain much on this subject which is of very great interest. ^{f1036}

Following the order of the service, we now come to the concluding Eulogies, which were as follows: —

XVII. (XVI.) ‘Take gracious pleasure, O Jehovah our God, in Thy people Israel and in their prayers, and in love accept the burnt-offerings of Israel, and their prayers with Thy good pleasure, and may the services of Thy people be ever acceptable unto Thee. And O that our eyes may see it, as Thou turnest in mercy to Zion. Blessed be Thou, O Jehovah, Who restoreth His Shekinah to Zion.’

XVIII. (XVII.) In saying this Eulogy, which was simply one of thanks, it was ordered that all should bend down. It was as follows: ‘We give praise to Thee, because Thou art He, Jehovah, our God, and the God of our fathers, for ever and ever. The Rock of our life, the Shield of our salvation, Thou art He, from generation to generation. We laud Thee, and declare Thy praise. For our lives which are bound up in Thine Hand, for our souls which are committed to Thee, and for Thy wonders which are with us every day and for Thy marvellous deeds and Thy goodnesses which are at all seasons, evening, and morning, and midday, Thou Gracious One, for Thy compassions never end, Thou Pitying One, for Thy mercies never cease, for ever do we put our trust in Thee. And for all this, blessed and exalted be Thy Name, our King, always, world without end. And all the living bless Thee, Selah, and praise Thy Name in truth, O God, our Salvation and our Help. Selah. Blessed art Thou, Jehovah. The Gracious One is Thy Name, and to Thee it is pleasant to give praise.’

After this the priests, if any were in the Synagogue, spoke the blessing, elevating their hands up to the shoulders {Sot. 7:6.} (in the Temple above the head). This was called the lifting up of hands. {Comp. ⁵⁴¹⁸1 Timothy

2:8.} In the Synagogue the priestly blessing was spoken in three sections, the people each time responding by an Amen. {Sot. 37 *b* 38 *a*.} Lastly, in the Synagogue, the word ‘Adonai’ was substituted for Jehovah. {Siphre on Numbers par. 39, p. 12 *a*.} ^{f1037} If no descendants of Aaron were present, the leader of the devotions repeated the usual priestly benediction. {~~4023~~ Numbers 6:23-26.} After the benediction followed the last Eulogy, which, in its abbreviated form (as presently used in the Evening Service), is as follows: —

XIX. (XVIII.) ‘O bestow on Thy people Israel great peace for ever. For Thou art King, and Lord of all peace. And it is good in Thine eyes to bless Thy people Israel at all times and at every hour with Thy peace. Blessed art Thou, Jehovah, Who blesseth His people Israel with peace!’

It was the practice of leading Rabbis, probably dating from very early times, to add at the close of this Eulogy certain prayers of their own, either fixed or free, of which the Talmud gives specimens. From very early times also, the custom seems to have obtained that the descendants of Aaron, before pronouncing the blessing, put off their shoes. In the benediction the priests turned towards the people, while he who led the ordinary prayers stood with his back to the people, looking towards the Sanctuary. The superstition, that it was unlawful to look at the priests while they spoke the blessing, {Chag. 10 *a*.} must be regarded as of later date. According to the Mishnah, they who pronounce the benediction must have no blemish on their hands, face, or feet, so as not to attract attention; but this presumably refers to those officiating in the Temple. ^{f1038} It is a curious statement, that priests from certain cities in Galilean were not allowed to speak the words of blessing, because their pronunciation of the gutturals was misleading. {Megill. 24.} According to the Jerusalem Talmud, {Jer. Gitt. 5:9. p 47 *b*; .} moral blemishes, or even sin, did not disqualify a priest from pronouncing the benediction, since it was really God, and not man, Who gave the blessing. ^{f1039} On the other hand, strict sobriety was insisted on such occasions. Later Judaism used the priestly benediction as a means for counteracting the effects of evil dreams. The public prayers closed with an Amen, spoken by the congregation.

The liturgical part being thus completed, one of the most important, indeed, what had been the primary object of the Synagogue service, began. The *Chazzan*, or minister, approached the Ark, and brought out a roll of the Law. It was taken from its case (*teq*, *teqah*), and unwound from those

cloths (*mitpachoth*) which held it. The time had now come for the reading of portions from the Law and the Prophets. On the Sabbath, at least seven persons were called upon successively to read portions from the Law, none of them consisting of less than three verses. On the 'days of congregation' (Monday and Thursday), three persons were called up; on New Moon's Day, and on the intermediate days of a festive week, four; on feast days, five; and on the Day of Atonement, six.^{f1040} No doubt, there was even in ancient times a lectionary, though certainly not that presently in use, which occupies exactly a year.^{f1041} On the contrary, the Palestinian lectionary occupied three {Meg. 29 *b.*} or, according to some, three and a half years, {Jer. Shabb. 16:1; Sopher. 16:10.} half a Sabbatic period. Accordingly, we find that the Massorah divides the Pentateuch into 154 sections. In regard to the lectionary of three and a half years we read of 175 sections. It requires, however, to be borne in mind, that preparatory to, and on certain festive days, the ordinary reading was interrupted, and portions substituted which bore on the subject of the feast. Possibly, at different periods different cycles may have obtained, those for three and a half years, three years, and even for one year. {Comp. Megill. 31 *b.*}^{f1042} According to the Talmud, {Gitt. 59 *b.*} a descendant of Aaron was always called up first to the reading;^{f1043} then followed a Levite, and afterwards five ordinary Israelites. As this practice, as well as that of priestly benediction,^{f1044} has been continued in the Synagogue from father to son, it is possible still to know who are descendants of Aaron, and who Levites. The reading of the Law was both preceded and followed by brief Benedictions.

Upon the Law followed a section from the Prophets,^{f1045} the so-called *Haphtarah*.^{f1046} The origin of this practice is not known, although it is one that must evidently have met a requirement on the part of the worshippers. Certain it is, that the present lectionary from the Prophets did not exist in early times; nor does it seem unlikely that the choice of the passage was left to the reader himself. At any rate, as regarded the ordinary Sabbath days, {Megill 4:4.} we are told that a reader might omit one or more verses, provided there was no break. As the Hebrew was not generally understood, the *Methurgeman*, or Interpreter, stood by the side of the reader, {Comp. ~~f1047~~ 1 Corinthians 14:27, 28.} and translated into the Aramaean verse by verse, and in the section from the Prophets, or *Haphtarah*, after every three verses. {Megill. 24 *a.*} But the *Methurgeman* was not allowed to read his translation, lest it might popularly be regarded as authoritative. This may help us in some measure to understand the

popular mode of Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. So long as the substance of the text was given correctly, the *Methurgeman* might paraphrase for better popular understanding. Again, it is but natural to suppose, that the *Methurgeman* would prepare himself for his work by such materials as he would find to hand, among which, of course, the translation of the LXX. would hold a prominent place. This may in part account alike for the employment of the LXX., and for its Targumic modifications, in the New Testament quotations.

The reading of the section from the Prophets (the *Haphtarah*) was in olden times immediately followed by an address, discourse, or sermon (*Derashah*), that is, where a Rabbi capable of giving such instruction, or a distinguished stranger, was present. Neither the leader of the devotions ('the delegate of the congregation' in this matter, or *Sheliach Tsibbur*), nor the *Methurgeman*, nor yet the preacher, required ordination.^{f1047} That was reserved for the *rule* of the congregation, whether in legislation or administration, doctrine or discipline.

The only points required in the preacher were the necessary qualifications, both mental and moral.^{f1048} When a great Rabbi employed a *Methurgeman* to explain to the people his sermon, he would, of course, select him for the purpose. Such an interpreter was also called *Amora*, or speaker. Perhaps the Rabbi would whisper to him his remarks, while he would repeat them aloud; or else he would only condescend to give hints, which the *Amora* would amplify; or he would speak in Hebrew, and the *Amora* translate it into Aramaean, Greek, Latin, or whatever the language of the people might be, for the sermon must reach the people in the vulgar tongue. The *Amora* would also, at the close of the sermon, answer questions or meet objections. If the preacher was a *very* great man, he would, perhaps, not condescend to communicate with the *Amora* directly, but employ one of his students as a middleman. This was also the practice when the preacher was in mourning for a very near relative — for so important was his office that it must not be interrupted, even by the sorrows or the religious obligations of 'mourning.' {Moed K 21 *a.*}

Indeed, Jewish tradition uses the most extravagant terms to extol the institution of preaching. To say that it glorified God, and brought men back, or at least nearer to Him, or that it quenched the soul's thirst, was as nothing. The little city, weak and besieged, but delivered by the wise man in it, {²⁰⁹⁵ Ecclesiastes 9:15.} served as symbol of the benefit which the

preacher conferred on his hearers. The Divine Spirit rested on him, and his office conferred as much merit on him as if he had offered both the blood and the fat upon the altar of burnt offering. {Ab. de R. Nath. 4.} No wonder that tradition traced the institution back to Moses, who had directed that, previous to, and on the various festivals, addresses, explanatory of their rites, and enforcing them, should be delivered to the people. {Meg. 4 a.} The Targum Jonathan assumes the practice in the time of the Judges; {Targum on ~~WRB~~ Judges 5:2, 9.} the men of the Great Synagogue are, of course, credited with it, and Shemayah and Abhtalyon are expressly designated as ‘preachers.’ {*Darshanin*, Pes. 70 b.} How general the practice was in the time of Jesus and His Apostles, the reader of the New Testament need not be told, and its witness is fully borne out by *Josephus* {Ag. Ap. 2:18.} and *Philo*. {In Flacc., ed. Frcf., p. 972; de Vita Mos. p. 688; Leg. ad Caj. pp. 1014, 1035.} Both the Jerusalem and the Babylon Talmud assume it as so common, that in several passages ‘Sabbath-observance’ and the ‘Sabbath-sermon’ are identified. Long before Hillel we read of Rabbis preaching, in Greek or Latin, in the Jewish Synagogues of Rome, {For ex. Pes. 53 b.} just as the Apostles preached in Greek in the Synagogues of the dispersed. That this practice, and the absolute liberty of teaching, subject to the authority of the ‘chief ruler of the Synagogue,’ formed important links in the Christianization of the world, is another evidence of that wonder-working Rule of God, which brings about marvellous results through the orderly and natural succession of events — nay, orders these means with the view to their ultimate issue.

But this is not all. We have materials for drawing an accurate picture of the preacher, the congregation, and the sermon, as in those days. We are, of course, only speaking of the public addresses in the Synagogues on Sabbaths — not of those delivered at other times or in other places. Some great Rabbi, or famed preacher, or else a distinguished stranger, is known to be in the town. He would, of course, be asked by the ruler of the Synagogue to deliver a discourse. But who is a great, preacher? We know that such a reputation was much coveted, and conferred on its possessor great distinction. The popular preacher was a power, and quite as much an object of popular homage and flattery as in our days. Many a learned Rabbi bitterly complained on finding his ponderous expositions neglected, while the multitude pushed and crowded into the neighboring Synagogue to hear the declamations of some shallow popular Haggadist.^{f1049} And so it came, that many cultivated this branch of theology. When a popular preacher was

expected, men crowded the area of the Synagogue, while women filled the gallery. {Succ. 51 *b.*} On such occasions, there was the additional satisfaction of feeling that they had done something specially meritorious in running with quick steps, and crowding into the Synagogue. {Ber. 6 *b.*} For, was it not to carry out the spirit of ~~חזק~~ Hosea 6:3; ~~חזק~~ 11:10 — at least, as Rabbinically understood? Even grave Rabbis joined in this ‘pursuit to know the Lord,’ and one of them comes to the somewhat caustic conclusion, that ‘the reward of a discourse is the haste.’ {Ber. 6 *b.*} However, more unworthy motives sometimes influenced some of the audience, and a Talmudic passage {Kidd. 81 *a.*} traces the cause of many fasts to the meetings of the two sexes on such occasions.

The type of a popular preacher was not very different from what in our days would form his chief requisites. He ought to have a good figure, {Taan. 16 *a.* See *Duschak*, u. s. p. 285.} a pleasant expression, and melodious voice (his words ought to be ‘like those of the bride to the bridegroom’), fluency, speech ‘sweet as honey,’ — ‘pleasant as milk and honey’ — ‘finely sifted like fine flour,’ a diction richly adorned, ‘like a bride on her wedding day,’ and sufficient confidence in his own knowledge and self-assurance never to be disconcerted. Above all he must be conciliatory, and avoid being too personal. Moses had addressed Israel as rebellious and hard-hearted, and he was not allowed to bring them into the land of promise. Elijah had upbraided them with having broken the covenant, and Elisha was immediately appointed his successor. Even Isaiah had his lips touched with burning coals, because he spoke of dwelling among a people of sinful lips. {Yalkut 2 p. 43 *a.*, beginning.} ^{f1050} As for the mental qualifications of the preacher, he must know his Bible well. As a bride knows properly to make use of her twenty-four ornaments, so must the preacher of the twenty-four books of the Bible. He must carefully prepare his subject — he is ‘to hear himself’ before the people hear him. But whatever else he may be or do, *he must be attractive.* ^{f1051} In earlier times the sermon might have consisted of a simple exposition of some passages from Scripture, or the Book of Sirach, which latter was treated and quoted by some of the Rabbis almost as if it had been canonical. {Comp. Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortr.* pp. 101-106, 351.} But this, or the full discussion of a single text ^{f1051} (*j r q* to bore), would probably not be so attractive as the adaptation of a text to present circumstances, or even its modification and alteration for such purposes. There were scarcely bounds to the liberties taken by the preacher. He would divide a sentence, cut off

one or two syllables from a word and join them to the next, so producing a different meaning, or giving a new interpretation to a text. Perhaps the strangest method was that of introducing Greek words and expressions into the Hebrew, and this not only to give a witty repartee, {As in Ber. R. 14.} but in illustration of Scripture. {Shem. R. 15.} Nay, many instances occur, in which a Hebrew word is, from the similarity of its sound with the Greek, rendered as if it were actually Greek, and thus a new meaning is given to a passage. ^{f1053}

If such license was taken, it seems a comparatively small thing that a doctrine was derived from a word, a particle, or even a letter. But, as already stated, the great point was to attract the hearers. Parables, stories, allegories, witticisms, strange and foreign words, absurd legends, in short, anything that might startle an audience, was introduced. ^{f1054} Sometimes a discourse was entirely Haggadic; at others, the Haggadah served to introduce the Halakhah. Sometimes the object of the preacher was purely homiletical; at others, he dealt chiefly with the explanation of Scripture, or of the rites and meaning of festivals. A favorite method was that which derived its name from the stringing together of pearls (*Charaz*), when a preacher, having quoted a passage or section from the Pentateuch, strung on to it another and like-sounding, or really similar, from the Prophets and the Hagiographa. Or else he would divide a sentence, generally under three heads, and connect with each of the clauses a separate doctrine, and then try to support it by Scripture. It is easy to imagine to what lengths such preachers might go in their misinterpretation and misrepresentations of the plain text of Holy Scripture. And yet a collection of short expositions (the *Pesiqta*), which, though not dating from that period, may yet fairly be taken as giving a good idea of this method of exposition, contains not a little that is fresh, earnest, useful, and devotional. It is interesting to know that, at the close of his address, the preacher very generally referred to the great Messianic hope of Israel. The service closed with a short prayer, or what we would term an 'ascription.'

We can now picture to ourselves the Synagogue, its worship, and teaching. We can see the leader of the people's devotions as (according to Talmudic direction) he first refuses, with mock-modesty, the honor conferred on him by the chief ruler; then, when urged, prepares to go; and when pressed a third time, goes up with slow and measured steps to the lectern, and then before the Ark. We can imagine how one after another, standing and facing the people, unrolls and holds in his hand a copy of the Law or of the

Prophets, and reads from the Sacred Word, the *Methurgeman* interpreting. Finally, we can picture it, how the preacher would sit down and begin his discourse, none interrupting him with questions till he had finished, when a succession of objections, answers, or inquiries might await the *Amora*, if the preacher had employed such help. And help it certainly was not in many cases, to judge by the deprecatory and caustic remarks, which not unfrequently occur, as to the manners, tone, vanity, self-conceit, and silliness of the *Amora* {Midr. on ~~2005~~ Ecclesiastes 7:5; 9:17 *b.*} who, as he stood beside the Rabbi, thought far more of attracting attention and applause to himself, than of benefiting his hearers. Hence some Rabbis would only employ special and trusted interpreters of their own, who were above fifty years of age. {Chag. 14 *a.*} In short, so far as the sermon was concerned, the impression it produced must have been very similar to what we know the addresses of the monks in the Middle Ages to have wrought. All the better can we understand, even from the human aspect, how the teaching of Jesus, alike in its substance and form, in its manner and matter, differed from that of the scribes; how multitudes would hang entranced on His word; and how, everywhere and by all, its impression was felt to be overpowering.

But it is certainly not the human aspect alone which here claims our attention. The perplexed inquiry: ‘Whence hath this man this wisdom and this knowledge?’ must find another answer than the men of Nazareth could suggest, although to those in our days also who deny His Divine character, this must ever seem an unanswered and unanswerable question.

CHAPTER 11

THE FIRST GALILEAN MINISTRY.

(St. ⁴⁰¹³Matthew 4:13-17; St. ⁴⁰¹⁴Mark 1:14, 15; St. ⁴⁰¹⁵Luke 4:15-32.)

THE visit to Nazareth was in many respects decisive. It presented by anticipation an epitome of the history of the Christ. He came to His own, and His own received Him not. The first time He taught in the Synagogue, as the first time He taught in the Temple, they cast Him out. On the one and the other occasion, they questioned His authority, and they asked for a 'sign.' In both instances, the power which they challenged was, indeed, claimed by Christ, but its display, in the manner which they expected, refused. The analogy seems to extend even farther — and if a misrepresentation of what Jesus had said when purifying the Temple formed the ground of the final false charge against Him, {St. ⁴⁰⁶¹Matthew 26:60, 61.} the taunt of the Nazarenes: 'Physician, heal thyself!' found an echo in the mocking cry, as He hung on the Cross: 'He saved others, Himself He cannot save.' {St. ⁴⁰⁶⁰Matthew 26:40-42.}

It is difficult to understand how, either on historical grounds, or after study of the character of Christ, the idea could have arisen ^{f1056} that Jesus had offered, or that He had claimed, to teach on that Sabbath in the Synagogue of Nazareth. Had He attempted what, alike in spirit and form, was so contrary to all Jewish notions, the whole character of the act would have been changed. As it was, the contrast with those by whom He was surrounded is almost as striking, as the part which He bore in the scene. We take it for granted, that what had so lately taken place in Cana, at only four miles' distance, or, to speak more accurately, in Capernaum, had become known in Nazareth. It raised to the highest pitch of expectancy the interest and curiosity previously awakened by the reports, which the Galileans had brought from Jerusalem, and by the general fame which had spread about Jesus. They were not to test, whether their countryman would be equal to the occasion, and do in His own city what they had heard had been done for Capernaum. To any ordinary man the return to Nazareth in such circumstances must have been an ordeal. Not so to the Christ, Who, in utter self-forgetfulness, had only this one aim of life — to

do the Will of Him that sent Him. And so His bearing that day in the Synagogue is itself evidence, that while *in*, He was not *of*, that time.

Realizing the scene on such occasions, we mark the contrast. As there could be no un-Jewish forwardness on the part of Jesus, so, assuredly, would there be none of that mock-humility of reluctance to officiate, in which Rabbinism delighted. If, as in the circumstances seems likely, Jesus commenced the first part of the service, and then pronounced before the 'Ark' those Eulogies which were regarded as, in the strictest sense, the prayer (*Tephillah*), we can imagine — though we can scarcely realize — the reverent solemnity, which would seem to give a new meaning to each well-remembered sentence. And in His mouth it all *had* a new meaning. We cannot know what, if any, petitions He inserted, though we can imagine what their spirit would have been. And now, one by one, Priest, Levite, and, in succession, five Israelites, had read from the Law. There is no reason to disturb the almost traditional idea, that Jesus Himself read the concluding portion from the Prophets, or the so-called *Haphtarah*. The whole narrative seems to imply this. Similarly, it is most likely that the *Haphtarah* for that day was taken from the prophecies of Isaiah, ^{f1057} and that it included the passage {~~2600~~ Isaiah 61:1, 2.} quoted by the Evangelist as read by the Lord Jesus. {St. ~~4048~~ Luke 4:18, 19.} We know that the 'rolls' on which the Law was written were distinct from those of the Prophets; {Baba B. 18 *b*.} and every probability points to it, that those of the Prophets, at least the Greater, were also written on separate scrolls. In this instance we are expressly told, that the minister 'delivered unto Him the book of the prophet Esaias,' we doubt not, for the *Haphtarah*, ^{f1058} and that, 'when He had unrolled the book,' He 'found' the place from which the Evangelist makes quotation.

When unrolling, and holding the scroll, much more than the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah must have been within range of His eyes. On the other hand, it is quite certain that the verses quoted by the Evangelist could not have formed the whole *Haphtarah*. According to traditional rule, {Massech. Soph. 12:7.} the *Haphtarah* ordinarily consisted of not less than twenty-one verses, ^{f1059} though, if the passage was to be 'targumed,' or a sermon to follow, that number might be shortened to seven, five, or even three verses. Now the passage quoted by St. Luke consists really of only one verse (~~2600~~ Isaiah 61:1), together with a clause from ~~2886~~ Isaiah 58:6, ^{f1060} and the first clause of Isaiah 61. This could scarcely have formed the whole *Haphtarah*. There are other reasons also against this

supposition. No doubt Jesus read alike the *Haphtarah* and the text of His discourse in Hebrew, and then ‘targumed’ or translated it: while St. Luke, as might be expected, quotes (with but two trifling alterations ^{f1061}) from the rendering of the LXX. But, on investigation, it appears that one clause is omitted from ^{2300b}Isaiah 61:1, ^{f1062} and that between the close of ^{2300b}Isaiah 61:1 and the clause of verse 2, which is added, a clause is inserted from the LXX. of ²³⁰⁶Isaiah 58:6. ^{f1063} This could scarcely have been done in reading the *Haphtarah*. But, if as we suppose, the passages quoted formed the introductory text of Christ’s discourse, such quotation and combination were not only in accordance with Jewish custom, but formed part of the favorite mode of teaching, the Charaz, or stringing, like pearls, passage to passage, illustrative of each other. ^{f1064} In the present instance, the portion of the scroll which Jesus unrolled may have exhibited in close proximity the two passages which formed the introductory text (the so-called *Pethichah*). But this is of comparatively small interest, since both the omission of a clause from ^{2300b}Isaiah 61:1, and the insertion of another adapted from ²³⁰⁶Isaiah 58:6, were evidently intentional. It might be presumptuous to attempt stating the reasons which may have influenced the Savior in this, and yet some of them will instinctively occur to every thoughtful reader.

It was, indeed, Divine ‘wisdom’ — ‘the Spirit of the Lord’ upon Him, which directed Jesus in the choice of such a text for His first Messianic Sermon. It struck the key-note to the whole of His Galilean ministry. The ancient Synagogue regarded ^{2300b}Isaiah 61:1, 2, as one of the three passages, {The other two being ^{2324b}Isaiah 32:14, 15, and ²³⁸⁰Lamentations 3:50.} in which mention of the Holy Ghost was connected with the promised redemption. ^{f1065} In this view, the application which the passage received in the discourse of our Lord was peculiarly suitable. For the words in which St. Luke reports what followed the *Pethichah*, or introductory text, seem rather a summary, than either the introduction or part of the discourse of Christ. ‘This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.’ A summary this, which may well serve to guide in all preaching. As regards its form, it would be: so to present the teaching of Holy Scripture, as that it can be drawn together in the focus of one sentence; as regards its substance, that this be the one focus: all Scripture fulfilled by a present Christ. And this — in the Gospel which He bears to the poor, the release which He announces to the captives, the healing which He offers to those whom sin had blinded, and the freedom He brings to them who were bruized; and all as the

trumpet-blast of God's Jubilee into His world of misery, sin, and want! A year thus begun would be glorious indeed in the blessings it gave.

There was not a word in all this of what common Jewish expectancy would have connected with, nay — chiefly accentuated in an announcement of the Messianic redemption; not a word to raise carnal hopes, or flatter Jewish pride. Truly, it was the most un-Jewish discourse for a Jewish Messiah of those days, with which to open His Ministry. And yet such was the power of these 'words of grace.' that the hearers hung spell-bound upon them. Every eye was fastened on Him with hungry eagerness. For the time they forgot all else — Who it was that addressed them, even the strangeness of the message, so unspeakably in contrast to any preaching of Rabbi or Teacher that had been heard in that Synagogue. Indeed, one can scarcely conceive the impression which the Words of Christ must have produced, when promise and fulfilment, hope and reality, mingled, and wants of the heart, hitherto unrealized, were wakened, only to be more than satisfied. It was another sphere, another life. Truly, the anointing of the Holy Ghost was on the Preacher, from Whose lips dropped these 'words of grace.' And if such was the announcement of the Year of God's Jubilee, what blessings must it bear in its bosom!

The discourse had been spoken, and the breathless silence with which, even according to Jewish custom, it had been listened to, ^{f1066} gave place to the usual after-sermon hum of an Eastern Synagogue. On one point all were agreed: that they were marvellous words of grace, which had proceeded out of His mouth. And still the Preacher waited, with deep longing of soul, for some question, which would have marked the spiritual application of what He had spoken. Such deep longing of soul is kindred to, and passes into almost sternness, just because he who so longs is so intensely in earnest, in the conviction of the reality of his message. It was so with Jesus in Nazareth. They were indeed making application of the Sermon to the Preacher, but in quite different manner from that to which His discourse had pointed. It was not the fulfilment of the Scripture in Him, but the circumstance, that such an one as the Son of Joseph, their village carpenter, should have spoken such words, that attracted their attention. Not, as we take it, in a malevolent spirit, but altogether unspiritually, as regarded the effect of Christ's words, did one and another, here and there, express wonderment to his neighbor.

They had *heard*, and now they would fain have *seen*. But already the holy indignation of Him, Whom they only knew as Joseph's son, was kindled. The turn of matters; their very admiration and expectation; their vulgar, unspiritual comments: it was all so entirely contrary to the Character, the Mission, and the Words of Jesus. No doubt they would next expect, that here in His own city, and all the more because it was such, He would do what they had heard had taken place in Capernaum. It was the world-old saying, as false, except to the ear, and as speciously popular as most such sayings: 'Charity begins at home' — or, according to the Jewish proverb, and in application to the special circumstances: 'Physician, heal thyself.'

^{f1067} Whereas, if there is any meaning in truth and principle; if there was any meaning and reality in Christ's Mission, and in the discourse He had just spoken, Charity does *not* begin at home; and 'Physician, heal thyself' is not of the Gospel for the poor, nor yet the preaching of God's Jubilee, but that of the Devil, whose works Jesus had come to destroy. How could He, in His holy abhorrence and indignation, say this better than by again repeating, though now with different application, that sad experience, 'No prophet is accepted in his own country,' which He could have hoped was for ever behind Him; {St. ~~John~~ John 4:44.} and by pointing to those two Old Testament instances of it, whose names and authority were most frequently on Jewish lips? Not they who were 'their own,' but they who were most receptive in faith — not Israel, but Gentiles, were those most markedly favored in the ministry of Elijah and of Elisha. ^{f1068}

As we read the report of Jesus' words, we perceive only dimly that aspect of them which stirred the wrath of His hearers to the utmost, and yet we do understand it. That He should have turned so fully the light upon the Gentiles, and flung its large shadows upon them; that 'Joseph's Son' should have taken up this position towards them; that He would make to them spiritual application unto death of His sermon, since they would not make it unto life: it stung them to the quick. Away He must out of His city; it could not bear His Presence any longer, not even on that holy Sabbath. Out they thrust Him from the Synagogue; forth they pressed Him out of the city; on they followed, and around they beset Him along the road by the brow of the hill on which the city is built — perhaps to that western angle, at present pointed out as the site. ^{f1069} This, with the unspoken intention of crowding Him over the cliff, ^{f1070} which there rises abruptly about forty feet out of the valley beneath. ^{f1071} If we are correct in indicating the locality, the road here bifurcates, ^{f1072} and we can conceive

how Jesus, Who had hitherto, in the silence of sadness, allowed Himself almost mechanically to be pressed onwards by the surrounding crowd, now turned, and by that look of commanding majesty, the forthbreaking of His Divine Being, which ever and again wrought on those around miracles of subjection, constrained them to halt and give way before Him, while unharmed He passed through their midst.^{f1073} So did Israel of old pass through the cleft waves of the sea, which the wonder-working rod of Moses had converted into a wall of safety. Yet, although He parted from it in judgment, not thus could the Christ have finally and for ever left His own Nazareth.^{f1074}

Cast out of His own city, Jesus pursued His solitary way towards Capernaum.^{f1075} There, at least, devoted friends and believing disciples would welcome Him. There, also, a large draught of souls would fill the Gospel-net. Capernaum would be His Galilean home. {St. ~~4001~~ Matthew 9:1.} Here He would, on the Sabbath-days, preach in that Synagogue, of which the good centurion was the builder, {St. ~~4075~~ Luke 7:5.} and Jarius the chief ruler. {St. ~~4072~~ Mark 5:22.} These names, and the memories connected with them, are a sufficient comment on the effect of His preaching: that 'His word was with power.' In Capernaum, also, was the now believing and devoted household of the court-officer, whose only son the Word of Christ, spoken at a distance, had restored to life. Here also, or in the immediate neighborhood, was the home of His earliest and closest disciples, the brothers Simon and Andrew, and of James and John, the sons of Zebedee.

From the character of the narrative, and still more from the later call of these four, {St. ~~4048~~ Matthew 4:18, 22, and parallels.} it would seem that, after the return of Jesus from Judaea into Galilee, His disciples had left Him, probably in Cana, and returned to their homes and ordinary avocations. They were not yet called to forsake all and follow Him, not merely to discipleship, but to fellowship and Apostolate. When He went from Cana to Nazareth, they returned to Capernaum. They knew He was near them. Presently He came; and now His Ministry was in their own Capernaum, or in its immediate neighborhood.

For Capernaum was not the only place where He taught. Rather was it the center for itinerancy through all that district, to preach in its Synagogues. {St. ~~4043~~ Matthew 4:13-17.} Amidst such ministry of quiet 'power,' chiefly alone and unattended by His disciples, the summer passed. Truly, it was

summer in the ancient land of Zebulun and Naphtali, in the Galilee of the Gentiles, when the glorious Light that had risen chased away the long winter's darkness, and those who had been the first exiles in Assyrian bondage were the first brought back to Israel's true liberty, and by Israel's Messiah-King. To the writer of the first Gospel, as, long years afterwards, he looked back on this, the happy time when he had first seen the Light, till it had sprung up even to him 'in the region and shadow of death,' it must have been a time of peculiarly bright memories. How often, as he sat at the receipt of custom, must he have seen Jesus passing by; how often must he have heard His Words, some, perhaps, spoken to himself, but all falling like good seed into the field of his heart, and preparing him at once and joyously to obey the summons when it came: Follow Me! And not to him only, but to many more, would it be a glowing, growing time of heaven's own summer.

There was a dim tradition in the Synagogue, that this prediction, { ~~<200>~~ Isaiah 9:2. } 'The people that walk in the darkness see a great light,' referred to the new light, with which God would enlighten the eyes of those who had penetrated into the mysteries of Rabbinic lore, enabling them to perceive concerning 'loosing and binding, concerning what was clean and what was unclean.' { Tanch. on ~~<1000>~~ Genesis 6:9; ed. Warsh. p. 11 b. } Others ^{f1076} regarded it as a promise to the early exiles, fulfilled when the great liberty came to them. To Levi-Matthew it seemed as if both interpretations had come true in those days of Christ's first Galilean ministry. Nay, he saw them combined in a higher unity when to their eyes, enlightened by the great Light, came the new knowledge of what was bound and what loosed, what unclean and clean, though quite differently from what Judaism had declared it to them; and when, in that orient Sun, the promise of liberty to long-banished Israel was at last seen fulfilled. It was, indeed, the highest and only true fulfilment of that prediction of Isaiah, ^{f1077} in a history where all was prophetic, every partial fulfilment only an unfolding and opening of the bud, and each symbolic of further unfolding till, in the fulness of time, the great Reality came, to which all that was prophetic in Israel's history and predictions pointed. And so as, in the evening of his days, Levi-Matthew looked back to distant Galilee, the glow of the setting sun seemed once more to rest on that lake, as it lay bathed in its sheen of gold. It lit up that city, those shores, that custom-house; it spread far off, over those hills, and across the Jordan. Truly, and in the only true sense, had then the

promise been fulfilled: {St. ~~40%~~ Matthew 9:16.} ‘To them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up.’

CHAPTER 12

AT THE ‘UNKNOWN’ FEAST IN JERUSALEM, AND BY THE POOL OF BETHESDA.

(St. ~~John~~ John 10)

THE shorter days of early autumn had come, ^{f1078} and the country stood in all its luxurious wealth of beauty and fruitfulness, as Jesus passed from Galilee to what, in the absence of any certain evidence, we must still be content to call ‘the Unknown Feast’ in Jerusalem. Thus much, however, seems clear that it was either the ‘Feast of Wood-offering’ on the 15th of Abh (in August), when, amidst demonstrations of joy, willing givers brought from all parts of the country the wood required for the service of the Altar; or else the ‘Feast of Trumpets’ on the 1st of Tishri (about the middle of September), which marked the beginning of the New (civil) Year. ^{f1079} The journey of Christ to that Feast and its results are not mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels, because that Judæan ministry which, if the illustration be lawful, was the historical thread on which St. John strung his record of what the Word spake, lay, in great measure, beyond their historical standpoint. Besides, this and similar events belonged, indeed, to that grand Self-Manifestation of Christ, with the corresponding growth of opposition consequent upon it, which it was the object of the Fourth Gospel to set forth; but it led to no permanent results, and so was outside the scope of the more popular, pragmatic record, which the other Gospels has in view.

There may in this instance, however, have been other reasons also for their silence. It has already been indicated that, during the summer of Christ’s first Galilean ministry, when Capernaum was His center of action, the disciples had returned to their homes and usual avocations, while Jesus moved about chiefly alone and unattended. This explains the circumstance of a second call, even to His most intimate and closest followers. It also accords best with that gradual development in Christ’s activity, which commencing with the more private teaching of the new Preacher of Righteousness in the villages by the lake, or in the Synagogues, expanded into that publicity in which He at last appears, surrounded by His Apostles, attended by the loving ministry of those to whom He had brought healing

of body or soul, and followed by a multitude which everywhere pressed around Him for teaching and help.

This more public activity commenced with the return of Jesus from ‘the Unknown Feast’ in Jerusalem. There He had, in answer to the challenge of the Jewish authorities, for the first time set forth His Messianic claims in all their fulness. And there, also, He had for the first time encountered that active persecution unto death, of which Golgotha was the logical outcome. This Feast, then, was the time of critical decision. Accordingly, as involving the separation from the old state and the commencement of a new condition of things, it was immediately followed by the call of His disciples to a new Apostleship. In this view, we can also better understand the briefness of the notices of His first Galilean ministry, and how, after Christ’s return from that Feast, His teaching became more full, and the display of His miraculous power more constant and public.

It seems only congruous, accordant with all the great decisive steps of Him in Whose footprints the disciples trod, only after He had marked them, as it were, with His Blood — that He should have gone up to that Feast alone and unattended. That such had been the case, has been inferred by some from this, that the narrative of the healing of the impotent man reads so Jewish, that the account of it appears to have been derived by St. John from a Jew at Jerusalem. { *Wetstein.* } ^{f1080} Others ^{f1081} have come to the same conclusion from the meagerness of details about the event. But it seems implied in the narrative itself, and the marked and exceptional absence of any reference to disciples leads to the obvious conclusion, that they had not been with their Master.

But, if Jesus was alone and unattended at the Feast, the question arises, whence the report was derived of what He said in reply to the challenge of the Jews? Here the answer naturally suggests itself, that the Master Himself may, at some later period of His life — perhaps during His last stay in Jerusalem — have communicated to His disciples, or else to him who stood nearest to Him, the details of what had passed on the first occasion when the Jewish authorities had sought to extinguish His Messianic claims in His blood. If that communication was made when Jesus was about to be offered up, it would also account for what otherwise might seem a difficulty: the very developed form of expression in which His relation to the Father, and His own Office and Power, are presented. We can understand how, from the very first, all this should have been laid before

the teachers of Israel. But in view of the organic development of Christ's teaching, we could scarcely expect it to have been expressed in such very full terms, till near the close of His Ministry. ^{f1082}

But we are anticipating. The narrative transports us at once to what, at the time, seems to have been a well-known locality in Jerusalem, though all attempts to identify it, or even to explain the name *Bethesda*, have hitherto failed. All we know is, that it was a pool enclosed within five porches, by the sheep-market, presumably close to the 'Sheep-Gate.' { ^{<1029>} ~~<1030>~~ Nehemiah 3:1, 32; ^{<1029>} 12:39. } This, as seems most likely, opened from the busy northern suburb of markets, bazaars, and workshops, eastwards upon the road which led over the Mount of Olives and Bethany to Jericho. ^{f1083} In that case, most probability would attach to the identification of the Pool Bethesda with a pool somewhat north of the so-called *Birket Israil*. At present it is wholly filled with rubbish, but in the time of the Crusaders it seems to have borne the name of the Sheep-pond, and, it was thought, traces of the five porches could still be detected. Be this as it may, it certainly bore in the 'Hebrew' — or rather Aramaean — 'tongue,' the name *Bethesda*. No doubt this name was designative, though the common explanations — *Beth Chisda* (so most modern writers, and Watkins) 'House of Mercy' (?), *Beth Istebha* (*akfsa Delitzsch*), 'House of Porches,' and *Beth Zeytha* (*Westcott*) 'House of the Olive' — seem all unsatisfactory. More probability attaches to the rendering *Beth Asutha* (*Wunsche*), or *Beth Asyatha*, 'House of Healing.' But as this derivation offers linguistic difficulties, we would suggest that the second part of the name (*Beth-Esda*) was really a Greek word Aramaized. Here two different derivations suggest themselves. The root-word of *Esda* might either express to 'become well' — Beth — ἰᾰσθαῖ or something akin to the Rabbinic *Zit* ^{f1084} (*fyz* = ζῆθι.) In that case, the designation would agree with an ancient reading of the name, *Bethzatha*. Or else, the name Bethesda might combine, according to a not uncommon Rabbinic practice, the Hebrew *Beth* with some Aramaized form derived from the Greek word ζέω, 'to boil' or 'bubble up' (subst. ζέσις); in which case it would mean 'the House of Bubbling-up,' viz. water. Any of the three derivations just suggested would not only give an apt designation for the pool, but explain why St. John, contrary to his usual practice, does not give a Greek equivalent for a Hebrew term.

All this is, however, of very subordinate importance, compared with the marvellous facts of the narrative itself. In the five porches surrounding this pool lay ‘a great multitude of the impotent,’ in anxious hope of a miraculous cure. We can picture to ourselves the scene. The popular superstitions,^{f1085} which gave rise to what we would regard as a peculiarly painful exhibition of human misery of body and soul, is strictly true to the times and the people. Even now travellers describe a similar concourse of poor crippled sufferers, on their miserable pallets or on rugs, around the mineral springs near Tiberias, filling, in true Oriental fashion, the air with their lamentations. In the present instance there would be even more occasion for this than around any ordinary thermal spring. For the popular idea was, that an Angel descended into the water, causing it to bubble up, and that only he who *first* stepped into the pool would be cured. As thus only one person could obtain benefit, we may imagine the lamentations of the ‘many’ who would, perhaps, day by day, be disappointed in their hopes. This bubbling up of the water was, of course, due not to supernatural but to physical causes. Such intermittent springs are not uncommon, and to this day the so-called ‘Fountain of the Virgin’ in Jerusalem exhibits the phenomenon. It is scarcely necessary to say, that the Gospel-narrative does not ascribe this ‘troubling of the waters’ to Angelic agency, nor endorses the belief, that only the first who afterwards entered them, could be healed. This was evidently the belief of the impotent man, as of all the waiting multitude. {St. John v.} But the words in verse 4 of our Authorized Version, and perhaps, also, the last clause of verse 3, are admittedly an interpolation.^{f1086}

In another part of this book it is explained at length,^{f1087} how Jewish belief at the time attached such agency to Angels, and how it localized (so to speak) special Angels in springs and rivers; and we shall have presently to show, what were the popular notions about miraculous cures. If, however, the belief about Bethesda arose merely from the mistaken ideas about the cause of this bubbling of the water, the question would naturally suggest itself, whether any such cases as those described had ever really occurred, and, if not, how such a superstition could have continued. But that such healing might actually occur in the circumstances, no one would be prepared to deny, who has read the accounts of pilgrimages to places of miraculous cure, or who considers the influence of a firm expectancy on the imagination, especially in diseases which have their origin in the nervous system. This view of the matter is confirmed, and Scripture still

further vindicated from even the faintest appearance of endorsing the popular superstition, by the use of the article in the expression ‘a multitude of the impotent’ (πλῆθος τῶν ἀσθενούντων), which marks this impotence as used in the generic sense, while the special diseases, afterwards enumerated without the article, are ranged under it as instances of those who were thus impotent. Such use of the Greek term, as not applying to any one specific malady, is vindicated by a reference to St. ^{f1087}Matthew 8:17 and St. ^{f1086}Mark 6:56, and by its employment by the physician Luke. It is, of course, not intended to imply, that the distempers to which this designation is given had all their origin in the nervous system; but we argue that, if the term ‘impotent’ was the general, of which the diseases mentioned in verse 3 were the specific — in other words, that, if it was an ‘impotence,’ of which these were the various manifestations, it may indicate, that they all, so far as relieved, had one common source, and this, as we would suggest, in the nervous system. ^{f1088}

With all reverence, we can in some measure understand, what feelings must have stirred the heart of Jesus, in view of this suffering, waiting ‘great multitude.’ Why, indeed, did He go into those five porches, since He had neither disease to cure, nor cry for help and come to Him from those who looked for relief to far other means? Not, surely, from curiosity. But as one longs to escape from the stifling atmosphere of a scene of worldly pomp, with its glitter and unreality, into the clearness of the evening-air, so our Lord may have longed to pass from the glitter and unreality of those who held rule in the Temple, or who occupied the seat of Moses in their Academies, to what was the atmosphere of His Life on earth, His real Work, among that suffering, ignorant multitude, which, in its sorrow, raised a piteous, longing cry for help where it had been misdirected to seek it.

And thus we can here also perceive the deep internal connection between Christ’s miracle of healing ‘the impotent man’ and the address of mingled sadness and severity, {St. ^{f1085}John 5:17-47.} in which He afterwards set before the Masters in Israel the one truth fundamental in all things. We have only, so to speak, to reverse the formal order and succession of that discourse, to gain an insight into what prompted Jesus to go to Bethesda, and by His power to perform this healing. ^{f1089} He had been in the Temple at the Feast; He had necessarily been in contact — it could not be otherwise, when in the Temple — with the great ones of Israel. What a stifling atmosphere there of glitter and unreality! What had He in common

with those who ‘received glory one of another, and the glory which cometh from the One only God’ they sought not? {ver. 44.} How could such men believe? The first meaning, and the object of His Life and Work, was as entirely different from their aims and perceptions, as were the respective springs of their inner being. They clung and appealed to Moses; to Moses, whose successors they claimed to be, let them go! {vv. 45-47.} Their elaborate searching and sifting of the Law in hope that, by a subtle analysis of its every particle and letter, by inferences from, and a careful drawing of a prohibitive hedge around, its letter, they would possess themselves of eternal life, {ver. 39.} what did it all come to? Utterly self-deceived, and far from the truth in their elaborate attempts to outdo each other in local ingenuity, they would, while rejecting the Messiah sent from God, at last become the victims of a coarse Messianic impostor. {vv. 40-43.} And even in the present, what was it all? Only the letter — the outward! All the lessons of their past miraculous history had been utterly lost on them. What had there been of the merely outward in its miracles and revelations? {ver. 37.} It had been the witness of the Father; but this was the very element which, amidst their handling of the external form, they perceived not. Nay, not only the unheard Voice of the Father, but also the heard voice of the Prophets — a voice which they might have heard even in John the Baptist. They heard, but did not perceive it — just as, in increasing measure, Christ’s sayings and doings, and the Father and His testimony, were not perceived. And so all hastened on to the judgment of final unbelief, irretrievable loss, and self-caused condemnation. {vv. 30-38.} It was all utterly mistaken; utter, and, alas! guilty perversion, their elaborate trifling with the most sacred things, while around them were suffering, perishing men, stretching ‘lame hands’ into emptiness, and wailing out their mistaken hopes into the eternal silence.

While they were discussing the niceties of what constituted labor on a Sabbath, such as what infringed its sacred rest or what constituted a burden, multitudes of them who labored and were heavy laden were left to perish in their ignorance. That was the Sabbath, and the God of the Sabbath of Pharisaism; this the rest, the enlightenment, the hope for them who labored and were heavy laden, and who longed and knew not where to find the true *Sabbatismos*! Nay, if the Christ had not been the very opposite of all that Pharisaism sought, He would not have been the Orient Sun of the Eternal Sabbath. But the God Who ever worked in love, Whose rest was to give rest, Whose Sabbath to remove burdens, was His Father.

He knew Him; He saw His working; He was in fellowship of love, of work, of power with Him. He had come to loose every yoke, to give life, to bring life, to be life — because He had life: life in its fullest sense. For, contact with Him, whatever it may be, gives life: to the diseased, health; to the spiritually dead, the life of the soul; to the dead in their graves, the life of resurrection. And all this was the meaning of Holy Scripture, when it pointed forward to the Lord's Anointed; and all this was not merely His own, but the Father's Will — the Mission which He had given Him, the Work which He had sent Him to do. {vv. 19-32.}

Translate this into deed, as all His teachings have been, are, and will be, and we have the miraculous cure of the impotent man, with its attendant circumstances. Or, conversely, translate that deed, with its attendant circumstances, into words, and we have the discourse of our Lord. Moreover, all this is fundamental to the highest understanding of our Lord's history. And, therefore, we understand how, many years afterwards, the beloved disciple gave a place to this miracle, when, in the full ripeness of spiritual discernment, he chose for record in his Gospel from among those 'many signs,' which Jesus truly did, {St. ~~John~~ John 20:30.} only five as typical, like the five porches of the great Bethesda of His help to the impotent, or like the five divisions into which the Psalter of praise was arranged. As he looked back, from the height where he stood at his journey's end, to where the sun was setting in purple and golden glory far across the intervening landscape, amidst its varying scenes this must have stood out before his sight, as what might show to us that 'Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through His Name. {St. ~~John~~ John 20:31.}

And so, understanding from what He afterwards said to 'the Jews' what He thought and felt in going thither, we are better prepared to follow the Christ to Bethesda. Two pictures must have been here simultaneously present to His mind. On the one side, a multitude whose sufferings and false expectancies rose, like the wail of the starving for bread; and, on the other side, the neighboring Temple, with its priesthood and teachers, who, in their self-seeking and the trifling of their religious externalism, neither understood, heard, nor would have cared for such a cry. If there was an Israel, Prince with God, and if there was a God of the Covenant, this must not, cannot be; and Christ goes to Bethesda as Israel's Messiah, the Truth, and the Life. There was twofold suffering there, and it were difficult to know which would have stirred Him most: that of the body, or the

mistaken earnestness which so trustfully looked for Heaven's relief — yet within such narrow limits as the accident or good fortune of being first pushed into the Angel-troubled waters. But this was also a true picture of His people in their misery, and in their narrow notions of God and of the conditions of His blessing. And now Israel's Messiah had at last come. What would we expect Him to have done? Surely not to preach controversial or reformatory doctrines; but to do, if it were in Him, and in doing to speak. And so in this also the Gospel-narrative proves itself true, by telling that He did, what alone would be true in a Messiah, the Son of God. It is, indeed, impossible to think of Incarnate Deity — and this, be it remembered, is the fundamental postulate of the Gospels — as brought into contact with misery, disease, and death without their being removed. That power went forth from Him always, everywhere, and to all, is absolutely necessary, if He was the Son of God, the Savior of the world. And so the miracles, as we mistakenly term the result of the contact of God with man, of the *Immanuel* (God with us), are not only the golden ladder which leads up to the *Miracle*, God manifest in the flesh, but the steps by which He descends from His height to our lowliness.

The waters had not yet been 'troubled,' when He stood among that multitude of sufferers and their attendant friends. It was in those breathless moments of the intense suspense of expectancy, when every eye was fixed on the *pool*, that the eye of the Savior searched for the most wretched object among them all. In him, as a typical case, could He best do and teach that for which He had come. This 'impotent' man, for thirty-eight years a hopeless sufferer, without attendant or friend {ver. 7.} among those whom misery — in this also the true outcome of sin — made so intensely selfish; and whose sickness was really the consequence of his sin, {ver. 14.} and not merely in the sense which the Jews attached to it, {Comp. St. ~~RWB~~ John 9:3.} — this now seemed the fittest object for power and grace. For, most marked in this history is the entire spontaneity of our Lord's help. ^{f1090} It is idle to speak either of faith or of receptiveness on the man's part. The essence of the whole lies in the utter absence of both; in Christ's raising, as it were, the dead, and calling the things that are not as though they were. This, the fundamental thought concerning His Mission and power as the Christ shines forth as the historical background in Christ's subsequent, explanatory discourse. The 'Wilt thou be made whole?' with which Jesus drew the man's attention to Himself, was only to probe and lay bare his misery. And then came the word of power, or rather

the power spoken forth, which made him whole every whit. Away from this pool, in which there was no healing; away — for the Son of God had come to him with the outflowing of His power and pitying help, and he was made whole. Away with his bed, not, although it was the holy Sabbath, but just because it was the Sabbath of holy rest and holy delight!

In the general absorbedness of all around, no ear, but that to which it had been spoken, had heard what the Savior had said. The waters had not been troubled, and the healing had been all unseen. Before the healed man, scarcely conscious of what had passed, had, with new-born vigor, gathered, himself up and rolled together his coverlet to hasten after Him, Jesus had already withdrawn. {ver. 13.} ^{f1091} In that multitude, all thinking only of their own sorrows and wants, He had come and gone unobserved. But they all now knew and observed this miracle of healing, as they saw this unbefriended and most wretched of them all healed, without the troubling of waters or first immersion in them. Then there was really help in Israel, and help not limited to such external means! How could Christ have taught that multitude, nay — all Jerusalem and Jewry, all this, as well as all about Himself, but by what He did? And so we learn here also another aspect of miracles, as necessary for those who, weary of Rabbinic wrangling, could, in their felt impotence, only learn by what He did that which He would say.

We know it not, but we cannot believe that on that day, nor, perhaps, thenceforth on any other day, any man stepped for healing into the bubbling waters of Bethesda. Rather would they ask the healed man, Whose was the word that had brought him healing? But he knew Him not. Forth he stepped into God's free air, a new man. It was truly the holy Sabbath within, as around him; but he thought not of the day, only of the rest and relief it had brought. It was the holy Sabbath, and he carried on it his bed. If he remembered that it was the Sabbath, on which it was unlawful to carry forth anything — a burden, he would not be conscious that it was a burden, or that he had any burden; but very conscious that He, Who had made him whole, had bidden him take up his bed and walk. These directions had been bound up with the very word ('Rise') in which his healing had come. That was enough for him. And in this lay the beginning and root of his inward healing. Here was simple trust, unquestioning obedience to the unseen, unknown, but real Savior. For he believed Him, ^{f1092} and therefore trusted in Him, that He must be right; and so, trusting without questioning, he obeyed.

The Jews saw him, as from Bethesda he carried home his ‘burden.’ Such as that he carried were their only burdens. Although the law of Sabbath-observance must have been made stricter in later Rabbinic development, when even the labor of moving the sick into the waters of Bethesda would have been unlawful, unless there had been present danger to life,^{f1093} yet, admittedly, this carrying of the bed was an infringement of the Sabbatic law, as interpreted by traditionalism. Most characteristically, it was this external infringement which they saw, and nothing else; it was the Person Who had commanded it Whom they would know, not Him Who had made whole the impotent man. Yet this is quite natural, and perhaps not so different from what we may still witness among ourselves.

It could not have been long after this — most likely, as soon as possible — that the healed man and his Healer met in the Temple. What He then said to him, completed the inward healing. On the ground of his having been healed, let him be whole. As he trusted and obeyed Jesus in the outward cure, so let him now inwardly and morally trust and obey. Here also this looking through the external to the internal, through the temporal to the spiritual and eternal, which is so characteristic of the after-discourse of Jesus, nay — of all His discourses and of His deeds, is most marked. The healed man now knew to Whom he owed faith, gratitude, and trust of obedience; and the consequences of this knowledge must have been incalculable. It would make him a disciple in the truest sense. And this was the only additional lesson which he, as each of us, must learn individually and personally: that the man healed by Christ stands in quite another position, as regards the morally right, from what he did before — not only before his healing, but even before his felt sickness, so that, if he were to go back to sin, or rather, as the original implies, ‘continue to sin,’^{f1094} a thing infinitely worse would come to him.

It seems an idle question, why the healed man told the Jews that it was Jesus. It was only natural that he should do so. Rather do we ask, How did he know that He Who had spoken to him was *Jesus*? Was it by the surrounding of keen-eyed, watchful Rabbis, or by the contradiction of sinners? Certain we are, that it was far better Jesus should have silently withdrawn from the porches of Bethesda to make it known in the Temple, Who it was that had done this miracle. Far more effectually could He so preach its lesson to those who had been in Bethesda, and to all Jewry.

And yet something further was required. He must speak it out in clear, open words, what was the hidden inward meaning of this miracle. As so often, it was the bitter hatred of His persecutors which gave Him the opportunity. The first forthbursting of His Messianic Mission and Character had come in that Temple, when He realized it as His Father's House, and His Life as about His Father's business. Again had these thoughts about His Father kindled within Him in that Temple, when, on the first occasion of His Messianic appearance there, He had sought to purge it, that it might be a House of Prayer. And now, once more in that House, it was the same consciousness about God as His Father, and His Life as the business of His Father, which furnished the answer to the angry invectives about His breach of the Sabbath-Law. The Father's Sabbath was His; the Father worked hitherto and He worked; the Father's work and His were the same; He was the Son of the Father. {ver. 17.} And in this He also taught, what the Jews had never understood, the true meaning of the Sabbath-Law, by emphasizing that which was the fundamental thought of the Sabbath — 'Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and *hallowed it:*' not the rest of inactivity, but of blessing and hallowing.

Once more it was not His whole meaning, but only this one point, that He claimed to be equal with God, of which they took hold. As we understand it, the discourse beginning with verse 19 is not a continuation of that which had been begun in verse 17, but was delivered on another, though probably proximate occasion. By what He had said about the Father working hitherto and His working, He had silenced the multitude, who must have felt that God's rest was truly that of beneficence, not of inactivity. But He had raised another question, that of His equality with God, and for this He was taken to task by the Masters in Israel. To them it was that He addressed that discourse which, so to speak, preached His miracle at the Pool of Bethesda. Into its details we cannot enter further than has already been done. Some of its reasonings can be clearly traced, as starting from certain fundamental positions, held in common alike by the Sanhedrists and by Christ. Others, such as probably in answer to unreported objections, we may guess at. This may also account for what may seem occasional abruptness of transitions.

But what most impresses us, is the majestic grandeur of Christ's self-consciousness in presence of His enemies, and yet withal the tone of pitying sadness which pervades His discourse. The time of the judgment of silence had not yet come. And for the present the majesty of His bearing

overawed them, even as it did His enemies to the end, and Christ could pass unharmed from among them. And so ended that day in Jerusalem. And this is all that is needful for us to know of His stay at the Unknown Feast. With this inward separation, and the gathering of hostile parties closes the first and begins the second, stage of Christ's Ministry.

CHAPTER 13

BY THE SEA OF GALILEE — THE FINAL CALL OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES, AND THE MIRACULOUS DRAUGHT OF FISHES

(St. ~~4018~~ Matthew 4:18-22; St. ~~4016~~ Mark 1:16-20; St. ~~4017~~ Luke 5:1-11.)

WE are once again out of the stifling spiritual atmosphere of the great City, and by the glorious Lake of Galilee. They were other men, these honest, simple, earnest, impulsive Galileans, than that self-seeking, sophisticated, heartless assemblage of Rabbis, whose first active persecution Jesus had just encountered, and for the time overawed by the majesty of His bearing. His return to Capernaum could not have remained unknown. Close by, on either side of the city, the country was studded with villages and towns, a busy, thriving, happy multitude. During that bright summer He had walked along that Lake, and by its shore and in the various Synagogues preached His Gospel. And they had been ‘astonished at His doctrine, for His word was with power.’ For the first time they had heard what they felt to be ‘the Word of God,’ and they had learned to love its sound. What wonder that, immediately on His return, ‘the people pressed upon Him to hear’ it.

If we surrender ourselves to the impression which the Evangelic narratives give us when pieced together, ^{f1095} it would almost seem, as if what we are about to relate had occurred while Jesus was returning from Jerusalem. For, the better reading of St. ~~4016~~ Mark 1:16 gives this as the mark of time: ‘As He was passing on by the Sea of Galilee.’ But perhaps, viewed in connection with what follows, the impression may be so far modified, that we may think of it as on the first morning after His return. It had probably been a night of storm on the Lake. For, the toil of the fishermen had brought them no draught of fishes, {St. ~~4015~~ Luke 5:5.} and they stood by the shore, or in the boats drawn up on the beach, casting in their nets to ‘wash’ them ^{f1096} of the sand and pebbles, with which such a night’s work would clog them, or to mend what had been torn by the violence of the waves. It was a busy scene; for, among the many industries by the Lake of Galilee, that of fishing was not only the most generally pursued, but perhaps the most lucrative.

Tradition had it, that since the days of Joshua, and by one of his ten ordinances, fishing in the Lake, though under certain necessary restrictions,

was free to all. ^{f1097} And as fish was among the favorite articles of diet, in health and sickness, on week-days and especially at the Sabbath-meal, many must have been employed in connection with this trade. Frequent, and sometimes strange, are the Rabbinic advices, what kinds of fish to eat at different times, and in what state of preparation. They were eaten fresh, dried, or pickled; {St. ^{<4070>}Matthew 7:10; 13:47; 15:36.} a kind of 'relish' or sauce was made of them, and the roe also prepared. {Ab. Z. 39 *a.*} or twine, {Bab. Mez 2:1.} and the smaller fish in baskets or casks. In truth, these Rabbis are veritable connoisseurs in this delicacy; they discuss their size with exaggerations, advise when they are in season, discern a peculiar flavor in the same kinds if caught in different waters, and tell us how to prepare them most tastefully, cautioning us to wash them down, if it cannot be with water, with beer rather than wine. {Moed K. 11 *a.*, last line.} ^{f1098} It is one of their usual exaggerations, when we read of 300 different kinds of fish at a dinner given to a great Rabbi, {Jer. Sheq. 6:2, p. 50 *a.*} although the common proverb had it, to denote what was abundant, that it was like 'bringing fish to Acco.' {Shem. R. 9.} Besides, fish was also largely imported from abroad. ^{f1099} It indicates the importance of this traffic, that one of the gates of Jerusalem was called 'the fish-gate.' {^{<4078>}Nehemiah 3:3.} Indeed, there is a legend {Ber. 44 *a.*} to the effect, that not less than 600,000 casks of sardines were every week supplied for the fig-dressers of King Jannaeus. But, apart from such exaggerations, so considerable was this trade that, at a later period, one of the Patriarchs of the Sanhedrin engaged in it, and actually freighted ships for the transport of fish. {Jer. Ab. Z. 2:10, p. 42 *a.*}

These notices, which might be largely multiplied, are of more than antiquarian interest. They give a more vivid idea of life by the Lake of Galilee, and show that those engaged in that trade, like Zebedee and his sons (^{hydanz}, 'the God-given,' like Theodore and Dorothea), were not unfrequently men of means and standing. This irrespective of the fact, that the Rabbis enjoined some trade or industrial occupation on every man, whatever his station. We can picture to ourselves, on that bright autumn morning, after a stormy night of bootless toil, the busy scene by the Lake, with the fishermen cleaning and mending their nets. Amidst their work they would scarcely notice the gathering crowd. As we have suggested from the better reading of St. ^{<4016>}Mark 1:16, it was Christ's first walk by the Lake on the morning after His return from Judaea. Engaged in their fishing on the afternoon, evening, and night of His arrival in Capernaum, they would

probably not have known of His presence till He spake to them. But He had come that morning specially to seek four of these fishers, that He might, now that the time for it had come, call them to permanent discipleship — and, what is more, fit them for the work to which he would call them.

Jewish customs and modes of thinking at that time do not help us further to understand the Lord's call of them, except so far as they enable us more clearly to apprehend what the words of Jesus would convey to them. The expression 'Follow Me' would be readily understood, as implying a call to become the *permanent* disciple of a teacher. {So in Erub. 30 *a*.} Similarly, it was not only the practice of the Rabbis, but regarded as one of the most sacred duties, for a Master to gather around him a circle of disciples. {Ab. 1:1; Sanh. 91 *b*.} Thus, neither Peter and Andrew, nor the sons of Zebedee, could have misunderstood the call of Christ, or even regarded it as strange. On that memorable return from His Temptation in the wilderness they had learned to know Him as the Messiah, {St. ~~John~~ John 1:37 etc.} and they followed Him. And, now that the time had come for gathering around Him a separate discipleship, when, with the visit to the Unknown Feast, the Messianic activity of Jesus had passed into another stage, that call would not come as a surprise to their minds or hearts.

So far as the Master was concerned, we mark three points. First, the call came *after* the open breach with, and initial persecution of, the Jewish authorities. It was, therefore, a call to fellowship in His peculiar relationship to the Synagogue. Secondly, it necessitated the abandonment of all their former occupations, and, indeed, of all earthly ties. {St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 4:20, 22.} Thirdly, it was from the first, and clearly, marked as totally different from a call to such discipleship, as that of any other Master in Israel. It was not to learn more of doctrine, nor more fully to follow out a life-direction already taken, but to begin, and to become, something quite new, of which their former occupation offered an emblem. The disciples of the Rabbis, even those of John the Baptist, 'followed,' in order to learn; they, in order to do, and to enter into fellowship with His Work. 'Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men.' It was then quite a new call this, which at the same time indicated its real aim and its untold difficulties. Such a call could not have been addressed to them, if they had not already been disciples of Jesus, understood His Mission, and the character of the Kingdom of God. But, the more we think of it, the more do we perceive the magnitude of the call and of the decision which it

implied — for, without doubt, they understood what it implied, as clearly, in some respects perhaps more clearly, than we do. All the deeper, then, must have been their loving belief in Him, and their earnest attachment, when, with such unquestioning trust, and such absolute simplicity and entireness of self-surrender, that it needed not even a spoken *Yea* on their part, they forsook ship and home to follow Him. And so, successively, Simon ^{fi100} and Andrew, and John and James — those who had been the first to hear, were also the first to follow Jesus. And ever afterwards did they remain closest to Him, who had been the first fruits of His Ministry.

It is not well to speak too much of the faith of men. With all the singleness of spiritual resolve — perhaps, as yet, rather impulse — which it implied, they probably had not themselves full or adequate conception of what it really meant. That would evolve in the course of Christ's further teaching, and of their learning in mind and heart. But, even thus, we perceive, that in their own call they had already, in measure, lived the miracle of the draught of fishes which they were about to witness. What had passed between Jesus and, first, the sons of Jona, and then those of Zebedee, can scarcely have occupied many minutes. But already the people were pressing around the Master in eager hunger for the Word; for, all the livelong night their own teachers had toiled, and taken nothing which they could give them as food. To such call the Fisher of Men could not be deaf. The boat of Peter shall be His pulpit; He had consecrated it by consecrating its owner. The boat has been thrust out a little from the land, and over the soft ripple of the waters comes the strange melody of that Word. We need scarcely ask what He spake. It would be of the Father, of the Kingdom, and of those who entered it — like what He spake from the Mount, or to those who labored and were heavy laden. But it would carry to the hearers the wondrous beauty and glory of that opening Kingdom, and, by contrast, the deep poverty and need of their souls. And Peter had heard it all in the boat, as he sat close by, in the shadow of His Majesty. Then, this was the teaching of which he had become a disciple; this, the net and the fishing to which he was just called. How utterly miserable, in one respect, must it have made him. Could such an one as he ever hope, with whatever toil, to be a successful fisher?

Jesus had read his thoughts, and much more than read them. It was all needed for the qualifying of Peter especially, but also of the others who had been called to be fishers of men. Presently it shall be all brought to light; not only that it may be made clear, but that, alike, the lesson and the help

may be seen. And this is another object in Christ's miracles to His disciples: to make clear their inmost thoughts and longings, and to point them to the right goal. 'Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.' That they toil in vain all life's night, only teaches the need of another beginning. The 'nevertheless, at Thy word,' marks the new trust, and the new work as springing from that trust. When Christ is in the boat and bids us let down the net, there must be 'a great multitude of fishes.' And all this in this symbolic miracle. Already 'the net was breaking,' when they beckoned to their partners in the other ship, that they should come and help them. And now both ships are burdened to the water's edge.

But what did it all mean to Simon Peter? He had been called to full discipleship, and he had obeyed the call. He had been in his boat beside the Savior, and heard what He had spoken, and it had gone to his heart. And now this miracle which he had witnessed! Such shoal of fish in one spot on the Lake of Galilee was not strange. The miraculous was, that the Lord had seen through those waters down where the multitude of fishes was, and bidden him let down for a draught. He could see through the intervening waters, right down to the bottom of that sea; He could see through him, to the very bottom of Peter's heart. He did see it — and all that Jesus had just spoken meant it, and showed him what was there. And could *he* then be a fisher of men, out of whose heart, after a life's night of toil, the net would come up empty, or rather only clogged with sand and torn with pebbles? This is what he meant when 'he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying: Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' And this is why Jesus comforted him: 'Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.' And so also, and so only, do we, each of us, learn the lesson of our calling, and receive the true comfort in it. Nor yet can anyone become a true fisher of men in any other than such manner.

The teaching and the comfort required not to be repeated in the life of Peter, nor in that of the others who witnessed and shared in what had passed. Many are the truths which shine out from the symbolism of this scene, when the first disciples were first called. That call itself; the boat; the command of Christ, despite the night of vain toil; the unlikely success; the net and its cast at the bidding of Christ, with the absolute certitude of result, where He is and when He bids; the miraculous direction to the spot; the multitude of fishes enclosed; the net about to break, yet not breaking; the surprise, as strange perhaps as the miracle itself; and then, last of all, the lesson of self-knowledge and humiliation: all these and much more has

the Church most truly read in this history. And as we turn from it, this stands out to us as its final outcome and lesson: ‘And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all and followed Him.’ ^{f1101}

CHAPTER 14

A SABBATH IN CAPERNAUM

(St. ~~4184~~ Matthew 8:14-17; St. ~~4102~~ Mark 1:21-34; St. ~~4103~~ Luke 4:33-41.)

It was the Holy Sabbath — the first after He had called around Him His first permanent disciples; the first, also, after His return from the Feast at Jerusalem. Of both we can trace indications in the account of that morning, noon, and evening which the Evangelists furnish. The greater detail with which St. Mark, who wrote under the influence of St. Peter, tells these events, shows the freshness and vividness of impression on the mind of Peter of those early days of his new life. As indicating that what is here recorded took place immediately after the return of Jesus from Jerusalem, we mark, that as yet there were no watchful enemies in waiting to entrap Him in such breach of the Law, as might furnish ground for judicial procedure. But, from their presence and activity so soon afterwards, {St. ~~4171~~ Luke 5:21; 6:2; 6:7.} we infer, that the authorities of Jerusalem had sent some of their familiars to track His steps in Galilee.

But as yet all seemed calm and undisturbed. Those simple, warm-hearted Galileans yielded themselves to the power of His words and works, not discerning hidden blasphemy in what He said, nor yet Sabbath-desecration in His healing on God's holy day. It is morning, and Jesus goes to the Synagogue at Capernaum. ^{f1102} To teach there, was now His wont. But frequency could not lessen the impression. In describing the Influence of His Person or words the Evangelists use a term, which really means *amazement*. ^{f1103} And when we find the same word to describe the impression of the 'Sermon on the Mount,' {St. ~~4173~~ Matthew 7:28.} the inference is naturally suggested, that it presents the type, if it does not sum up the contents, of some of His Synagogue-discourses. It is not necessary to suppose that, what held His hearers spell-bound, had necessarily also its effect on their hearts and lives. Men may be enraptured by the ideal without trying to make it the real. Too often it is even in inverse proportion; so that those who lead not the most moral lives even dare to denounce the New Testament standpoint, as below their own conceptions of right and duty. But there is that in man, evidence of his origin and destiny, which always and involuntarily responds to the presentation of the

higher. And in this instance it was not only what He taught, but the contrast with that to which they had been accustomed on the part of 'the Scribes,' which filled them with amazement. There was no appeal to human authority, other than that of the conscience; no subtle logical distinctions, legal niceties, nor clever sayings. Clear, limpid, and crystalline, flowed His words from out the spring of the Divine Life that was in Him.

Among the hearers in the Synagogue that Sabbath morning was one of a class, concerning whose condition, whatever difficulties may attach to our proper understanding of it, the reader of the New Testament must form some definite idea. The term 'demoniacal possession' occurs not in the New Testament. We owe it to Josephus, {Comp. *Delitzsch in Riehm's Handwörterbuch.*} from whom it has passed into ecclesiastical language. We dismiss it the more readily, that, in our view, it conveys a wrong impression. The New Testament speaks of those who had a spirit, or a demon, or demons, or an unclean spirit, or the spirit of an unclean demon, but chiefly of persons who were 'demonized.' ^{f1104} Similarly, it seems a strange inaccuracy on the part of commentators to exclude from the Gospel, of St. John all notice of the 'demonized.' That the Fourth Gospel, although not reporting any healing of the demonized, shares the fundamental view of the Synoptists, appears not only from St. ~~<R2D>~~ John 7:20, 8:48, 52, but especially from 8:49 and ~~<R2D>~~ 10:20, 21. ^{f1105} We cannot believe that the writer of the Fourth Gospel would have put into the mouth of Jesus the answer 'I am not a demon,' or have allowed Him to be described by His friends as not one 'demonized,' without a single word to show dissent from the popular view, if he had not shared the ideas of the Synoptists. In discussing a question of such very serious import in the study and criticism of the Gospels, the precise facts of the case should in the first place be clearly ascertained.

The first question here is, whether Christ Himself shared the views, not indeed of His contemporaries (for these, as we shall see, were very different), but of the Evangelists in regard to what they call the 'demonized'? This has been extensively denied, and Christ represented as only unwilling needlessly to disturb a popular prejudice, which He could not at the time effectually combat. But the theory requires more than this; and, since Christ not only tolerated, but in addressing the demonized actually adopted, or seemed to adopt, the prevailing view, it has been argued, that, for the sake of these poor afflicted persons, He acted like a physician who appears to enter into the fancy of his patient, in order the

more effectually to heal him of it. This view seems, however, scarcely worth refuting, since it imputes to Jesus, on a point so important, a conduct not only unworthy of Him, or indeed of any truly great man, but implies a canon of ‘accommodation’ which might equally be applied to His Miracles, or to anything else that contravened the notions of an interpreter, and so might transform the whole Gospel-narratives into a series of historically untrustworthy legends. But we will not rest the case on what might be represented as an appeal to prejudice. For, we find that Jesus not only tolerated the popular ‘prejudice,’ or that He ‘adopted it for the sake of more readily healing those thus afflicted’ — but that He even made it part of His disciples’ commission to ‘cast out demons,’ {St. ~~4008~~ Matthew 10:8.} and that, when the disciples afterwards reported their success in this, Christ actually made it a matter of thanksgiving to God. {St. ~~2007~~ Luke 10:17, 18.} The same view underlies His reproof to the disciples, when failing in this part of their work; {St. ~~4072~~ Matthew 17:21; comp. also 12:43 etc., also spoken to the disciples.} while in St. ~~2119~~ Luke 11:19, 24, He adopts, and argues on this view as against the Pharisees. Regarded therefore in the light of history, impartial criticism can arrive at no other conclusion, than that Jesus of Nazareth shared the views of the Evangelists as regards the ‘demonized.’ ^{f1106}

Our next inquiry must be as to the character of the phenomenon thus designated. In view of the fact that in St. ~~4092~~ Mark 9:21, the demonized had been such ‘of a child,’ it is scarcely possible to ascribe it simply to *moral* causes. Similarly, personal faith does not seem to have been a requisite condition of healing. Again, as other diseases are mentioned without being attributed to demoniacal influence, and as *all* who were dumb, deaf, or paralyzed would not have been described as ‘demonized,’ it is evident that all physical, or even mental distempers of the same class were not ascribed to the same cause: some might be natural, while others were demoniacal. On the other hand, there were more or less violent symptoms of disease in every demonized person, and these were greatly aggravated in the last paroxysm, when the demon quitted his habitation. We have, therefore, to regard the phenomena described as caused by the influence of such ‘spirits,’ primarily, upon that which forms the nexus between body and mind, the nervous system, and as producing different physical effects, according to the part of the nervous system affected. To this must be added a certain impersonality of consciousness, so that for the time the consciousness was not that of the demonized, but the demonizer, just as in

certain mesmeric states the consciousness of the mesmerized is really that of the mesmeriser. We might carry the analogy farther, and say, that the two states are exactly parallel — the demon or demons taking the place of the mesmeriser, only that the effects were more powerful and extensive, perhaps more enduring. But one point seems to have been assumed, for which there is, to say the least, no evidence, viz., that because, at least in many cases, the disease caused by the demon was permanent, therefore those who were so affected were *permanently* or constantly under the power of the demon. Neither the New Testament, nor even Rabbinic literature, conveys the idea of permanent demoniac indwelling, to which the later term ‘possession’ owes its origin.^{f1107} On the contrary, such accounts, as that of the scene in the Synagogue of Capernaum, convey the impression of a sudden influence, which in most cases seems occasioned by the spiritual effect of the Person or of the Words of the Christ. To this historical sketch we have only to add, that the phenomenon is not referred to either in the Old Testament.^{f1108} or in the Apocrypha,^{f1109} nor, for that matter in the Mishnah,^{f1110} where, indeed, from the character of its contents, one would scarcely expect to find it. But we find it mentioned not only in the New Testament, but in the writings of *Josephus*.^{f1111} The references in heathen or in Christian writings posterior to those of the New Testament lie beyond our present inquiry.^{f1112}

In view of these facts, we may arrive at some more definite conclusions. Those who contend that the representations of the Evangelists are identical with the popular Jewish notions of the time, must be ill acquainted with the latter. What these were, is explained in another place.^{f1113} Suffice it here to state that, whatever want of clearness there may be about the Jewish ideas of demoniac influences, there is none as to the means proposed for their removal. These may be broadly classified as: *magical means* for the prevention of such influences (such as the avoidance of certain places, times, numbers, or circumstances; amulets, etc.); *magical means* for the cure of diseases; and direct *exorcism* (either by certain outward means, or else by formulas of incantation). Again, while the New Testament furnishes no data by which to learn the views of Jesus or of the Evangelists regarding the exact character of the phenomenon, it furnishes the fullest details as to the manner in which the demonised were set free. This was always the same. It consisted neither in magical means formulas of exorcism, but always in the Word of Power which Jesus spake, or entrusted to His disciples, and which the demons always obeyed. There is here not only

difference, but contrariety in comparison with the current Jewish notions, and it leads to the conclusion that there was the same contrast in His views, as in His treatment of the ‘demonized.’

Jewish superstition in regard to the demoniacal state can, therefore, no more affect the question of the credibility of the Gospel-accounts of it, than can quotations from heathen or from post-Apostolic Christian writers. In truth, it must be decided purely on New Testament grounds; and resolves itself into that of the general trustworthiness of the Evangelic narratives, and of our estimate of the Person of Christ. Thus viewed, he who regards Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God can be in no doubt. If we are asked to explain the *rationale* of the phenomenon, or of its cessation — if, indeed, it has wholly and everywhere ceased — we might simply decline to attempt that for which we have not sufficient data, and this, without implying that such did not exist, or that, if known, they would not wholly vindicate the facts of the case. At any rate, it does not follow that there are no such data because we do not possess them; nor is there any ground for the contention that, if they existed, we ought to possess them. For, admittedly, the phenomenon was only a temporary one.

And yet certain considerations will occur to the thoughtful reader, which, if they do not explain, will at least make him hesitate to designate as inexplicable, the facts in question. In our view, at least, he would be a bold interpreter who would ascribe all the phenomena even of heathen magic to jugglery, or else to purely physical causes. Admittedly they have ceased, or perhaps, as much else, assumed other forms, just as, so far as evidence goes, demoniac influence has — at least in the form presented in the New Testament. But, that it has so ceased, does not prove that it never existed. If we believe that the Son of God came to destroy the works of the Devil, we can understand the developed enmity of the kingdom of darkness; and if we regard Christ as Very God, taking, in manner to us mysterious, Humanity, we can also perceive how the Prince of Darkness might, in counterfeit, seek through the demonized a temporary dwelling in Humanity for purposes of injury and destruction, as Christ for healing and salvation. In any case, holding as we do that this demoniac influence was not *permanent* in the demonized, the analogy of certain mesmeric influences seems exactly to apply. No reference is here made to other supernatural spirit-influences of which many in our days speak, and which, despite the lying and imposture probably connected with them, have a background of truth and reality, which, at least in the present writer’s experience, cannot

be absolutely denied. In the mysterious connection between the sensuous and supersensuous, spirit and matter, there are many things which the vulgar 'bread-and-butter philosophy' fails rightly to apportion, or satisfactorily to explain. That, without the intervention of sensuous media, mind can, may, and does affect mind; that even animals, in proportion to their sensitiveness, or in special circumstances, are affected by that which is not, or else not yet, seen, and this quite independently of man; that, in short, there are not a few phenomena 'in heaven and earth' of which our philosophy dreams not — these are considerations which, however the superficial sciolist may smile at them, no earnest inquirer would care to dismiss with peremptory denial. And superstition only begins when we look for them, or else when we attempt to account for and explain them, not in the admission of their possibility.

But, in our view, it is of the deepest importance always to keep in mind, that the 'demonized' was not a *permanent* state, or possession by the powers of darkness. For, it establishes a *moral* element, since, during the period of their temporary liberty, the demonized might have shaken themselves free from the overshadowing power, or sought release from it. Thus the demonized state involved personal responsibility, although that of a diseased and disturbed consciousness.

In one respect those who were 'demonized' exhibited the same phenomenon. They all owned the Power of Jesus. It was not otherwise in the Synagogue at Capernaum on that Sabbath-morning. What Jesus had spoken produced an immediate effect on the demonized, though one which could scarcely have been anticipated. For, there is authority for inserting the word 'straightway' {In St. ^{<40023>}Mark 1:23.} immediately after the account of Jesus' preaching. Yet, as we think of it, we cannot imagine that the demon would have continued silent nor yet that he could have spoken other than the truth in the Presence of the God-Man. There must be, and yet there cannot be, resistance. The very Presence of the Christ meant the destruction of this work of the Devil. Involuntarily, in his confessed inability of disguise or resistance, he owns defeat, even before the contest. 'What have we to do with Thee, Jesus of Nazareth?' ^{f1114} Thou art come to destroy us! ^{f1115} I know Thee Who Thou art, the Holy One of God.' And yet there seems in these words already an emergence of the consciousness of the demonized, at least in so far that there is no longer confusion between him and his tormentor, and the latter speaks in his own name. One stronger than the demon had affected the higher part in the demonized. It

was the Holy One of God, in Whose Presence the powers of moral destruction cannot be silent, but must speak, and own their subjection and doom. The Christ needs not to contend: that He is the Christ, is itself victory.

But this was not all. He had come not only to destroy the works of the Devil. His Incarnation meant this — and more: to set the prisoners free. By a word of command He gagged ^{f1116} the confessions of the demon, unwilling made, and even so with hostile intent. It was not by such voices that He would have His Messiahship ever proclaimed. Such testimony was wholly unfitting and incongruous; it would have been a strange discord on the witness of the Baptist and the Voice Which had proclaimed Him from heaven. And, truly, had it been admitted, it would have strangely jarred in a Life which needed not, and asked not even the witness of men, but appealed straightway to God Himself. Nor can we fail to perceive how, had it been allowed, it would have given a true ground to what the Pharisees sought to assign as the interpretation of His Power, that by the Prince of Demons He cast out demons. And thus there is here also deep accord with the fundamental idea which was the outcome of His Temptation: that not the seemingly shortest, but the Divine way must lead Him to the goal, and that goal not Royal proclamation, but the Resurrection.

The same power which gagged the confession also bade the demon relinquish his prey. One wild paroxysm — and the sufferer was for ever free. But on them all who saw and heard it fell the utter stupor and confusion of astonishment. ^{f1117} Each turned to his neighbor with the inquiry: ‘What is this? A new doctrine with authority! And He commandeth the unclean spirits, and they obey Him.’ ^{f1118} Well might they inquire. It had been a threefold miracle: ‘a new doctrine;’ ‘with authority;’ and obedience of the unclean spirits to His command. There is throughout, and especially in the account of the casting out of the demon, such un-Jewish simplicity, with entire absence of what would have been characteristic in a Jewish exorcist; such want of all that one would have expected, if the event had been invented, or colored for a purpose, or tinged by contemporary notions; and, withal, such sublimity and majesty, that it is difficult to understand how any one can resist the impression of its reality, or that He Who so spake and did was in truth the Son of God.

From the Synagogue we follow the Savior, in company with His called disciples, to Peter's wedded home. But no festive meal, as was Jewish wont, awaited them there. A sudden access of violent 'burning fever,' ^{f1119} such as is even now common in that district, had laid Peter's mother-in-law prostrate. If we had still any lingering thought of Jewish magical cures as connected with those of Jesus, what is now related must dispel it. The Talmud gives this disease precisely the same name (*atrymx atca Eshatha Tsemirta*), 'burning fever,' and prescribes for it a magical remedy, of which the principal part is to tie a knife wholly of iron by a braid of hair to a thornbush, and to repeat on successive days ^{
}Exodus 3:2, 3, then ver. 4, and finally ver. 5, after which the bush is to be cut down, while a certain magical formula is pronounced. {Shabb. 37 a.} How different from this, alike in its sublime simplicity and in the majestic bearing of Him Who healed, is the Evangelic narrative of the cure of Peter's mother-in-law. To ignore, in our estimate of the trustworthiness of the Gospels, this essential contrast, would be a grave historical mistake. Jesus is 'told' of the sickness; He is besought for her who is stricken down. In His Presence disease and misery cannot continue. Bending over the sufferer, He 'rebuked the fever,' just as He had rebuked ^{f1120} 'the demon' in the Synagogue, and for the same reason, since all disease, in the view of the Divine Healer, is the outcome of sin. Then lifting her by the hand, she rose up, healed, to 'minister' unto them. It was the first *Diaconate* ^{f1121} of woman in the Church, might we not almost say, in the world? — a Diaconate to Christ, and to those that were His; the Diaconate of one healed by Christ; a Diaconate immediately following such healing. The first, this, of a long course of woman's Diaconate to Christ, in which, for the first time, woman attained her true position. And what a Sabbath-meal it must have been, after that scene in the Synagogue and after that healing in the house, when Jesus was the Guest, they who had witnessed it all sat at meat with Him, and she who had been healed was the *Deaconess*. Would that such were ever our Christian festive meals!

It was evening. The sun was setting, and the Sabbath past. All that day it had been told from home to home what had been done in the Synagogue; it had been whispered what had taken place in the house of their neighbor Simon. This one conviction had been borne in upon them all, that 'with authority' He spake, *with authority* and power He commanded even the unclean spirits, and they obeyed. No scene more characteristic of the Christ than that on this autumn evening at Capernaum. One by one the stars had

shone out over the tranquil Lake and the festive city, lighting up earth's darkness with heaven's soft brilliancy, as if they stood there witnesses, that God had fulfilled His good promise to Abraham. {~~0227~~Genesis 22:17, 18.} On that evening no one in Capernaum thought of business, pleasure, or rest. There must have been many homes of sorrow, care, and sickness there, and in the populous neighborhood around. To them, to all, had the door of hope now been opened. Truly, a new Sun had risen on them, with healing in His wings. No disease too desperate, when even the demons owned the authority of His mere rebuke. From all parts they bring them: mothers, widows, wives, fathers, children, husbands — their loved ones, the treasures they had almost lost; and the whole city throngs — a hushed, solemnized, overawed multitude — expectant, waiting at the door of Simon's dwelling. There they laid them, along the street up to the market-place, on their beds; or brought them, with beseeching look and word. What a symbol of this world's misery, need, and hope; what a symbol, also, of what the Christ really is as the Consoler in the world's manifold woe! Never, surely, was He more truly the Christ; nor is He in symbol more truly such to us and to all time, than when, in the stillness of that evening, under the starlit sky, He went through that suffering throng, laying His hands in the blessing of healing on every one of them, and casting out many devils. No picture of the Christ more dear to us, than this of the unlimited healing of whatever disease of body or soul. In its blessed indefiniteness it conveys the infinite potentiality of relief, whatever misery have fallen on us, or whatever care or sorrow oppress us. He must be blind, indeed, who sees not in this Physician the Divine Healer; in this Christ the Light of the World; the Restorer of what sin had blighted; the Joy in our world's deep sorrow. Never was prophecy more truly fulfilled than, on that evening, this of Isaiah: 'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.' {Isaiah 53.} By His Incarnation and Coming, by His taking our infirmities, and bearing our sicknesses — for this in the truest and widest sense is the meaning of the Incarnation of the Christ — did He become the Healer, the Consoler of humanity, its Savior in all ills of time, and from all ills of eternity. The most real fulfilment this, that can be conceived, of Isaiah's rapt vision of Who and what the Messiah was to be, and to do; not, indeed, what is sometimes called fulfilment, or expected as such, in a literal and verbal correspondence with the prediction. An utterly mechanical, external, and unspiritual view this of prophecy, in which, in quite Jewish literalism, the spirit is crushed by the letter. But, viewed in its real bearing on mankind with its wants, Christ, on that evening, was the real, though as yet

only initial, fulfilment of the world's great hope, to which, centuries before, the God-directed hand of the prophet had pointed. ^{f1122}

So ended that Sabbath in Capernaum: a Sabbath of healing, joy, and true rest. But far and wide, into every place of the country around, throughout all the region of Galilee, spread the tidings, and with them the fame of Him Whom demons must obey, though they dare not pronounce Him the Son of God. And on men's ears fell His Name with sweet softness of infinite promise, 'like rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth.'

CHAPTER 15

SECOND JOURNEY THROUGH GALILEE — THE HEALING OF THE LEPER.

(St. ~~<4023>~~ Matthew 4:23; 8:2-4; St. ~~<4035>~~ Mark 1:35-45;
St. ~~<4042>~~ Luke 4:42-44; 5:12-16.)

A DAY and an evening such as of that Sabbath of healing in Capernaum must, with reverence be it written, have been followed by what opens the next section. ^{f1123} To the thoughtful observer there is such unbroken harmony in the Life of Jesus, such accord of the inward and outward, as to carry instinctive conviction of the truth of its record. It was, so to speak, an inward necessity that the God-Man, when brought into contact with disease and misery, whether from physical or supernatural causes, should remove it by His Presence, by His touch, by His Word. An outward necessity also, because no other mode of teaching equally convincing would have reached those accustomed to Rabbinic disputations, and who must have looked for such a manifestation from One Who claimed such authority. And yet, so far from being a mere worker of miracles, as we should have expected if the history of His miracles had been of legendary origin, there is nothing more marked than the pain, we had almost said the humiliation, which their necessity seems to have carried to His heart. ‘Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe;’ ‘an evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign;’ ‘blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed’ — such are the utterances of Him Who sighed when He opened the ears of the deaf, {St. ~~<40734>~~ Mark 7:34.} and bade His Apostles look for higher and better things than power over all diseases or even over evil spirits. {St. ~~<4007>~~ Luke 10:17-20.} ^{f1124} So would not the Messiah of Jewish legend have spoken or done; nor would they who invented such miracles have so referred to them.

In truth, when, through the rift in His outward history, we catch a glimpse of Christ’s inner Being, these miracles, so far as not the outcome of the mystic union of the Divine and the Human in His Person, but as part of His Mission, form part of His Humiliation. They also belong to that way which He had chosen in his initial conquest of the Tempter in the Wilderness, when He chose, not the sudden display of absolute power for the subdual

of His people, but the painful, slow method of meeting the wants, and addressing Himself to the understanding and capacity of those over Whom He would reign. In this view, it seems as if we could gain a fresh understanding, not only of the expediency of His final departure, so far as concerned the future teaching of the disciples by the Holy Spirit, but of His own longing for the Advent of the Comforter. In truth, the two teachers and the two modes of teaching could not be together, and the Ascension of the Christ, as the end of His Humiliation, marked the Advent of the Holy Ghost, as bestowing another mode of teaching than that of the days of His Humiliation.

And so, thinking of the scene on the evening before, we can understand how, ‘very early, while it was still very dark,’ {St. ~~4035~~ Mark 1:35.} Jesus rose up, and went into a solitary place to pray. The use of the same expression ^{f1125} in St. ~~4135~~ Mark 13:35 enables us to fix the time as that of the fourth night-watch, or between three and six o’clock of the morning. It was not till some time afterwards, that even those, who had so lately been called to His closest fellowship, rose, and, missing Him, followed. Jesus had prayed in that solitude, and consecrated it. After such a day, and in prospect of entering on His second journey through Galilee ^{f1126} — this time in so far different circumstances — He must prevent the dawn of the morning in prayer. And by this also would they learn, that He was not merely a worker of miracles, but that He, Whose Word demons obeyed, lived a Life, not of outward but of inward power, in fellowship with His Father, and baptized his work with prayer. But as yet, and, indeed, in measure all through His Life on earth, it seemed difficult for them in any measure to realize this. ‘All men seek for Thee,’ and therefore they would have had Him return to Capernaum. But this was the very reason why He had withdrawn ere dawn of day. He had come forth, and that, ^{f1127} not to attract the crowds, and be proclaimed a King, but to preach the Kingdom of God. Once more we say it: so speaks not, nor acts the hero of Jewish legend!

As the three Synoptists accordingly state, Jesus now entered on His second Galilean journey. There can be little doubt, that the chronological succession of events is here accurately indicated by the more circumstantial narrative in St. Mark’s Gospel. ^{f1128} The arrangement of St. Luke appears that of historical grouping, while that of St. Matthew is determined by the Hebraic plan of his Gospel, which seems constructed on the model of the Pentateuch, ^{f1129} as if the establishment of the Kingdom by the Messiah

were presented as the fulfilment of its preparatory planting in Israel. But this second journey through Galilee, which the three Gospels connect with the stay at Capernaum, marks a turning-point in the working of the Christ. As already stated, the occurrences at the 'Unknown Feast,' ^{f1130} in Jerusalem, formed a new point of departure. Christ had fully presented His claims to the Sanhedrists, and they had been fully rejected by the Scribes and the people. Henceforth He separated Himself from that 'untoward generation;' henceforth, also, began His systematic persecution by the authorities, when His movements were tracked and watched. Jesus went alone to Jerusalem. This, also, was fitting. Equally so, that on His return He called His disciples to be His followers; and that from Capernaum He entered, in their company, on a new phase in His Work.

Significantly, His Work began where that of the Rabbis, we had almost said of the Old Testament saints, ended. Whatever remedies, medical, magical, or sympathetic, Rabbinic writings may indicate for various kinds of disease, leprosy is not included in the catalogue. They left aside what even the Old Testament marked as moral death, by enjoining those so stricken to avoid all contact with the living, and even to bear the appearance of mourners. As the leper passed by, his clothes rent, his hair disheveled, ^{f1131} and the lower part of his face and his upper lip covered, {~~f1135~~ Leviticus 13:45.} it was as one going to death who reads his own burial-service, while the mournful words, 'Unclean! Unclean!' which he uttered, proclaimed that his was both living and moral death. Again, the Old Testament, and even Rabbinism, took, in the measures prescribed in leprosy, primarily a moral, or rather a ritual, and only secondarily a sanitary, view of the case. The isolation already indicated, which banished lepers from all intercourse except with those similarly stricken, ^{f1132} and forebade their entering not only the Temple or Jerusalem, but any walled city, ^{f1133} could not have been merely prompted by the wish to prevent infection. For all the laws in regard to leprosy are expressly stated not to have application in the case of heathens, proselytes before their conversion, and even of Israelites on their birth. ^{f1134} The same inference must also be drawn from the circumstance, that the priestly examination and subsequent isolation of the leper were not to commence during the marriage-week, or on festive days, {Neg. 3:2.} since, evidently, infection would have been most likely to spread in such circumstances. ^{f1135}

It has already been stated, that Rabbinism confessed itself powerless in presence of this living death. Although, as *Michaelis* rightly suggests, {Das

Mos. Recht, vol. 4 p. 195.} the sacrificial ritual for the cleansed leper implies, at least, the possibility of a cure, it is in every instance traced to the direct agency of God. ^{f1136} Hence the mythical theory, which, to be rational, must show some precedent to account for the origination of the narrative in the Gospel, here once more breaks down. ^{f1137} *Keim* cannot deny the evident authenticity of the Evangelic narrative, and has no better explanation to offer than that of the old Rationalists, which *Strauss* had already so fully refuted ^{f1138} — that the poor sufferer only asked of Jesus to *declare*, not to *make*, him clean. ^{f1139} In truth, the possibility of any cure through human agency was never contemplated by the Jews. *Josephus* speaks of it as possibly granted to prayer, {Ant. 3:11. 3.} but in a manner betokening a pious phraseology without serious meaning. We may go further, and say that not only did Rabbinism never suggest the cure of a leper, but that its treatment of those sufferers presents the most marked contrast to that of the Savior. And yet, as if writing its own condemnation, one of the titles which it gives to the Messiah is ‘the Leprous,’ the King Messiah being represented as seated in the entrance to Rome, surrounded by, and relieving all misery and disease, in fulfilment of ~~2804~~ Isaiah 53:4. {Sanh. 98 b.} ^{f1140}

We need not here enumerate the various symptoms, by which the Rabbinic law teaches us to recognize true leprosy. ^{f1141} Any one capable of it might make the medical inspection, although only a descendant of Aaron could formally pronounce clean or unclean. {Neg. 3:1.} Once declared leprous, the sufferer was soon made to feel the utter heartlessness of Rabbinism. To banish him outside walled towns {Kel. 1:7.} may have been a necessity, which, perhaps, required to be enforced by the threatened penalty of forty stripes save one. {Pes. 67.} Similarly, it might be a right, even merciful, provision, that in the Synagogues lepers were to be the first to enter and the last to leave, and that they should occupy a separate compartment (*Mechitsah*), ten palms high, and six feet wide. {Neg. 13:12.} For, from the symbolism and connection between the physical and the psychical, ^{f1142} the Old Testament, in its rites and institutions, laid the greatest stress on ‘clean and unclean.’ To sum it up in briefest compass, and leaving out of view leprosy of clothes or houses, ^{f1143} according to the Old Testament. Defilement was conveyed only by the animal body, and attached to no other living body than that of man, nor could any other living body than that of man communicate defilement. The Old Testament mentioned eleven principal kinds of defilement. These, as being capable of communicating

further defilement, were designated *Abhoth hattumeoth* — ‘fathers of defilements’ — the defilement which they produced being either itself an *Abh hattumeah*, or else a ‘Child,’ or a ‘Child’s Child of defilement’ (*hamwfh dl w dl w dl w*). We find in Scripture thirty-two *Abhoth hattumeoth*, as they are called. To this Rabbinic tradition added other twenty-nine. Again, according to Scripture, these ‘fathers of defilements’ affected only in two degrees; the direct effect produced by them being designated ‘the beginning,’ or ‘the first,’ and that further propagated, ‘the second’ degree. But Rabbinic ordinances added a third, fourth, and even fifth degree of defilement.^{f1144} From this, as well as the equally intricate arrangements about purification, the Mishnic section about ‘clean and unclean’ is at the same time the largest and most intricate in the Rabbinic code, while its provisos touched and interfered, more than any others, with every department of life.

In the elaborate code of defilements leprosy was not only one of ‘the fathers of uncleanness,’ but, next to defilement from the dead, stood foremost amongst them. Not merely actual contact with the leper, but even his entrance defiled a habitation, {Kel. 1:1-4.} and everything in it, to the beams of the roof. {Neg. 13:11.} But beyond this, Rabbinic harshness or fear carried its provisions to the utmost sequences of an unbending logic. It is, indeed, true that, as in general so especially in this instance, Rabbinism loved to trace disease to moral causes. ‘No death without sin, and no pain without transgression;’ {Shabb. 55 a.} ‘the sick is not healed, till all his sins are forgiven him.’ {Nedar. 41 a.} These are oft-repeated sayings; but, when closely examined, they are not quite so spiritual as they sound. For, first, they represent a reaction against the doctrine of original sin, in the sense that it is not the Fall of man, but one’s actual transgression, to which disease and death are to be traced according to the saying: ‘Not the serpent kills, but sin.’ {Ber. 33 a.}^{f1145} But their real unspirituality appears most clearly, when we remember how special diseases were traced to particular sins. Thus, {Ber. 5 b.} childlessness and leprosy are described as chastisements, which indeed procure for the sufferer forgiveness of sins, but cannot, like other chastisements, be regarded as the outcome of love, nor be received in love.^{f1146} And even such sentiments in regard to sufferings {Ber. 5 a.} are immediately followed by such cynical declarations on the part of Rabbis so afflicted, as that they loved neither the chastisement, nor its reward. {Ber. 5 b.} And in regard to leprosy, tradition had it that, as leprosy attached to the house, the dress, or the person, these

were to be regarded as always heavier strokes, following as each successive warning had been neglected, and a reference to this was seen in ~~2009~~ Proverbs 19:29. {Bemidb. R. 13.} ^{f1147} Eleven sins are mentioned {Tanch. on Hammetsora 4; ed. Lemberg 2 p. 24 *a.*} which bring leprosy, among them pre-eminently those of which the tongue is the organ. {u. s., 2, p.23 *a*; Arach. 15 *b*; and in many passages.}

Still, if such had been the real views of Rabbinism one might have expected that Divine compassion would have been extended to those, who bore such heavy burden of their sins. Instead of this, their burdens were needlessly increased. True, as wrapped in mourner's garb the leper passed by, his cry 'Unclean!' was to incite others to pray for him, but also to avoid him. {Moed K.}. No one was even to salute him; his bed was to be low, inclining towards the ground. {u.s. 15 *a*}. If he even put his head into a place, it became unclean. No less a distance than four cubits (six feet) must be kept from a leper; or, if the wind came from that direction, a hundred were scarcely sufficient. Rabbi Meir would not eat an egg purchased in a street where there was a leper. Another Rabbi boasted, that he always threw stones at them to keep them far off, while others hid themselves or ran away. ^{f1129} {Vayyik. R. 16. [Leprosy is there brought into connection with calumny]. To such extent did Rabbinism carry its inhuman logic in considering the leper as a mourner, that it even forbade him to wash his face. {Moed. K 15 *a.*}

We can now in some measure appreciate the contrast between Jesus and His contemporaries in His bearing towards the leper. Or, conversely, we can judge by the healing of this leper of the impression which the Savior had made upon the people. He would have fled from a Rabbi; he came in lowest attitude of entreaty to Jesus. Criticism need not so anxiously seek for an explanation of his approach. There was no Old Testament precedent for it: not in the case of Moses, nor even in that of Elisha, and there was no Jewish expectancy of it. But to have heard Him teach, to have seen or known Him as healing all manner of disease, must have carried to the heart the conviction of His absolute power. And so one can understand this lowly reverence of approach, this cry which has so often since been wrung from those who have despaired of all other help: 'If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.' It is not a prayer, but the ground-tone of all prayer — faith in His Power, and absolute committal to Him of our helpless, hopeless need. And Jesus, touched with compassion, willed it. It almost seems, as if it were in the very exuberance of power that Jesus, acting in so direct

contravention of Jewish usage, touched the leper. It was fitting that Elisha should disappoint Naaman's expectancy, that the prophet would heal his leprosy by the touch of his hand. It was even more fitting that Jesus should surprise the Jewish leper by touching, ere by His Word He cleansed him. And so, experience ever finds that in Christ the real is far beyond the ideal. We can understand, how, from his standpoint, *Strauss* should have found it impossible to understand the healing of leprosy by the touch and Word of Jesus. Its explanation lies in the fact, that He was the God-Man. And yet, as our inner tending after God and the voice of conscience indicate that man is capable of adoption into God's family, so the marked power which in disease mind has over body points to a higher capability in Man Perfect, the Ideal Man, the God-Man, of vanquishing disease by His Will.

It is not quite so easy at first sight to understand, why Christ should with such intense earnestness, almost vehemence,^{f1149} have sent the healed man away, as the term bears, 'cast him out.'^{f1150} Certainly not (as *Volkmar* — fantastically in error on this, as on so many other points — imagines) because He disapproved of his worship. Rather do we once more gather, how the God-Man shrank from the fame connected with miracles, specially with such an one, which as we have seen, were rather of inward and outward necessity than of choice in His Mission. Not so, followed by a curious crowd, or thronged by eager multitudes of sight-seers, or aspirants for temporal benefits, was the Kingdom of Heaven to be preached and advanced. It would have been the way of a Jewish Messiah, and have led up to His royal proclamation by the populace. But as we study the character of the Christ, no contrast seems more glaring, let us add, more painful, than that of such a scene. And so we read that, when, notwithstanding the Savior's charge to the healed leper to keep silence, it was nevertheless — nay, as might perhaps have been expected — all the more made known by him, as, indeed, in some measure it could scarcely have remained entirely unknown, He could no more, as before, enter the cities, but remained without in desert places, whither they came to Him from every quarter. And in that withdrawal He spoke, and healed, 'and prayed.'

Yet another motive of Christ's conduct may be suggested. His injunction of silence was combined with that of presenting himself to the priest and conforming to the ritual requirements of the Mosaic Law in such cases.^{f1151} It is scarcely necessary to refute the notion, that in this Christ was prompted either by the desire to see the healed man restored to the society of his

fellows, or by the wish to have some officially recognized miracle, to which He might afterwards appeal. Not to speak of the un-Christ-likeness of such a wish or purpose, as a matter of fact, He did *not* appeal to it, and the healed leper wholly disappears from the Gospel-narrative. And yet his conforming to the Mosaic Ritual was to be ‘a testimony unto them.’ The Lord, certainly, did not wish to have the Law of Moses broken — and broken not superseded, it would have been, if its provisions had been infringed before His Death, Ascension, and the Coming of the Holy Ghost had brought their fulfilment.

But there is something else here. The course of this history shows, that the open rupture between Jesus and the Jewish authorities, which had commenced at the Unknown Feast at Jerusalem, was to lead to practical sequences. On the part of the Jewish authorities, it led to measures of active hostility. The Synagogues of Galilee are no longer the quite scenes of His teaching and miracles; His Word and deeds no longer pass unchallenged. It had never occurred to these Galileans, as they implicitly surrendered themselves to the power of His words, to question their orthodoxy. But now, immediately after this occurrence, we find Him accused of blasphemy. {St. ~~QNT~~ Luke 5:21.} They had not thought it breach of God’s Law when, on that Sabbath, He had healed in the Synagogue of Capernaum and in the home of Peter; but after this it became sinful to extend like mercy on the Sabbath to him whose hand was withered. {St. ~~QNT~~ Luke 6:7.} They had never thought of questioning the condescension of his intercourse with the poor and needy; but now they sought to sap the commencing allegiance of His disciples by charging Him with undue intercourse with publicans and sinners, {St. ~~QNT~~ Luke 5:30.} and by inciting against Him even the prejudices and doubts of the half-enlightened followers of His own Forerunner. {St. ~~QNT~~ Luke 5:30.} All these new incidents are due to one and the same cause; the presence and hostile watchfulness of the Scribes and Pharisees, who now for the first time appear on the scene of His ministry. It is too much then to infer, that, immediately after that Feast at Jerusalem, the Jewish authorities sent their familiars into Galilee after Jesus, and that it was to the presence and influence of this informal deputation that the opposition to Christ, which now increasingly appeared, was due? If so, then we see not only an additional motive for Christ’s injunction of silence on those whom He had healed, and for His own withdrawal from the cities and their throng, but we can understand how, as He afterwards answered those, whom John had

sent to lay before Christ his doubts, by pointing to His works, so He replied to the sending forth of the Scribes of Jerusalem to watch, oppose, and arrest Him, by sending to Jerusalem as His embassy the healed leper, to submit to all the requirements of the Law. It was *His* testimony unto them — His, Who was meek and lowly in heart; and it was in deepest accord with what He had done, and was doing. Assuredly, He Who brake not the bruised reed, did not cry nor lift up His Voice in the streets, but brought forth judgment unto truth. And in Him shall the nations trust!

CHAPTER 16

THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM, — CONCERNING THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS — THE HEALING OF THE PARALYSED

(St. ~~4001~~ Matthew 9:1-8; St. ~~4001~~ Mark 2:1-12; St. ~~4157~~ Luke 5:17-26.)

It is a remarkable instance of the reserve of the Gospel-narratives, that of the second journey of Jesus in Galilee no other special event is recorded than the healing of the leper. And it seems also to indicate, that this one miracle had been so selected for a special purpose. But if, as we have suggested, after the 'Unknown Feast,' the activity of Jesus assumed a new and what, for want of a better name, may be called an anti-Judaic character, we can perceive the reason of it. The healing of leprosy was recorded as typical. With this agrees also what immediately follows. For, as Rabbinism stood confessedly powerless in face of the living death of leprosy, so it had no word of forgiveness to speak to the conscience burdened with sin, nor yet word of welcome to the sinner. But this was the inmost meaning of the two events which the Gospel-history places next to the healing of the leper: the forgiveness of sins in the case of the paralytic, and the welcome to the chief of sinners in the call of Levi-Matthew.

We are still mainly following the lead of St. Mark, ^{f1152} alike as regards the succession of events and their details. And here it is noteworthy, how the account in St. Mark confirms that by {St. John 5} of what had occurred at the Unknown Feast. Not that either Evangelist could have derived it from the other. But if we establish the trustworthiness of the narrative in St. John 5, which is unconfirmed by any of the Synoptists, we strengthen not only the evidence in favor of the Fourth Gospel generally, but that in one of its points of chief difficulty, since such advanced teaching on the part of Jesus, and such developed hostility from the Jewish authorities, might scarcely have been looked for at so early a stage. But when we compare the language of St. Mark with the narrative in the fifth chapter of St. John's Gospel, at least four points of contact prominently appear. For, first, the unspoken charge of the Scribes, {St. ~~4006~~ Mark 2:6, 7.} that in forgiving sins Jesus blasphemed by making Himself equal with God, has its exact counterpart in the similar charge against Him in St. ~~4158~~ John 5:18,

which kindled in them the wish to kill Jesus. Secondly, as in that case the final reply of Jesus pointed to ‘the authority’ (ἐξουσία) which the Father had given Him for Divine administration on earth, {St. ~~467~~ John 5:27.} so the healing of the paralytic was to show the Scribes that He had ‘authority’ (ἐξουσία) ^{f1153} for the dispensation upon earth of the forgiveness of sins, which the Jews rightly regarded as the Divine prerogative. Thirdly, the words which Jesus spake to the paralytic: ‘Rise, take up thy bed, and walk,’ {St. ~~409~~ Mark 2:9.} are to the very letter the same ^{f1154} which are recorded {In St. ~~468~~ John 5:8} as used by Him when He healed the impotent man at the Pool of Bethesda. Lastly, alike in the words which Jesus addressed to the Scribes at the healing of the paralytic, and in those at the Unknown Feast, He made final appeal to His works as evidential of His being sent by, and having received of, the Father ‘the authority’ to which He laid claim. {St. ~~466~~ John 5:36; comp. St. ~~400~~ Mark 2:10.} It would be utterly irrational to regard these as coincidences, and not references. And their evidential force becomes the stronger, as we remember the entire absence of design on the part of St. Mark. ^{f1155} But this correspondence not only supports the trustworthiness of the two independent narratives in St. Mark and in St. John, but also confirms alike that historical order in which we have arranged the events, and the suggestion that, after the encounter at the Unknown Feast, the authorities of Jerusalem had sent representatives to watch, oppose, and, if possible, entrap Jesus.

In another manner, also, the succession of events, as we have traced it, seems confirmed by the account of the healing of the paralytic. The second journey of Jesus through Galilee had commenced in autumn ; the return to Capernaum was ‘after days,’ which, in common Jewish phraseology, ^{f1156} meant a considerable interval. As we reckon, it was winter, which would equally account for Christ’s return to Capernaum, and for His teaching in the house. For, no sooner ‘was it heard that He was in the house,’ or, as some have rendered it, ‘that He was at home,’ than so many flocked to the dwelling of Peter, which at that period may have been ‘the house’ or temporary ‘home’ of the Savior, as to fill its limited space to overflowing, and even to crowd out to the door and beyond it. The general impression on our minds is, that this audience was rather in a state of indecision than of sympathy with Jesus. It included ‘Pharisees and doctors of the Law,’ who had come on purpose from the towns of Galilee, from Judaea, and from Jerusalem. These occupied the ‘uppermost rooms,’ sitting, no doubt, near to Jesus. Their influence must have been felt by the people. Although

irresistibly attracted by Jesus, an element of curiosity, if not of doubt, would mingle with their feelings, as they looked at their leaders, to whom long habit attached the most superstitious veneration. If one might so say, it was like the gathering of Israel on Mount Carmel, to witness the issue as between Elijah and the priests of Baal.

Although in no wise necessary to the understanding of the event, it is helpful to try and realize the scene. We can picture to ourselves the Savior 'speaking the Word' to that eager, interested crowd, which would soon become forgetful even of the presence of the watchful 'Scribes.' Though we know a good deal of the structure of Jewish houses, ^{f1157} we feel it difficult to be sure of the exact place which the Savior occupied on this occasion. Meetings for religious study and discussion were certainly held in the *Aliyah* or upper chamber. {Shabb. 1:4; Jer. Sanh. 21 *b*; Jer. Pes. 30 *b*, and often.} But, on many grounds, such a *locale* seems utterly unsuited to the requirements of the narrative. ^{f1158} Similar objections attach to the idea, that it was the front room of one of those low houses occupied by the poor. ^{f1159} Nor is there any reason for supposing that the house occupied by Peter was one of those low buildings, which formed the dwellings of the very poor. It must, at any rate, have contained, besides a large family room, accommodation for Peter and his wife, for Peter's mother-in-law, and for Jesus as the honored guest. The Mishnah calls a small house one that is 9 feet long by 12 broad, and a large house one that is 12 feet long by 15 broad, and adds that a dining-hall is 15 feet square, the height being always computed at half the length and breadth. {Baba B. 6:4.} But these notices seem rather to apply to a single room. They are part of a legal discussion, in which reference is made to a building which might be erected by a man for his son on his marriage, or as a dwelling for his widowed daughter. Another source of information is derived from what we know of the price and rental of houses. We read {In Jer. Keth. 4:14, p. 29 *b*.} of a house as costing ten (of course, gold) dinars, which would make the price 250 silver dinars, or between 71. and 81. of our money. This must, however, have been 'a small house,' since the rental of such is stated to have been from 7s. to 28s. a year, {Tos. B. Mets. 100:04.} while that of a large house is computed at about 91. a year, {u. s., c. 8:31, ed, z.} and that of a courtyard at about 14s. a year. {Baba Mets. 5:2.}

All this is so far of present interest as it will help to show, that the house of Peter could not have been a 'small one.' We regard it as one of the better dwellings of the middle classes. In that case all the circumstances fully

accord with the narrative in the Gospels. Jesus is speaking the Word, standing in the covered gallery that ran round the courtyard of such houses, and opened into the various apartments. Perhaps He was standing within the entrance of the guest-chamber, while the Scribes were sitting within that apartment, or beside Him in the gallery. The court before Him is thronged, out into the street. All are absorbedly listening to the Master, when of a sudden those appear who are bearing a paralytic on his pallet. It had of late become too common a scene to see the sick thus carried to Jesus to attract special attention. And yet one can scarcely conceive that, if the crowd had merely filled an apartment and gathered around its door, it would not have made way for the sick, or that somehow the bearers could not have come within sight, or been able to attract the attention of Christ. But with a courtyard crowded out into the street, all this would be, of course, out of the question. In such circumstances, what was to be done? Access to Jesus was simply impossible. Shall they wait till the multitude disperses, or for another and more convenient season? Only those would have acted thus who have never felt the preciousness of an opportunity, because they have never known what real need is. Inmost in the hearts of those who bore the paralyzed was the belief, that Jesus could, and that he would, heal. They must have heard it from others; they must have witnessed it themselves in other instances. And inmost in the heart of the paralytic was, as we infer from the first words of Jesus to him, not only the same conviction, but with it weighed a terrible fear, born of Jewish belief, lest his sins might hinder his healing. And this would make him doubly anxious not to lose the present opportunity.

And so their resolve was quickly taken. If they cannot approach Jesus with their burden, they can let it down from above at His feet. Outside the house, as well as inside, a stair led up to the roof. They may have ascended it in this wise, or else reached it by what the Rabbis called 'the road of the roofs,' {*Jos*, Ant. 13:5. 3; *Bab. Mez.* 88 *a.*} passing from roof to roof, if the house adjoined others in the same street. The roof itself, which had hard beaten earth or rubble underneath it, was paved with brick, stone, or any other hard substance, and surrounded by a balustrade which, according to Jewish Law, was at least three feet high. It is scarcely possible to imagine, that the bearers of the paralytic would have attempted to dig through this into a room below, not to speak of the interruption and inconvenience caused to those below by such an operation. But no such objection attaches if we regard it, not as the main roof of the house, but as

that of the covered gallery under which we are supposing the Lord to have stood. This could, of course, have been readily reached from above. In such case it would have been comparatively easy to ‘unroof’ the covering of ‘tiles,’ and then, ‘having dug out’ an opening through the lighter framework which supported the tiles, to let down their burden ‘into the midst before Jesus.’ All this, as done by four strong men, would be but the work of a few minutes. But we can imagine the arresting of the discourse of Jesus, and the breathless surprise of the crowd as this opening through the tiles appeared, and slowly a pallet was let down before them. Busy hands would help to steady it, and bring it safe to the ground. And on that pallet lay one paralyzed, his fevered face and glistening eyes upturned to Jesus.

It must have been a marvellous sight, even at a time and in circumstances when the marvellous might be said to have become of every-day occurrence. This energy and determination of faith exceeded aught that had been witnessed before. Jesus saw it, and He spake. For, as yet, the blanched lips of the sufferer had not parted to utter his petition. He believed, indeed, in the power of Jesus to heal, with all the certitude that issued, not only in the determination to be laid at His feet, but at whatever trouble and in any circumstances, however novel or strange. It needed, indeed, faith to overcome all the hindrances in the present instance; and still more faith to be so absorbed and forgetful of all around, as to be let down from the roof through the broken tiling into the midst of such an assembly. And this open outburst of faith shone out the more brightly, from its contrast with the covered darkness and clouds of unbelief within the breast of those Scribes, who had come to watch and ensnare Jesus.

As yet no one had spoken, for the silence of expectancy had fallen on them all. *Could* He, and, if He could, *would* He help — and *what* would He do? But He, Who perceived man’s unspoken thoughts, knew that there was not only faith, but also fear, in the heart of that man. Hence the first words which the Savior spake to him were: ‘Be of good cheer.’ {St. ^{400B}Matthew 9:2.} He had, indeed, got beyond the coarse Judaic standpoint, from which suffering seemed an expiation of sin. It was argued by the Rabbis, that, if the loss of an eye or a tooth liberated a slave from bondage, much more would the sufferings of the whole body free the soul from guilt; and, again, that Scripture itself indicated this by the use of the word ‘covenant,’ alike in connection with the salt which rendered the sacrifices meet for the altar, {^{400B}Leviticus 2:13.} and sufferings, {^{400B}Deuteronomy 28:69 b.} ^{f1160} which

did the like for the soul by cleansing away sin. {Ber. 5 *a.*} We can readily believe, as the recorded experience of the Rabbis shows, {Ber. 5 *b.*} that such sayings brought neither relief to the body, nor comfort to the soul of real sufferers. But this other Jewish idea was even more deeply rooted, had more of underlying truth, and would, especially in presence of the felt holiness of Jesus, have a deep influence on the soul, that recovery would not be granted to the sick unless his sins had first been forgiven him. {Nedar. 41 *a.*} It was this deepest, though, perhaps, as yet only partially conscious, want of the sufferer before Him, which Jesus met when, in words of tenderest kindness, He spoke forgiveness to his soul, and that not as something to come, but as an act already past: ‘Child, thy sins have been forgiven.’^{f1161} We should almost say, that He needed first to speak these words, before He gave healing: needed, in the psychological order of things; needed, also, if the inward sickness was to be healed, and because the inward stroke, or paralysis, in the consciousness of guilt, must be removed, before the outward could be taken away.

In another sense, also, there was a higher ‘need be’ for the word which brought forgiveness, before that which gave healing. Although it is not for a moment to be supposed, that, in what Jesus did, He had primary intention in regard to the Scribes, yet here also, as in all Divine acts, the undesigned adaptation and the undesigned sequences are as fitting as what we call the designed. For, with God there is neither past nor future; neither immediate nor mediate; but all is one, the eternally and God-pervaded Present. Let us recall, that Jesus was in the presence of those in whom the Scribes would feign have wrought disbelief, not of His power to cure disease — which was patent to all — but in His Person and authority; that, perhaps, such doubts had already been excited. And here it deserves special notice, that, by first speaking forgiveness, Christ not only presented the deeper moral aspect of His miracles, as against their ascription to magic or Satanic agency, but also established that very claim, as regarded His Person and authority, which it was sought to invalidate. In this forgiveness of sins He presented His Person and authority as Divine, and He proved it such by the miracle of healing which immediately followed. Had the two been inverted, there would have been evidence, indeed, of His power, but not of His Divine Personality, nor of His having authority to forgive sins; and this, not the doing of miracles, was the object of His Teaching and Mission, of which the miracles were only secondary evidence.

Thus the inward reasoning of the Scribes, ^{f1162} which was open and known to Him Who readeth all thoughts, ^{f1163} issued in quite the opposite of what they could have expected. Most unwarranted, indeed, was the feeling of contempt which we trace in their unspoken words, whether we read them: ‘Why doth this one thus speak blasphemies?’ or, according to a more correct transcript of them: ‘Why doth this one speak thus? He blasphemeth!’ Yet from their point of view they were right, for God alone can forgive sins; nor has that power ever been given or delegated to man. But was He a mere man, like even the most honored of God’s servants? Man, indeed; but ‘the Son of Man’ ^{f1164} Indeed, the whole passage, as will be seen, is an attempt to adapt. ~~(1239)~~ Numbers 23:19 to the Christian controversy.} in the emphatic and well-understood sense of being the Representative Man, who was to bring a new life to humanity; the Second Adam, the Lord from Heaven. It seemed easy to say: ‘Thy sins have been forgiven.’ But to Him, Who had ‘authority’ to do so on earth, it was neither more easy nor more difficult than to say: ‘Rise, take up thy bed, and walk.’ Yet this latter, assuredly, proved the former, and gave it in the sight of all men unquestioned reality. And so it was the thoughts of these Scribes, which, as applied to Christ, were ‘evil’ — since they imputed to Him — blasphemy that gave occasion for offering real evidence of what they would have impugned and denied. In no other manner could the object alike of miracles and of this special miracle have been so attained as by the ‘evil thoughts’ of these Scribes, when, miraculously brought to light, they spoke out the inmost possible doubt, and pointed to the highest of all questions concerning the Christ. And so it was once more the wrath of man which praised Him!

‘And the remainder of wrath did he restrain.’ As the healed man slowly rose, and, still silent, rolled up his pallet, a way was made for him between this multitude which followed him with wondering eyes. Then, as first mingled wonderment and fear fell on Israel on Mount Carmel, when the fire had leaped from heaven, devoured the sacrifice, licked up the water in the trench, and even consumed the stones of the altar, and then all fell prostrate, and the shout rose to heaven: ‘Jehovah, He is the Elohim!’ so now, in view of this manifestation of the Divine Presence among them. The amazement of fear fell on them in this Presence, and they glorified God, and they said: ‘We have never seen it on this wise!’

CHAPTER 17

THE CALL OF MATTHEW — THE SAVIOR’S WELCOME TO SINNERS — RABBINIC THEOLOGY AS REGARDS THE DOCTRINE OF FORGIVENESS IN CONTRAST TO THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST — THE CALL OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

(St. ^{<109>}Matthew 9:9-13; St. ^{<113>}Mark 2:13-17; St. ^{<117>}Luke 5:27-32; St. ^{<102>}Matthew 10:2-4; St. ^{<113>}Mark 3:13-19; St. ^{<112>}Luke 6:12-19.)

IN two things chiefly does the fundamental difference appear between Christianity and all other religious systems, notably Rabbinism. And in these two things, therefore, lies the main characteristic of Christ’s work; or, taking a wider view, the fundamental idea of all religions. Subjectively, they concern sin and the sinner; or, to put it objectively, the forgiveness of sin and the welcome to the sinner. But Rabbinism, and every other system down to modern humanitarianism — if it rises so high in its idea of God as to reach that of sin, which is its shadow — can only generally point to God for the forgiveness of sin. What here is merely an abstraction, has become a concrete reality in Christ. He speaks forgiveness on earth, because He is its embodiment. As regards the second idea, that of the sinner, all other systems know of no welcome to him till, by some means (inward or outward), he have ceased to be a sinner and become a penitent. They would first make him a penitent, and then bid him welcome to God; Christ first welcomes him to God, and so makes him a penitent. The one demands, the other imparts life. And so Christ is the Physician Whom they that are in health need not, but they that are sick. And so Christ came not to call the righteous but sinners, not to repentance, as our common text erroneously puts it in St. ^{<109>}Matthew 9:13, and St. ^{<107>}Mark 2:17, ^{f1165} but to Himself, to the Kingdom; and this is the beginning of repentance.

Thus it is that Jesus, when His teaching becomes distinctive from that of Judaism, puts these two points in the foreground: the one at the cure of the paralytic, the other in the call of Levi-Matthew. And this, also, further explains His miracles of healing as for the higher presentation of Himself as the Great Physician, while it gives some insight into the *nexus* of these two events, and explains their chronological succession. ^{f1166} It was fitting that at the very outset, when Rabbinism followed and challenged Jesus with

hostile intent, these two spiritual facts should be brought out, and that, not in a controversial, but in a positive and practical manner. For, as these two questions of sin and of the possible relation of the sinner to God are the great burden of the soul in its upward striving after God, so the answer to them forms the substance of all religions. Indeed, all the cumbrous observances of Rabbinism — its whole law — were only an attempted answer to the question: How can a man be just with God?

But, as Rabbinism stood self-confessedly silent and powerless as regarded the forgiveness of sins, so it had emphatically no word of welcome or help for the sinner. The very term ‘Pharisee,’ or ‘separated one,’ implied the exclusion of sinners. With this the whole character of Pharisaism accorded; perhaps, we should have said, that of Rabbinism, since the Sadducean would here agree with the Pharisaic Rabbi. The contempt and avoidance of the unlearned, which was so characteristic of the system, arose not from mere pride of knowledge, but from the thought that, as ‘the Law’ was the glory and privilege of Israel — indeed, the object for which the world was created and preserved — ignorance of it was culpable. Thus, the unlearned blasphemed his Creator, and missed or perverted his own destiny. It was a principle, that ‘the ignorant cannot be pious.’ On the principles of Rabbinism, there was logic in all this, and reason also, though sadly perverted. The yoke of ‘the Kingdom of God’ was the high destiny of every true Israelite. Only, to them it lay in external, not internal conformity to the Law of God: ‘in meat and drink,’ not ‘in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.’ True, they also perceived, that ‘sins of thought’ and purpose, though uncommitted, were ‘more grievous than even sins of outward deed;’ {Yoma 29 *a.*} but only in this sense, that each outward sin was traceable to inward dereliction or denial of the Law — ‘no man sinneth, unless the spirit of error has first entered into him.’ {Sot. 3 *a.*} On this ground the punishment of infidelity or apostasy in the next world was endless, while that of actual transgressions was limited in duration. {Rosh haSh. 17 *a.*} ^{f1167}

As ‘righteousness came by the Law,’ so also return to it on the part of the sinner. Hence, although Rabbinism had no welcome to the sinner, it was unceasing in its call to repentance and in extolling its merits. All the prophets had prophesied only of repentance. {Ber. 34 *b.*} The last pages of the Tractate on the Day of Atonement are full of praises of repentance. It not only averted punishment and prolonged life, but brought good, even the final redemption to Israel and the world at large. It surpassed the

observance of all the commandments, and was as meritorious as if one had restored the Temple and Altar, and offered all sacrifices. {Vayyik. R. 7.} One hour of penitence and good works outweighed the whole world to come. These are only a few of the extravagant statements by which Rabbinism extolled repentance. But, when more closely examined, we find that this repentance, as preceding the free welcome of invitation to the sinner, was only another form of work-righteousness. This is, at any rate, one meaning ^{f1168} of the saying which conjoined the Law and repentance, and represented them as preceding the Creation. {Pes. 54 *a*; Ber. R. 1.} Another would seem derived from a kind of Manichæan view of sin. According to it, God Himself was really the author of the *Yetser haRa*, or evil impulse ^{f1169} ('the law in our members'), for which, indeed, there was an absolute necessity, if the world was to continue. {Yoma 69 *b*; Ber. R. 9, and in many places.} ^{f1170} Hence, 'the penitent' was really 'the great one,' since his strong nature had more in it of the 'evil impulse,' and the conquest of it by the penitent was really of greater merit than abstinence from sin. {Sanh. 99 *a*; Maimon. Hil. Tesh. Per. 7.} Thus it came, that the true penitent really occupied a higher place — 'stood where the perfectly righteous could not stand.' {Sanh. 99 *a*; Ber. 34 *b*.} There is then both work and merit in penitence; and we can understand, how 'the gate of penitence is open, even when that of prayer is shut,' {Yalkut on Psalm 32 p. 101 *b*.} and that these two sentences are not only consistent, but almost cover each other, that the Messianic deliverance would come, if all Israel did righteousness, {Sanh. 98 *a*.} and, again, if all Israel repented for only one day; {Sanh. 98 *a*; Jer. Taan. 64 *a*.} or, to put it otherwise, if Israel were all saints, or all sinners. {Sanh. 98 *a*.}

We have already touched the point where, as regards repentance, as formerly in regard to forgiveness, the teaching of Christ is in absolute and fundamental contrariety to that of the Rabbis. According to Jesus Christ, when we have done all, we are to feel that we are but unprofitable servants. {St. ^{<270>}Luke 17:10.} According to the Rabbis, as St. Paul puts it, 'righteousness cometh by the Law;' and, when it is lost, the Law alone can restore life; ^{f1171} while, according to Christian teaching, it only bringeth death. Thus there was, at the very foundation of religious life, absolute contrariety between Jesus and His contemporaries. Whence, if not from heaven, came a doctrine so novel as that which Jesus made the basis of His Kingdom?

In one respect, indeed, the Rabbinic view was in some measure derived from the Old Testament, though by an external and, therefore, false interpretation of its teaching. In the Old Testament, also, ‘repentance’ was *Teshubhah* **hṇwct**, ‘return;’ while, in the New Testament, it is ‘change of mind’ **μετανοια**. It would not be fair here to argue, that the common expression for repenting was ‘to do penitence’ **hkwct hc**[], since by its side we frequently meet that other: ‘to return in penitence’ **hkwctb bwc**. Indeed, other terms for repentance also occur. Thus *Tohu* **whṭ** means repentance in the sense of regret; *Charatah*, perhaps, more in that of a change of mind; while *Teyubha* or *Teshubhah* is the return of repentance. Yet, according to the very common Rabbinic expression, there is a ‘gate of repentance’ **abwyṭ hbwct r**[]c through which a man must enter, and, even if *Charatah* be the sorrowing change of mind, it is at most only that gate. Thus, after all, there is more in the ‘doing of penitence’ than appears at first sight. In point of fact, the full meaning of repentance as *Teshubhah*, or ‘return,’ is only realized, when a man has returned from dereliction to observance of the Law. Then, sins of purpose are looked upon as if they had been unintentional — nay, they become even virtuous actions. {Yoma 86.}

We are not now speaking of the forgiveness of sins. In truth, Rabbinism knew nothing of a forgiveness of sin, free and unconditional, unless in the case of those who had not the power of doing anything for their atonement. Even in the passage which extols most the freeness and the benefits of repentance (the last pages of the Tractate on the Day of Atonement), there is the most painful discussion about sins great and small, about repentance from fear or from love, about sins against commands or against prohibitions; and, in what cases repentance averted, or else only deferred, judgment, leaving final expiation to be wrought by other means. These were: personal sufferings, {Ber. 5 *a*, *b*; Kidd. 81 *b*.} death, {Yoma u. s.} or the Day of Atonement. {Yoma u. s., and many passages.} Besides these, there were always the ‘merits of the fathers;’ {In almost innumerable passages.} or, perhaps, some one good work done; {Ab. Zar. 5 *a*.} or, at any rate, the brief period of purgatorial pain, which might open the gate of mercy. These are the so-called ‘advocates’ (Peraqlitin, **zyfyl qrp**) of the penitent sinner. In a classical passage on the subject, {Mehilta, 76 *a*.} repentance is viewed in its bearing on four different spiritual ^{f1172} conditions, which are supposed to be respectively referred to in

~~2482~~ Jeremiah 3:22; ~~8160~~ Leviticus 16:30; ~~2214~~ Isaiah 22:14; and ~~1982~~ Psalm 89:32. The first of these refers to a breach of a *command*, with immediate and persistent cry for forgiveness, which is at once granted. The second is that of a breach of a *prohibition*, when, besides repentance, the Day of Atonement is required. The third is that of *purposed* sin, on which death or cutting off had been threatened, when, besides repentance and the Day of Atonement, sufferings are required; while in *open profanation* of the Name of God, only death can make final atonement. {See also Yoma 86 and following.}

But the nature of repentance has yet to be more fully explained. Its gate is sorrow and shame. {Ber. 12 *b*; Chag. 5 *a*.} In that sense repentance may be the work of a moment, ‘as in the twinkling of an eye,’ {Pesiqta ed. Bub. p. 163 *b*.} and a life’s sins may obtain mercy by the tears and prayers of a few minutes’ repentance.’ ^{f1173} To this also refers the beautiful saying, that all which rendered a sacrifice unfit for the altar, such as that it was broken, fitted the penitent for acceptance, since ‘the sacrifices of God were a broken and contrite heart.’ {Vayyik. R. 7.} By the side of what may be called contrition, Jewish theology places *confession* (*Viddui*, *ywryw*). This was deemed so integral a part of repentance, that those about to be executed, {Sanh. 6:2.} or to die, {Shabb. 32 *a*.} were admonished to it. Achan of old had thus obtained pardon. {Sanh. u. s.} But in the case of the living all this could only be regarded as repentance in the sense of being its preparation or beginning. Even if it were *Charatah*, or regret at the past, it would not yet be *Teshubhah*, or return to God; and even if it changed purposed into unintentional sin, arrested judgment, and stayed or banished its Angel, it would still leave a man without those works which are not only his real destiny and merit heaven, but constitute true repentance. For, as sin is ultimately dereliction of the Law, beginning within, so repentance is ultimately return to the Law. In this sense there is a higher and meritorious confession, which not only owns sin but God, and is therefore an inward return to Him. So Adam, when he saw the penitence of Cain, burst into {~~1981~~ Psalm 92} ‘It is a good thing to confess ^{f1174} unto the Lord.’ {Ber. R. 22.} ^{f1175} Manasseh, when in trouble, called upon God and was heard, {~~4812~~ 2 Chronicles 33:12, 13.} although it is added, that this was only done in order to prove that the door of repentance was open to all. Indeed, the Angels had closed the windows of Heaven against his prayers, but God opened a place for their entrance beneath His throne of glory. {Debar. R. 2; ed. Warsh. p. 7 *a*; comp. Sanh. 102 *b*, last lines, and 103 *a*.} Similarly,

even Pharaoh, who, according to Jewish tradition, made in the Red Sea confession of God, {^{f1251b}Exodus 15:11.} was preserved, became king of Nineveh, and so brought the Ninevites to true repentance, which verily consisted not merely in sackcloth and fasting, but in restitution, so that every one who had stolen a beam pulled down his whole palace to restore it. {Taan. 16 a.}

But, after all, inward repentance only arrested the decrees of justice. {Rosh haSh. 17 b.} That which really put the penitent into right relationship with God was *good deeds*. The term must here be taken in its widest sense. *Fasting* is meritorious in a threefold sense: as the expression of humiliation, {Baba. Mez. 85 a.} as an offering to God, similar to, but better than the fat of sacrifices on the altar, {Ber. 17 a.} and as preventing further sins by chastening and keeping under the body. {u. s.} A similar view must be taken of self-inflicted penance's. {Baba Mez. 85 a.} ^{f1176} On the other hand, there was restitution to those who had been wronged — as a woman once put it to her husband, to the surrender of one's 'girdle.' {Tanch. Noach 4.} ^{f1177} Nay, it must be of even more than was due in strict law. {See the discussion in B. Mez. 37 a.} To this must be added public acknowledgment of public sins. If a person had sinned in one direction, he must not only avoid it for the future, ^{f1178} but aim at doing all the more in the opposite direction, or of overcoming sin in the same circumstances of temptation. ^{f1179} Beyond all this were the really *good works*, whether occupation with the Law {Vayyik. R. 3, towards the end.} or outward deeds, which constituted perfect repentance. Thus we read, {In B. Bab. 10 a.} that every time Israel gave alms or did any kindness, they made in this world great peace, and procured great Paracletes between Israel and their Father in Heaven. Still farther, we are told {Vayyik. R. 25, beg. ed. Warsh. p. 38 a.} what a sinner must do who would be pardoned. If he had been accustomed daily to read one column in the Bible, let him read two; if to learn one chapter in the Mishnah, let him learn two. But if he be not learned enough to do either, let him become an administrator for the congregation, or a public distributor of alms. Nay, so far was the doctrine of external merit carried, that to be buried in the land of Israel was supposed to ensure forgiveness of sins. {Tanch. on Genesis 58.} This may, finally, be illustrated by an instance, which also throws some light on the parable of Dives in Hades. Rabbi Simeon ben Lakish had in early life been the associate of two robbers. But he repented, 'returned to his God with all his heart, with fasting and prayer, was early and late before God, and

busied himself with the *Torah* (Law) and the commandments.' Then both he and his former companions died, when they saw him in glory, while themselves were in the lowest hell. And when they reminded God, that with Him there was no regard of persons, He pointed to the Rabbi's penitence and their own impenitence. On this they asked for respite, that they might 'do great penitence,' when they were told that there was no space for repentance after death. This is farther enforced by a parable to the effect, that a man, who is going into the wilderness, must provide himself with bread and water while in the inhabited country, if he would not perish in the desert.

Thus, in one and another respect, Rabbinic teaching about the need of repentance runs close to that of the Bible. But the vital difference between Rabbinism and the Gospel lies in this: that whereas Jesus Christ freely invited *all* sinners, whatever their past, assuring them of welcome and grace, the last word of Rabbinism is only despair, and a kind of Pessimism. For, it is expressly and repeatedly declared in the case of certain sins, and, characteristically, of heresy, that, even if a man genuinely and truly repented, he must expect immediately to die — indeed, his death would be the evidence that his repentance was genuine, since, though such a sinner might turn from his evil, it would be impossible for him, if he lived, to lay hold on the good, and to do it. {Ab. Zar. 17 *a*. }

It is in the light of what we have just learned concerning the Rabbinic views of forgiveness and repentance that the call of Levi-Matthew must be read, if we would perceive its full meaning. There is no need to suppose that it took place immediately on the cure of the paralytic. On the contrary, the more circumstantial account of St. Mark implies, that some time had intervened. {St. ~~4023~~ Mark 2:13.} If our suggestion be correct, that it was winter when the paralytic was healed at Capernaum, we may suppose it to have been the early spring-time of that favored district, when Jesus 'went forth again by the seaside.' And with this, as we shall see, best agrees the succession of after-events.

Few, if any, could have enjoyed better opportunities for hearing, and quietly thinking over the teaching of the Prophet of Nazareth, than Levi-Matthew. There is no occasion for speculating which was his original, or whether the second name was added after his conversion, since in Galilee it was common to have two names — one the strictly Jewish, the other the Galilean. {Gitt. 34 *b*. } Nor do we wonder, that in the sequel the first or

purely Jewish name of *Levi* was dropped, and only that of Matthew (*Matti, Mattai, Matteya, Mattithyah*), retained. The latter which is the equivalent of Nathanael, or of the Greek Theodore (gift of God), seems to have been frequent. We read that it was that of a former Temple-official, {Sheq. 5:1.} and of several Rabbis. {Eduy. 2:5; Yoma 84 *a.*} It is perhaps of more interest, that the Talmud {Sanh. 43 *a.*, in the older editions; comp, Chesron. haShas, p. 22 *b.*} names five as the disciples of Jesus, and among them these two whom we can clearly identify: Matthew ^{f1180} and Thaddaeus.

Sitting before ^{f1181} his custom-house, as on that day when Jesus called him, Matthew must have frequently heard Him as He taught by the sea-shore. For this would be the best, and therefore often chosen, place for the purpose. Thither not only the multitude from Capernaum could easily follow; but here was the landing-place for the many ships which traversed the Lake, or coasted from town to town. And this not only for them who had business in Capernaum or that neighborhood, but also for those who would then strike the great road of Eastern commerce, which led from Damascus to the harbors of the West. Touching the Lake in that very neighborhood, it turned thence, northwards and westwards, to join what was termed the Upper Galilean road.

We know much, and yet, as regards details, perhaps too little about those 'tolls, dues, and customs,' which made the Roman administration such sore and vexatious exaction to all 'Provincials,' and which in Judaea loaded the very name of publican with contempt and hatred. They who cherished the gravest religious doubts as to the lawfulness of paying any tribute to Caesar, as involving in principle recognition of a bondage to which they would fain have closed their eyes, and the substitution of heathen kingship for that of Jehovah, must have looked on the publican as the very embodiment of anti-nationalism. But perhaps men do not always act under the constant consciousness of such abstract principles. Yet the endless vexatious interferences, the unjust and cruel exactions, the petty tyranny, and the extortionate avarice, from which there was neither defence nor appeal, would make it always well-nigh unbearable. It is to this that the Rabbis so often refer. If 'publicans' were disqualified from being judges or witnesses, it was, at least so far as regarded witnessbearing, because 'they exacted more than was due.' {Sanh. 25 *b.*} Hence also it was said, that repentance was specially difficult for tax-gatherers and custom-house officers. {Baba K. 94 *b.*} ^{f1182}

It is of importance to notice, that the Talmud distinguishes two classes of 'publicans': the tax-gatherer in general (*Gabbai*), and the *Mokhes*, or *Mokhsa*, who was specially the *douanier* or custom-house official. ^{f1183} Although both classes fall under the Rabbinic ban, the *douanier* — such as Matthew was — is the object of chief execration. And this, because his exactions were more vexatious, and gave more scope to rapacity. The *Gabbai*, or tax-gatherer, collected the regular dues, which consisted of ground-, income-, and poll-tax. The ground-tax amounted to one-tenth of all grain and one-fifth of the wine and fruit grown; partly paid in kind, and partly commuted into money. The income-tax amounted to 1 per cent.; while the head-money, or poll-tax, was levied on all persons, bond and free, in the case of men from the age of fourteen, in that of women from the age of twelve, up to that of sixty-five.

If this offered many opportunities for vexatious exactions and rapacious injustice, the *Mokhes* might inflict much greater hardship upon the poor people. There was tax and duty upon all imports and exports; on all that was bought and sold; bridge-money, road-money, harbor-dues, town-dues, etc. The classical reader knows the ingenuity which could invent a tax, and find a name for every kind of exaction, such as on axles, wheels, pack-animals, pedestrians, roads, highways; on admission to markets; on carriers, bridges, ships, and quays; on crossing rivers, on dams, on licenses, in short, on such a variety of objects, that even the research of modern scholars has not been able to identify all the names. On goods the *ad valorem* duty amounted to from 2 1/2 to 5, and on articles of luxury to even 12 1/2 per cent. But even this was as nothing, compared to the vexation of being constantly stopped on the journey, having to unload all one's pack-animals, when every bale and package was opened, and the contents tumbled about, private letters opened, and the *Mokhes* ruled supreme in his insolence and rapacity.

The very word *Mokhes* seems, in its root-meaning, associated with the idea of oppression and injustice. He was literally, as really, an oppressor. The Talmud charges them with gross partiality, remitting in the case of those to whom they wished to show favor, and exacting from those who were not their favorites. They were a criminal race, to which ~~Leviticus~~ ^{Leviticus} 20:5 applied. It was said, that there never was a family which numbered a *Mokhes*, in which all did not become such. Still, cases are recorded when a religious publican would extend favor to Rabbis, or give them timely notice to go into hiding. If one belonging to the sacred association (a *Chabher*)

became either a *Gabbai* or a *Mokhes*, he was at once expelled, although he might be restored on repentance. {Jer. Dem. 23 *a*; comp. Bekhor. 31 *a*.} That there was ground for such rigor, appears from such an occurrence, {In B. Kamma 10:2.} as when a *Mokhes* took from a defenseless person his ass, giving him another, and very inferior, animal for it. Against such unscrupulous oppressors every kind of deception was allowed; goods might be declared to be votive offerings, {Nedar. 3:4.} or a person pass his slave as his son. {Jer. Kidd. 66 *b*.}

The *Mokhes* was called 'great' {Shabb. 78 *b*} if he employed substitutes, and 'small' if he stood himself at the receipt of custom. Till the time of Caesar the taxes were farmed in Rome, at the highest bidding, mostly by a joint-stock company of the knightly order, which employed publicans under them. But by a decree of Caesar, the taxes of Judaea were no longer farmed, but levied by publicans in Judaea, and paid directly to the Government, the officials being appointed by the provincials themselves. {Jos. Ant. 14:10. 5.} ^{f1184} This was, indeed, a great alleviation, although it perhaps made the tax-gatherers only more unpopular, as being the direct officials of the heathen power. This also explains how, if the Mishnah forbids {B. Kamma 10:1.} even the changing of money from the guilt-laden chest of a *Mokhes*, or *douanier*, the Gemara {Baba K. 113 *a*.} adds, that such applied to custom-house officers who either did not keep to the tax appointed by the Government, or indeed to any fixed tax, and to those who appointed themselves to such office — that is, as we take it, who would volunteer for the service, in the hope of making profit on their own account. An instance is, however, related of a *Gabbai*, or tax-gatherer, becoming a celebrated Rabbi, though the taint of his former calling deterred the more rigid of his colleagues from intercourse with him. {Bekhor. 31 *a*.} On heathen feast days toll was remitted to those who came to the festival. {Ab. Zar. 13 *a*.} Sometimes this was also done from kindness. {Tos. B. Mets. 8:25, ed. Zuck.} The following story may serve as a final illustration of the popular notions, alike about publicans and about the merit of good works. The son of a *Mokhes* and that of a very pious man had died. The former received from his townsmen all honor at his burial, while the latter was carried unmourned to the grave. This anomaly was Divinely explained by the circumstance, that the pious man had committed one transgression, and the publican had done one good deed. But a few days afterwards a further vision and dream was vouchsafed to the survivors, when the pious was seen walking in gardens

beside water-brooks, while the publican was described stretching out his tongue towards the river to quench his thirst, but unable to reach the refreshing stream. {Jer. Chag. 77 *d*; comp Jer. Sanh. 23 *c*, and Sanh. 44 *b*. }

What has been described in such detail, will cast a peculiar light on the call of Matthew by the Savior of sinners. For, we remember that Levi-Matthew was not only a 'publican,' but of the worst kind: a '*Mokhes*' or *douanier*; a 'little Mokhes,' who himself stood at his custom-house; one of the class to whom, as we are told, repentance offered special difficulties. And, of all such officials, those who had to take toll from ships were perhaps the worst, if we are to judge by the proverb: 'Woe to the ship which sails without having paid the dues.' {Ab. Zar. 10 *b*. } And yet, after all, Matthew may have been only one of that numerous class to whom religion is merely a matter quite outside of, and in another region from life, and who, having first gone astray through ignorance, feel themselves ever farther repelled, or rather shut out, by the narrow, harsh uncharitableness of those whom they look upon as the religious and pious.

But now quite another day had dawned on him. The Prophet of Nazareth was not like those other great Rabbis, or their pietist, self-righteous imitators. There was that about Him which not only aroused the conscience, but drew the heart — compelling, not repelling. What He said opened a new world. His very appearance bespoke Him not harsh, self-righteous, far away, but the Helper, if not even the Friend, of sinners. There was not between Him and one like Matthew, the great, almost impassable gap of repentance. He had seen and heard Him in the Synagogue — and who that had heard His Words, or witnessed His power, could ever forget, or lose the impression? The people, the rulers, even the evil spirits, had owned His authority. But in the Synagogue Jesus was still the Great One, far-away from him; and he, Levi-Matthew, the 'little Mokhes' of Capernaum, to whom, as the Rabbis told him, repentance was next to impossible. But out there, in the open, by the seashore, it was otherwise. All unobserved by others, he observed all, and could yield himself, without reserve, to the impression. Now, it was an eager multitude that came from Capernaum; then, a long train bearing sufferers, to whom gracious, full, immediate relief was granted — whether they were Rabbinic saints, or sinners. And still more gracious than His deeds were His Words.

And so Matthew sat before his custom-house, and hearkened and hoped. Those white-sailed ships would bring crowds of listeners; the busy caravan

on that highway would stop, and its wayfarers turn aside to join the eager multitude, to hear the Word or see the Word. Surely, it was not ‘a time for buying and selling,’ and Levi would have little work, and less heart for it at his custom-house. Perhaps he may have witnessed the call of the first Apostles; he certainly must have known the fishermen and ship-owners of Capernaum. And now it appeared, as if Jesus had been brought still nearer to Matthew. For, the great ones of Israel, ‘the Scribes of the Pharisees,’^{f1185} and their pietest followers, had combined against Him, and would exclude Him, not on account of sin, but on account of the sinners. And so, we take it, long before that eventful day which for ever decided his life, Matthew had, in heart, become the disciple of Jesus. Only he dared not, could not, have hoped for personal recognition — far less for call to discipleship. But when it came, and Jesus fixed on him that look of love which searched the inmost deep of the soul, and made Him the true Fisher of men, it needed not a moment’s thought or consideration. When he spake it, ‘Follow Me,’ the past seemed all swallowed up in the present heaven of bliss. He said not a word, for his soul was in the speechless surprise of unexpected love and grace; but he rose up, left the custom-house, and followed Him. That was a gain that day, not of Matthew alone, but of all the poor and needy in Israel — nay, of all sinners from among men, to whom the door of heaven was opened. And, verily, by the side of Peter, as the stone, we place Levi-Matthew, as typical of those rafters laid on the great foundation, and on which is placed the flooring of that habitation of the Lord, which is His Church.

It could not have been long after this — probably almost immediately — that the memorable gathering took place in the house of Matthew, which gave occasion to that cavil of the Pharisaic Scribes, which served further to bring out the meaning of Levi’s call. For, opposition ever brings into clearer light positive truth, just as judgment comes never alone, but always conjoined with display of higher mercy. It was natural that all the publicans around should, after the call of Matthew, have come to his house to meet Jesus. Even from the lowest point of view, the event would give them a new standing in the Jewish world, in relation to the Prophet of Nazareth. And it was characteristic that Jesus should improve such opportunity. When we read of ‘sinners’ as in company with these publicans, it is not necessary to think of gross or open offenders, though such may have been included. For, we know what such a term may have included in the Pharisaic vocabulary. Equally characteristic was it, that the Rabbinites

should have addressed their objection as to fellowship with such, not to the Master, but to the disciples. Perhaps, it was not only, nor chiefly, from moral cowardice, though they must have known what the reply of Jesus would have been. On the other hand, there was wisdom, or rather cunning, in putting it to the disciples. They were but initial learners — and the question was one not so much of principle, as of acknowledged Jewish propriety. Had they been able to lodge this cavil in their minds, it would have fatally shaken the confidence of the disciples in the Master; and, if they could have been turned aside, the cause of the new Christ would have been grievously injured, if not destroyed. It was with the same object, that they shortly afterwards enlisted the aid of the well-meaning, but only partially-instructed disciples of John on the question of fasting, {St. ^{f1094}Matthew 9:14-17.} which presented a still stronger *consensus* of Jewish opinion as against Christ, all the more telling, that here the practice of John seemed to clash with that of Jesus.

But then John was at the time in prison, and passing through the temporary darkness of a thick cloud towards the fuller light. But Jesus could not leave His disciples to answer for themselves. What, indeed, could or would they have had to say? And He ever speaks for us, when we cannot answer for ourselves. From their own standpoint and contention, nay — also in their own form of speech — He answered the Pharisees. And He not only silenced their gain-saying, but further opened up the meaning of His acting, nay — His very purpose and Mission. ‘No need have they who are strong and in health {The latter in St. ^{f1151}Luke 5:31.} of a physician, but they who are ill.’ It was the very principle of Pharisaism which He thus set forth, alike as regarded their self-exclusion from Him and His consorting with the diseased. And, as the more Hebraic St. Matthew adds, applying the very Rabbinic formula, so often used when superficial speciousness of knowledge is directed to further thought and information: ‘Go and learn!’ ^{f1186} Learn what? What their own Scriptures meant; what was implied in the further prophetic teaching, as correction of a one-sided literalism and externalism that misinterpreted the doctrine of sacrifices — learn that fundamental principle of the spiritual meaning of the Law as explanatory of its mere letter, ‘I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.’ They knew no mercy that was not sacrifice ^{f1187} — with merit attaching; He no sacrifice, real and acceptable to God, that was not mercy. And this also is a fundamental principle of the Old Testament, as spiritually understood; and, being such a fundamental principle, He afterwards again applied this saying of the

prophet {^{<2016>}Hosea 6:6.} to His own mode of viewing and treating the Sabbath-question. {St. ^{<1127>}Matthew 12:7.}

This was one aspect of it, as Jesus opened up anew the Old Testament, of which their key of knowledge had only locked the door. There was yet another and higher, quite explaining and applying alike this saying and the whole Old Testament, and thus His Own Mission. And this was the fullest unfolding and highest vindication of it: 'For, I am not come to call righteous men, but sinners.' ^{f1188} The introduction of the words 'to repentance' in some manuscripts of St. Matthew and St. Mark shows, how early the full meaning of Christ's words was misinterpreted by prosaic apologetic attempts, that failed to fathom their depth. For, Christ called sinners to better and higher than repentance, even to Himself and His Kingdom; and to 'emendate' the original record by introducing these words from another Gospel ^{f1189} marks a purpose, indicative of retrogression. And this saying of Christ concerning the purpose of His Incarnation and Work: 'to call not righteous men, but sinners,' also marks the standpoint of the Christ, and the relation which each of us, according to his view of self, of righteousness, and of sin — personally, voluntarily, and deliberately — occupies towards the Kingdom and the Christ.

The history of the call of St. Matthew has also another, to some extent subordinate, historical interest, for it was no doubt speedily followed by the calling of the other Apostles. {St. ^{<1012>}Matthew 10:2-4; St. ^{<1013>}Mark 3:13-19; St. ^{<1162>}Luke 6:12-19.} This is the chronological succession in the Synoptic narratives. It also affords some insight into the history of those, whom the Lord chose as bearers of His Gospel. The difficulties connected with tracing the family descent or possible relationship between the Apostles are so great, that we must forego all hope of arriving at any certain conclusion. Without, therefore, entering on details about the genealogy of the Apostles, and the varied arrangement of their names in the Gospels, which, with whatever uncertainty remaining in the end, may be learned from any work on the subject, some points at least seem clear. First, it appears that only the calling of those to the Apostolate is related, which in some sense is typical, viz. that of Peter and Andrew, of James and John, of Philip and Bartholomew (or Bar Telamyon, or Temalyon, {Vayyik. R. 6; Pesiq. R. 22, ed. Friedm. p. 113 a.} generally supposed the same as Nathanael), and of Matthew the publican. Yet, secondly, there is something which attaches to each of the others. Thomas, who is called Didymus (which means 'twin'), is closely connected with Matthew, both in

St. Luke's Gospel and in that of St. Matthew himself. James is expressly named as the son of Alphaeus or Clopas. {St. ~~<B125>~~ John 19:25.} ^{f1190} This we know to have been also the name of Matthew-Levi's father. But, as the name was a common one, no inference can be drawn from it, and it does not seem likely that the father of Matthew was also that of James, Judas, and Simon, for these three seem to have been brothers. Judas is designated by St. Matthew as Lebbaeus, from the Hebrew *lebh*, a heart, and is also named, both by him and by St. Mark, Thaddaeus — a term which, however, we would not derive, as is commonly done, from *thad*, the 'female breast,' but following the analogy of the Jewish name *Thodah*, from 'praise.' ^{f1191} In that case both Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus would point to the heartiness and the Thanksgiving of the Apostle, and hence to his character. St. Luke simply designates him Judas of James, which means that he was the brother (less probably, the son) of James. {St. ~~<B15>~~ Luke 6:15; comp. St. ~~<B142>~~ John 14:22.} Thus his real name would have been Judas Lebbaeus, and his surname Thaddaeus. Closely connected with these two we have in all the Gospels, Simon, surnamed Zelotes or Cananaean (not Canaanite), both terms indicating his original connection with the Galilean Zealot party, the 'Zealots for the Law.' {War. 4:3, 9.} His position in the Apostolic Catalogue, and the testimony of Hegesippus, {Euseb. H. E. 3:11; 4:22.} seem to point him out as the son of Clopas, and brother of James, and of Judas Lebbaeus. These three were, in a sense, cousins of Christ, since, according to Hegesippus, Clopas was the brother of *Joseph*, while the sons of Zebedee were real cousins, their mother Salome being a sister of the Virgin. ^{f1192} Lastly, we have Judas Iscariot, or *Ish Kerioth*, 'a man of Kerioth,' a man of Kerioth,' a town in Judah. {~~<B155>~~ Joshua 15:25.} Thus the betrayer alone would be of Judaeen origin, the others all of Galilean; and this may throw light on not a little in his after-history.

No further reference than this briefest sketch seems necessary, although on comparison it is clear that the Apostolic Catalogues in the Gospels are ranged in three groups, each of them beginning with respectively the same name (Simon, Philip, and James the son of Alphaeus). This, however, we may remark — how narrow, after all, was the Apostolic circle, and how closely connected most of its members. And yet, as we remember the history of their calling, or those notices attached to their names which afford a glimpse into their history, it was a circle, thoroughly representative of those who would gather around the Christ. Most marked and most solemn of all, it was after a night of solitary prayer on the mountain-side,

that Jesus at early dawn ‘called His disciples, and of them He chose twelve, whom also He named Apostles,’ ‘that they should be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sickness and to cast out devils.’ ^{f1193}

CHAPTER 18

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT — THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST AND RABBINIC TEACHING. ^{F1194}

(St. ~~<1187>~~ Matthew 5:7.)

It was probably on one of those mountain-ranges, which stretch to the north of Capernaum, that Jesus had spent the night of lonely prayer, which preceded the designation of the twelve to the Apostolate. As the soft spring morning broke, He called up those who had learned to follow Him, and from among them chose the twelve, who were to be His Ambassadors and Representatives. {St. ~~<1183>~~ Luke 6:13.} ^{f1195} But already the early light had guided the eager multitude which, from all parts, had come to the broad level plateau beneath to bring to Him their need of soul or body. To them He now descended with words of comfort and power of healing. But better yet had He to say, and to do for them, and for us all. As they pressed around Him for that touch which brought virtue of healing to all, He retired again to the mountain-height, ^{f1196} and through the clear air of the bright spring day spake, what has ever since been known as the ‘Sermon on the Mount,’ from the place where He sat, or as that ‘in the plain’ (St. ~~<1187>~~ Luke 6:17), from the place where He had first met the multitude, and which so many must have continued to occupy while He taught.

The first and most obvious, perhaps, also, most superficial thought, is that which brings this teaching of Christ into comparison, we shall not say with that of His contemporaries — since scarcely any who lived in the time of Jesus said aught that can be compared with it, but with the best of the wisdom and piety of the Jewish sages, as preserved in Rabbinic writings. Its essential difference, or rather contrariety, in spirit and substance, not only when viewed as a whole, but in almost each of its individual parts, will be briefly shown in the sequel. For the present we only express this as deepest conviction, that it were difficult to say which brings greater astonishment (though of opposite kind): a first reading of the ‘Sermon on the Mount,’ or that of any section of the Talmud. The general reader is here at a double disadvantage. From his upbringing in an atmosphere which Christ’s Words have filled with heaven’s music, he knows not, and cannot know, the nameless feeling which steals over a receptive soul when, in the

silence of our moral wilderness, those voices first break on the ear, that had never before been wakened to them. How they hold the soul entranced, calling up echoes of inmost yet unrealized aspiration, itself the outcome of the God-born and God-tending within us, and which renders us capable of new birth into the Kingdom; call up, also, visions and longings of that world of heavenly song, so far away and yet so near us; and fill the soul with subduedness, expectancy, and ecstasy! So the travel-stained wanderer flings him down on the nearest height, to feast his eyes with the first sight of home in the still valley beneath; so the far-of exile sees in his dreams visions of his child-life, all transfigured; so the weary prodigal leans his head in silent musing of mingled longing and rest on a mother's knee. So, and much more; for, it is the Voice of God Which speaks to us in the cool of the evening, amidst the trees of the lost Garden; to us who, in very shame and sorrow, hide, and yet even so hear, not words of judgment but of mercy, not concerning an irrevocable, and impossible past, but concerning a real and to us possible future, which is that past, only better, nearer, dearer — for, that it is not the human which has now to rise to the Divine, but the Divine which has come down to the human.

Or else, turn from this to a first reading of the wisdom of the Jewish Fathers in their Talmud. It little matters, what part be chosen for the purpose. Here, also, the reader is at disadvantage, since his instructors present to him too frequently broken sentences, extracts torn from their connection, words often mistranslated as regards their real meaning, or misapplied as regards their bearing and spirit; at best, only isolated sentences. Take these in their connection and real meaning, and what a terrible awakening! Who, that has read half-a-dozen pages successively of any part of the Talmud, can feel otherwise than by turns shocked, pained, amused, or astounded? There is here wit and logic, quickness and readiness, earnestness and zeal, but by the side of it terrible profanity, uncleanness, superstition and folly. Taken as a whole, it is not only utterly unspiritual, but anti-spiritual. Not that the Talmud is worse than might be expected of such writings in such times and circumstances, perhaps in many respects much better — always bearing in mind the particular standpoint of narrow nationalism, without which Talmudism itself could not have existed, and which therefore is not an accretion, but an essential part of it. But, taken not in abrupt sentences and quotations, but as a whole, it is so utterly and immeasurably unlike the New Testament, that it is not easy to determine which, as the case may be, is greater, the

ignorance or the presumption of those who put them side by side. Even where spiritual life pulsates, it seems propelled through valves that are diseased, and to send the life-blood gurgling back upon the heart, or along ossified arteries that quiver not with life at its touch. And to the reader of such disjointed Rabbinic quotations there is this further source of misunderstanding, that the *form* and *sound of words* is so often the same as that of the sayings of Jesus, however different their spirit. For, necessarily, the wine — be it new or old — made in Judaea, comes to us in Palestinian vessels. The new teaching, to be historically true, must have employed the old forms and spoken the old language. But the ideas underlying terms equally employed by Jesus and the teachers of Israel are, in everything that concerns the relation of souls to God, so absolutely different as not to bear comparison. Whence otherwise the enmity and opposition to Jesus from the first, and not only after His Divine claim had been pronounced? These two, starting from principles alien and hostile, follow opposite directions, and lead to other goals. He who has thirsted and quenched his thirst at the living fount of Christ's Teaching, can never again stoop to seek drink at the broken cisterns of Rabbinism.

We take here our standpoint on St. Matthew's account of the 'Sermon on the Mount,' to which we can scarcely doubt that by St. Luke {St. Luke 6} is parallel. Not that it is easy, or perhaps even possible to determine, whether all that is now grouped in the 'Sermon on the Mount' was really spoken by Jesus on this one occasion. From the plan and structure of St. Matthew's Gospel, the presumption seems rather to the contrary. For, isolated parts of it are introduced by St. Luke in other connections, yet quite fitly.^{f1197} On the other hand, even in accordance with the traditional characterization of St. Matthew's narrative, we expect in it the fullest account of our Lord's Discourses,^{f1198} while we also notice that His Galilean Ministry forms the main subject of the First Gospel.^{f1199} And there is one characteristic of the 'Sermon on the Mount' which, indeed, throws light on the plan of St. Matthew's work in its apparent chronological inversion of events, such as in its placing the 'Sermon on the Mount' before the calling of the Apostles. We will not designate the 'Sermon on the Mount' as the promulgation of the New Law, since that would be a far too narrow, if not erroneous, view of it. But it certainly seems to correspond to the Divine Revelation in the 'Ten Words' from Mount Sinai. Accordingly, it seems appropriate that the Genesis-part of St. Matthew's Gospel should be immediately followed by the Exodus-part, in which the

new Revelation is placed in the forefront, to the seeming breach of historical order, leaving it afterwards to be followed by an appropriate grouping of miracles and events, which we know to have really preceded the ‘Sermon on the Mount.’

Very many-sided is that ‘Sermon on the Mount,’ so that different writers, each viewing it from his standpoint, have differently sketched its general outline, and yet carried to our minds the feeling that thus far they had correctly understood it. We also might attempt humble contribution towards the same end. Viewing it in the light of the time, we might mark in it alike advancement on the Old Testament (or rather, unfolding of its inmost, yet hidden meaning), and contrast to contemporary Jewish teaching. And here we would regard it as presenting the full delineation of the ideal man of God, of prayer, and of righteousness — in short, of the inward and outward manifestation of discipleship. Or else, keeping before us the different standpoint of His hearers, we might in this ‘Sermon’ follow up this contrast to its underlying ideas as regards: First, the right relationship between man and God, or true righteousness — what inward graces characterize and what prospects attach to it, in opposition to Jewish views of merit and of reward. Secondly, we would mark the same contrast as regards sin (*hamartology*), temptation, etc. Thirdly, we would note it, as regards salvation (*soteriology*); and, lastly, as regards what may be termed moral theology: personal feelings, married and other relations, discipleship, and the like. And in this great contrast two points would prominently stand out: New Testament humility, as opposed to Jewish (the latter being really pride, as only the consciousness of failure, or rather, of inadequate perfectness, while New Testament humility is really despair of self); and again, Jewish as opposed to New Testament perfectness (the former being an attempt by means external or internal to strive up to God: the latter a new life, springing from God, and in God). Or, lastly, we might view it as *upward* teaching in regard to God: the *King*; *inward* teaching in regard to man: *the subjects of the King*; and *outward* teaching in regard to the Church and the world: *the boundaries of the Kingdom*.

This brings us to what alone we can here attempt: a general outline of the ‘Sermon on the Mount.’ Its great subject is neither righteousness, nor yet the New Law (if such designation be proper in regard to what in no real sense is a Law), but that which was innermost and uppermost in the Mind of Christ — the Kingdom of God. Notably, the Sermon on the Mount contains not any detailed or systematic doctrinal, ^{f1200} nor any ritual

teaching, nor yet does it prescribe the form of any outward observances. This marks, at least negatively, a difference in principle from all other teaching. Christ came to found a Kingdom, not a School; to institute a fellowship, not to propound a system. To the first disciples all doctrinal teaching sprang out of fellowship with Him. They saw Him, and therefore believed; they believed, and therefore learned the truths connected with Him, and springing out of Him. So to speak, the seed of truth which fell on their hearts was carried thither from the flower of His Person and Life.

Again, as from this point of view the Sermon on the Mount differs from all contemporary Jewish teaching, so also is it impossible to compare it with any other system of morality. The difference here is one not of degree, nor even of kind, but of standpoint. It is indeed true, that the Words of Jesus, properly understood, marks the utmost limit of all possible moral conception. But this point does not come in question. Every moral system is a road by which, through self-denial, discipline, and effort, men seek to reach the goal. Christ begins with this goal, and places His disciples at once in the position to which all other teachers point as the end. They work up to the goal of becoming the ‘children of the Kingdom;’ He makes men such, freely, and of His grace: and this is the Kingdom. What the others labor for, He gives. They begin by demanding, He by bestowing: because he brings good tidings of forgiveness and mercy. Accordingly, in the real sense, there is neither new law nor moral system here, but entrance into a new life: ‘Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father Which is in heaven is perfect.’

But if the Sermon on the Mount contains not a new, nor, indeed, any system of morality, and addresses itself to a new condition of things, it follows that the promises attaching, for example, to the so-called ‘Beatitudes’ must not be regarded as the *reward* of the spiritual state with which they are respectively connected, nor yet as their result. It is not *because* a man is poor in spirit that his is the Kingdom of Heaven, in the sense that the one state will grow into the other, or be its result; still less is the one the reward of the other.^{f1201} The connecting link — so to speak, the theological copula between the ‘state’ and the promise — is in each case Christ Himself: because He stands between our present and our future, and ‘has opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.’ Thus the promise represents the gift of grace by Christ in the new Kingdom, as adapted to each case.

It is Christ, then, as the King, Who is here flinging open the gates of His Kingdom. To study it more closely: in the three chapters, under which the Sermon on the Mount is grouped in the first Gospel, {chs. 5-7} the Kingdom of God is presented *successively, progressively, and extensively*. Let us trace this with the help of the text itself.

In the first part of the Sermon on the Mount {St. ~~401B~~ Matthew 5} the Kingdom of God is delineated generally, first *positively*, and then *negatively*, marking especially how its righteousness goes deeper than the mere letter of even the Old Testament Law. It opens with ten Beatitudes, which are the New Testament counterpart to the Ten Commandments. These present to us, not the observance of the Law written on stone, but the realization of that Law which, by the Spirit, is written on the fleshly tables of the heart. {St. ~~401B~~ Matthew 5:3-12.}

These Ten Commandments in the Old Covenant were preceded by a Prologue. {~~401B~~ Exodus 19:3-6.} The ten Beatitudes have, characteristically, not a Prologue but an Epilogue, {St. ~~401B~~ Matthew 5:13-16.} which corresponds to the Old Testament Prologue. This closes the first section, of which the object was to present the Kingdom of God in its characteristic features. But here it was necessary, in order to mark the real continuity of the New Testament with the Old, to show the relation of the one to the other. And this is the object of verses 17 to 20, the last-mentioned verse forming at the same time a grand climax and transition to the criticism of the Old Testament-Law in its merely literal application, such as the Scribes and Pharisees made. {vv. 21 to end of chapter 5.} For, taking even the letter of the Law, there is not only progression, but almost contrast, between the righteousness of the Kingdom and that set forth by the teachers of Israel. Accordingly, a detailed criticism of the Law now follows, and that not as interpreted and applied by 'tradition,' but in its barely literal meaning. In this part of the 'Sermon on the Mount' the careful reader will mark an analogy to Exodus 21 and 22:

This closes the first part of the 'Sermon on the Mount.' The second part is contained in St. Matthew 6. In this the criticism of the Law is carried deeper. The question now is not as concerns the Law in its literality, but as to what constituted more than a mere observance of the outward commandments: *piety, spirituality, sanctity*. Three points here stood out specially — nay, stand out still, and in all ages. Hence this criticism was not only of special application to the Jews, but is universal, we might almost

say, prophetic. These three high points are *alms*, *prayer*, and *fasting* — or, to put the latter more generally, the relation of the physical to the spiritual. These three are successively presented, negatively and positively. {Alms, 6:1-4; Prayer, vv. 5-15; Fasting, 16-18.} But even so, this would have been but the external aspect of them. The Kingdom of God carries all back to the grand underlying ideas. What were this or that mode of giving alms, unless the right idea be apprehended, of what constitutes riches, and where they should be sought? This is indicated in verses 19 to 21. Again, as to *prayer*: what matters it if we avoid the externalism of the Pharisees, or even catch the right form as set forth in the ‘Lord’s Prayer,’ unless we realize what underlies prayer? It is to lay our inner man wholly open to the light of God in genuine, earnest simplicity, to be quite shone through by Him. {vv. 22, 23.} It is, moreover, absolute and undivided self-dedication to God. {vv. 22-24.} And in this lies its connection, alike with the spirit that prompts *almsgiving*, and with that which prompts real *fasting*. That which underlies all such fasting is a right view of the relation in which the body with its wants stands to God — the temporal to the spiritual. {vv. 25 to end of ch. vi.} It is the spirit of prayer which must rule alike alms and fasting, and pervade them: the upward look and self-dedication to God, the seeking first after the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness, that man, and self, and life may be baptized in it. Such are the real alms, the real prayers, the real fasts of the Kingdom of God.

If we have rightly apprehended the meaning of the two first parts of the ‘Sermon on the Mount,’ we cannot be at a loss to understand its *third* part, as set forth in the seventh chapter of St. Matthew’s Gospel. Briefly, it is this, as addressed to His contemporaries, nay — with wider application to the men of all times: *First*, the Kingdom of God cannot be *circumscribed*, as you would do it. {7:1-5.} *Secondly*, it cannot be *extended*, as you would do it, by external means, {ver. 6.} but cometh to us from God, {vv. 7-12.} and is entered by personal determination and separation. {vv. 13, 14.} *Thirdly*, it is not *preached*, as too often is attempted, when thoughts of it are merely of the external. {vv. 15, 16.} *Lastly*, it is not *manifested* in life in the manner too common among religionists, but is very real, and true, and good in its effects. {vv. 17-20.} And this Kingdom, as received by each of us, is like a solid house on a solid foundation, which nothing from without can shake or destroy. {vv. 24-27.}

The infinite contrast, just set forth, between the Kingdom as presented by the Christ and Jewish contemporary teaching is the more striking, that it

was expressed in a form, and clothed in words with which all His hearers were familiar; indeed, in modes of expression current at the time. It is this which has misled so many in their quotations of Rabbinic parallels to the 'Sermon on the Mount.' They perceive outward similarity, and they straightway set it down to identity of spirit, not understanding that often those things are most unlike in the spirit of them, which are most like in their form. No part of the New Testament has had a larger array of Rabbinic parallels adduced than the 'Sermon on the Mount;' and this, as we might expect, because, in teaching addressed to His contemporaries, Jesus would naturally use the forms with which they were familiar. Many of these Rabbinic quotations are, however, entirely inapt, the similarity lying in an expression or turn of words.^{f1202} Occasionally, the misleading error goes even further, and that is quoted in illustration of Jesus' sayings which, either by itself or in the context, implies quite the opposite. A detailed analysis would lead too far, but a few specimens will sufficiently illustrate our meaning.

To begin with the first Beatitude, to the poor in spirit, since theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven, this early Jewish saying {Ab. 4:4.} is its very counterpart, marking not the optimism, but the pessimism of life: 'Ever be more and more lowly in spirit, since the expectancy of man is to become the food of worms.' Another contrast to Christ's promise of grace to the 'poor in spirit' is presented in this utterance of self-righteousness {Sanh. 43 b.} on the part of Rabbi Joshua, who compares the reward (rkc) formerly given to him who brought one or another offering to the Temple with that of him who is of a lowly mind (l pc wt[rch]), to whom it is reckoned as if he had brought all the sacrifices. To this the saying of the great Hillel {Vayyik. R. 1, ed. Warsh. p. 2 b.} seems exactly parallel: 'My humility is my greatness, and my greatness my humility,' which, be it observed, is elicited by a Rabbinic accommodation of ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 113:5, 6: 'Who is exalted to sit, who humbleth himself to behold.' It is the omission on the part of modern writers of this explanatory addition, which has given the saying of Hillel even the faintest likeness to the first Beatitude.

But even so, what of the promise of 'the Kingdom of Heaven?' What is the meaning which Rabbinism attaches to that phrase, and would it have entered the mind of a Rabbi to promise what he understood as the Kingdom to all men, Gentiles as well as Jews, who were poor in spirit? We recall here the fate of the Gentiles in Messianic days, and, to prevent

misstatements, summarize the opening pages of the Talmudic tractate on Idolatry. {Abhodah Zarah.} At the beginning of the coming era of the Kingdom, God is represented as opening the Torah, and inviting all who had busied themselves with it to come for their reward. On this, nation by nation appears — first, the Romans, insisting that all the great things they had done were only done for the sake of Israel, in order that they might the better busy themselves with the Torah. Being harshly repulsed, the Persians next come forward with similar claims, encouraged by the fact that, unlike the Romans, they had not destroyed the Temple. But they also are in turn repelled. Then all the Gentile nations urge that the Law had not been offered to them, which is proved to be a vain contention, since God had actually offered it to them, but only Israel had accepted it. On this the nations reply by a peculiar Rabbinic explanation of ~~Exod~~ Exodus 19:17, according to which God is actually represented as having lifted Mount Sinai like a cask, and threatened to put it over Israel unless they accepted the Law. Israel's obedience, therefore, was not willing, but enforced. On this the Almighty proposes to judge the Gentiles by the Noachic commandments, although it is added, that, even had they observed them, these would have carried no reward. And, although it is a principle that even a heathen, if he studied the Law, was to be esteemed like the High-Priest, yet it is argued, with the most perverse logic, that the reward of heathens who observed the Law must be less than that of those who did so because the Law was given them, since the former acted from impulse, and not from obedience!

Even thus far the contrast to the teaching of Jesus is tremendous. A few further extracts will finally point the difference between the largeness of Christ's World-Kingdom, and the narrowness of Judaism. Most painful as the exhibition of profanity and national conceit is, it is needful in order to refute what we must call the daring assertion, that the teaching of Jesus, or the Sermon on the Mount, had been derived from Jewish sources. At the same time it must carry to the mind, with almost irresistible force, the question whence, if not from God, Jesus had derived His teaching, or how else it came so to differ, not in detail, but in principle and direction, from that of all His contemporaries.

In the Talmudic passages from which quotation has already been made, we further read that the Gentiles would enter into controversy with the Almighty about Israel. They would urge, that Israel had not observed the Law. On this the Almighty would propose Himself to bear witness for

them. But the Gentiles would object, that a father could not give testimony for his son. Similarly, they would object to the proposed testimony of heaven and earth, since self-interest might compel them to be partial. For, according to ~~1908~~ Psalm 76:8, 'the earth was afraid' — because, if Israel had not accepted the Law, it would have been destroyed, but it 'became still' when at Sinai they consented to it. On this the heathen would be silenced out of the mouth of their own witnesses, such as Nimrod, Laban, Potiphar, Nebuchadnezzar, etc. They would then ask, that the Law might be given them, and promise to observe it. Although this was now impossible, yet God would, in His mercy, try them by giving them the Feast of Tabernacles, as perhaps the easiest of all observances. But as they were in their tabernacles, God would cause the sun to shine forth in his strength, when they would forsake their tabernacles in great indignation, according to ~~1908~~ Psalm 2:3. And it is in this manner that Rabbinism looked for the fulfilment of those words in ~~1904~~ Psalm 2:4: 'He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision,' this being the only occasion on which God laughed! And if it were urged, that at the time of the Messiah all nations would become Jews, this was indeed true; but although they would adopt Jewish practices, they would apostatize in the war of Gog and Magog, when again ~~1904~~ Psalm 2:4 would be realized: 'The Lord shall laugh at them.' And this is the teaching which some writers would compare with that of Christ! In view of such statements, we can only ask with astonishment: What fellowship of spirit can there be between Jewish teaching and the first Beatitude?

It is the same sad self-righteousness and utter carnalness of view which underlies the other Rabbinic parallels to the Beatitudes, pointing to contrast rather than likeness. Thus the Rabbinic blessedness of mourning consists in this, that much misery here makes up for punishment hereafter. {Erub. 41 *b.*} We scarcely wonder that no Rabbinic parallel can be found to the third Beatitude, unless we recall the contrast which assigns in Messianic days the possession of earth to Israel as a nation. Nor could we expect any parallel to the fourth Beatitude, to those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. Rabbinism would have quite a different idea of 'righteousness,' considered as 'good works,' and chiefly as almsgiving (designated as *Tsedaqah*, or righteousness). To such the most special reward is promised, and that *ex opere operato*. {Baba B. 10 *a.*} Similarly, Rabbinism speaks of the perfectly righteous rwmg qydx and the perfectly unrighteous, or else of the righteous and unrighteous (according as the

good or the evil might weigh heaviest in the scale); and, besides these, of a kind of middle state. But such a conception as that of ‘hunger’ and ‘thirst’ after righteousness would have no place in the system. And, that no doubt may obtain, this sentence may be quoted: ‘He that says, I give this “Sela” as alms, in order that **I ybc b** my sons may live, and that I may merit the world to come, behold, this is the perfectly righteous.’ {Baba B. 10 b; comp. Pes. 8 a; Rosh haSh. 4 a.} Along with such assertions of work-righteousness we have this principle often repeated, that all such merit attaches only to Israel, while the good works and mercy of the Gentiles are actually reckoned to them as sin, {B. Bath. u. s.} though it is only fair to add that one voice (that of Jochanan ben Zakkai) is raised in contradiction of such horrible teaching.

It seems almost needless to prosecute this subject; yet it may be well to remark, that the same self-righteousness attaches to the quality of mercy, so highly prized among the Jews, and which is supposed not only to bring reward, {B. Bath. 9 b.} but to atone for sins. {Chag. 27 a.} ^{f1203} With regard to purity of heart, there is, indeed, a discussion between the school of Shammai and that of Hillel, the former teaching that guilty thoughts constitute sin, while the latter expressly confines it to guilty deeds. {B. Mez. 43 b and 44 a; comp also Kidd. 42 b.} The Beatitude attaching to peace-making has many analogies in Rabbinism; but the latter would never have connected the designation of ‘children of God’ with any but Israel. {Ab. 3:14.} A similar remark applies to the use of the expression ‘Kingdom of Heaven’ in the next Beatitude.

A more full comparison than has been made would almost require a separate treatise. One by one, as we place the sayings of the Rabbis by the side of those of Jesus in this Sermon on the Mount, we mark the same essential contrariety of spirit, whether as regards righteousness, sin, repentance, faith, the Kingdom, alms, prayer, or fasting. Only two points may be specially selected, because they are so frequently brought forward by writers as proof, that the sayings of Jesus did not rise above those of the chief Talmudic authorities. The first of these refers to the well-known words of our Lord: {St. ^{<4072>}Matthew 7:12.} ‘Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.’ This is compared with the following Rabbinic parallel, {Shabb. 31 a.} in which the gentleness of Hillel is contrasted with the opposite disposition of Shammai. The latter is said to have harshly repelled an intending proselyte, who wished to be taught the

whole Law while standing on one foot, while Hillel received him with this saying: 'What is hateful to thee, do not to another. This is the whole Law, all else is only its explanation. But it will be noticed that the words in which the Law is thus summed up are really only a quotation from Tob. 4:15, although their presentation as the substance of the Law is, of course, original. But apart from this, the merest beginner in logic must perceive, that there is a vast difference between this negative injunction, or the prohibition to do to others what is hateful to ourselves, and the positive direction to do unto others as we would have them do unto us. ^{f1204} The one does not rise above the standpoint of the Law, being as yet far from that love which would lavish on others, the good we ourselves desire, while the Christian saying embodies the nearest approach to absolute love of which human nature is capable, making that the test of our conduct to others which we ourselves desire to possess. And, be it observed, the Lord does not put self-love as the principle of our conduct, but only as its ready test. Besides, the further explanation in St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Luke 6:38 should here be kept in view, as also what may be regarded as the explanatory additions in St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Matthew 5:42-48.

The second instance, to which it seems desirable to advert, is the supposed similarity between petitions in the Lord's Prayer {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Matthew 6:9-13.} and Rabbinic prayers. Here, we may remark, at the outset, that both the spirit and the manner of prayer are presented by the Rabbis so externally, and with such details, as to make it quite different from prayer as our Lord taught His disciples. This appears from the Talmudic tractate specially devoted to that subject, {Berakhoth.} where the exact position, the degree of inclination, and other trivialities, never referred to by Christ, are dwelt upon at length as of primary importance. {Ber. 34 a b; 32 a; 58 b.} Most painful, for example, is it {Jer. Ber. 8 b.} to find this interpretation of Hezekiah's prayer, {~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Isaiah 38:2. Beautiful prayers in Ber. 16 b, 17 a; but most painful instances very frequently occur in the Midrashim, such as in Shem. R. 43.} when the King is represented as appealing to the merit of his fathers, detailing their greatness in contrast to Rahab or the Shunammite, who yet had received a reward, and closing with this: 'Lord of the world, I have searched the 248 members which Thou hast given me, and not found that I have provoked Thee to anger with any one of them, how much more then shouldest Thou on account of these prolong my life?' After this, it is scarcely necessary to point to the self-righteousness which, in this as in other respects, is the most painful characteristic of Rabbinism.

That the warning against prayers at the corner of streets was taken from life, appears from the well-known anecdote {Jer. Ber. 8 c.} concerning one, Rabbi Jannai, who was observed saying his prayers in the public streets of Sepphoris, and then advancing four cubits to make the so-called supplementary prayer. Again, a perusal of some of the recorded prayers of the Rabbis {Ber. 29 b.} will show, how vastly different many of them were from the petitions which our Lord taught. Without insisting on this, nor on the circumstance that all recorded Talmudic prayers are of much later date than the time of Jesus, it may, at the same time, be freely admitted that here also the form, and sometimes even the spirit, approached closely to the words of our Lord. On the other hand, it would be folly to deny that the Lord's Prayer, in its sublime spirit, tendency, combination, and succession of petitions, is unique; and that such expressions in it as 'Our Father,' 'the Kingdom,' 'forgiveness,' 'temptation,' and others, represent in Rabbinism something entirely different from that which our Lord had in view. But, even so, such petitions as 'forgive us our debts,' could, as has been shown in a previous chapter, have no true parallel in Jewish theology. ^{f1205}

Further details would lead beyond our present scope. It must suffice to indicate that such sayings as St. ^{f1205}Matthew 5:6, 15, 17, 25, 29, 31, 46, 47; ^{f1205}6:8, 12, 18, 22, 24, 32; ^{f1205}7:8, 9, 10, 15, 17-19, 22, 23, have no parallel, in any real sense, in Jewish writings, whose teaching, indeed, often embodies opposite ideas. Here it may be interesting, by one instance, to show what kind of Messianic teaching would have interested a Rabbi. In a passage {Abhod. Zar. 17 a and 27 b.} which describes the great danger of intercourse with Jewish Christians, as leading to heresy, a Rabbi is introduced, who, at Sepphoris, had met one of Jesus' disciples, named Jacob, a 'man of Kefr Sekanya,' reputed as working miraculous cures in the name of his Master. ^{f1206} It is said, that at a later period the Rabbi suffered grievous persecution, in punishment for the delight he had taken in a comment on a certain passage of Scripture, which Jacob attributed to his Master. It need scarcely be said, that the whole story is a fabrication; indeed, the supposed Christian interpretation is not even fit to be reproduced; and we only mention the circumstance as indicating the contrast between what Talmudism would have delighted in hearing from its Messiah, and what Jesus spoke.

But there are points of view which may be gained from Rabbinic writings, helpful to the understanding of the 'Sermon on the Mount,' although not of its spirit. Some of these may here be mentioned. Thus, when {In St.

Matthew 5:18.} we read that not one jot or title shall pass from the Law, it is painfully interesting to find in the Talmud the following quotation and mistranslation of St. ^{f1157}Matthew 5:17: ‘I have come not to diminish from the Law of Moses, nor yet have I come to add to the Law of Moses.’ {Shabb. 116 b.} ^{f1207} But the Talmud here significantly omits the addition made by Christ, on which all depends: ‘till all be fulfilled.’ Jewish tradition mentions this very letter *Yod* as irremovable, {Jer. Sanh. p. 20 c.} adding, that if all men in the world were gathered together to abolish the least letter in the Law, they would not succeed. {Shir. haSh. R. on ch. 5:11, ed. Warsh. p. 27 a.} Not a letter could be removed from the Law — {Shem. R. 6.}, a saying illustrated by this curious conceit, that the *Yod* which was taken by God out of the name of Sarah (Sarai), was added to that of Hoshea, making him Joshua (Jehoshua). {Sanh. 107a, and other passages.} Similarly, {In Vayyik. R. 19.} the guilt of changing those little hooks (‘tittles’) which make the distinction between such Hebrew letters as **d** and **r**, **h** and **j**, **b** and **k**, is declared so great, that, if such were done, the world would be destroyed. ^{f1208} Again the thought about the danger of those who broke the least commandment is so frequently expressed in Jewish writings, as scarcely to need special quotation. Only, there it is put on the ground, that we know not what reward may attach to one or another commandment. The expression ‘they of old,’ {St. ^{f1152}Matthew 5:21.} quite corresponds to the Rabbinic appeal to those that had preceded, the *Zezenim* or *Rishonim*. In regard to St. ^{f1152}Matthew 5:22, we remember that the term ‘brother’ applied only to Jews, while the Rabbis used to designate the ignorant {B. Kamma 50 b.} — or those who did not believe such exaggerations, as that in the future God would build up the gates of Jerusalem with gems thirty cubits high and broad — as *Reyqa*, {Sanh. 100 a.} with this additional remark, that on one such occasion the look of a Rabbi had immediately turned the unbeliever into a heap of bones!

Again, the opprobrious term ‘fool’ was by no means of uncommon occurrence among the sages; {Sotah 3:4; Shabb. 13 b.} and yet they themselves state, that to give an opprobrious by-name, or to put another openly to shame, was one of the three things which deserved Gehenna. {Bab. Mez. 58 b, at bottom.} To verse 26 the following is an instructive parallel: ‘To one who had defrauded the custom-house, it was said: “Pay the duty.” He said to them: “Take all that I have with me.” But the tax-gatherer answered him, “Thinkest thou, we ask only this one payment of

duty? Nay, rather, that duty be paid for all the times in which according to thy wont, thou hast defrauded the custom-house.”’ {Pesiqt. ed. *Bub.* 164 *a.*} The mode of swearing mentioned in verse 35 was very frequently adopted, in order to avoid pronouncing the Divine Name. Accordingly, they swore by the Covenant, by the Service of the Temple, or by the Temple. But perhaps the usual mode of swearing, which is attributed even to the Almighty, is ‘By thy life’ (*dyyj*). Lastly, as regards our Lord’s admonition, it is mentioned {In the Midrash on ~~ORIS~~ Ruth 3:18.} as characteristic of the pious, that their ‘yea is yea,’ and their ‘nay nay.’

Passing to St. Matthew 6, we remember, in regard to verse 2, that the boxes for charitable contributions in the Temple were trumpet-shaped, and we can understand the figurative allusion of Christ to demonstrative piety. ^{f1209} The parallelisms in the language of the Lord’s Prayer — at least so far as the wording, not the spirit, is concerned — have been frequently shown. If the closing doxology, ‘Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory,’ {ver. 13.} were genuine, it would correspond to the common Jewish ascription, from which, in all probability, it has been derived. In regard to versed 14 and 15, although there are many Jewish parallels concerning the need of forgiving those that have offended us, or else asking forgiveness, we know what meaning Rabbinism attached to the forgiveness of sins. Similarly, it is scarcely necessary to discuss the Jewish views concerning fasting. In regard to verses 25 and 34, we may remark this exact parallel: {In Sot. 48 *b.*} ‘Every one who has a loaf in his basket, and says, What shall I eat to-morrow? is one of little faith.’ But Christianity goes further than this. While the Rabbinic saying only forbids care when there is bread in the basket, our Lord would banish anxious care even if there were no bread in the basket. The expression in verse 34 seems to be a Rabbinic proverb. Thus, {Sanh. 100 *b.*} we read: ‘Care not for the morrow, for ye know not what a day may bring forth. Perhaps he may not be on the morrow, and so have cared for a world that does not exist for him.’ Only here, also, we mark that Christ significantly says not as the Rabbis, but, ‘the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself.’

In chapter 7, verse 2, the saying about having it measured to us with the same measure that we mete, occurs in precisely the same manner in the Talmud, {Sot. 1:7.} and, indeed, seems to have been a proverbial expression. The illustration in verses 3 and 4, about the mote and the beam, appears thus in Rabbinic literature: {Arach. 16 *b.*} ‘I wonder if there is any one in this generation who would take reproof. If one said, Take the mote

out of thine eye, he would answer, Take the beam from out thine own eye.' On which the additional question is raised, whether any one in that generation were capable of reproving. As it also occurs with only trifling variations in other passages, {B. Bath. 15 *b*; Bekhor. 38 *b*; Yalk. on Ruth.} we conclude that this also was a proverbial expression. The same may be said of gathering 'grapes of thorns.' {Pes. 49 *a*.} Similarly, the designation of 'pearls' (verse 6) for the valuable sayings of sages is common. To verse 11 there is a realistic parallel, {In Ber. R 33.} when it is related, that at a certain fast, on account of drought, a Rabbi admonished the people to good deeds, on which a man gave money to the woman from whom he had been divorced, because she was in want. This deed was made a plea in prayer by the Rabbi, that if such a man cared for his wife who no more belonged to him, how much more should the Almighty care for the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Upon this, it is added, the rain descended plentifully. If difference, and even contrast of spirit, together with similarity of form, were to be further pointed out, we should find it in connection with verse 14, which speaks of the fewness of those saved, and also verse 26, which refers to the absolute need of doing, as evidence of sonship. We compare with this what the Talmud {Jer. Ber. 13 *d*, towards the end.} says of Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai, whose worthiness was so great, that during his whole lifetime no rainbow was needed to ensure immunity from a flood, and whose power was such that he could say to a valley: Be filled with gold dinars. The same Rabbi was wont to say: 'I have seen the children of the world to come, and they are few. If there are three, I and my son are of their number; if they are two, I and my son are they.' After such expression of boastful self-righteousness, so opposed to the passage in the Sermon on the Mount, of which it is supposed to be the parallel, we scarcely wonder to read that, if Abraham had redeemed all generations to that of Rabbi Simon, the latter claimed to redeem by his own merits all that followed to the end of the world, nay — that if Abraham were reluctant, he (Simon) would take Ahijah the Shilonite with him, and reconcile the whole world! {In Sukk. 45 *b* he proposes to conjoin with himself his son, instead of Abraham.} Yet we are asked by some to see in such Rabbinic passages parallels to the sublime teaching of Christ!

The 'Sermon on the Mount' closes with a parabolic illustration, which in similar form occurs in Rabbinic writings. Thus, {In Ab. 3:17.} the man whose wisdom exceeds his works is compared to a tree whose branches are many, but its roots few, and which is thus easily upturned by the wind;

while he whose works exceed his wisdom is likened to a tree, whose branches are few, and its roots many, against which all the winds in the world would strive in vain. A still more close parallel is that {Ab. de R. Nath. 24.} in which the man who has good works, and learns much in the Law, is likened to one, who in building his house lays stones first, and on them bricks, so that when the flood cometh the house is not destroyed; while he who has not good work, yet busies himself much with the Law, is like one who puts bricks below, and stones above which are swept away by the waters. Or else the former is like one who puts mortar between the bricks, fastening them one to the other; and the other to one who merely puts mortar outside, which the rain dissolves and washes away.

The above comparisons of Rabbinic sayings with those of our Lord lay no claim to completeness. They will, however, suffice to explain and amply to vindicate the account of the impression left on the hearers of Jesus. But what, even more than all else, must have filled them with wonderment and awe was, that He Who so taught also claimed to be the God-appointed final Judge of all, whose fate would be decided not merely by professed discipleship, but by their real relation to Him (St. ~~4072~~ Matthew 7:21-23). And so we can understand it, that, alike in regard to what He taught and what He claimed, ‘The people were astonished at His doctrine: for He taught them as One having authority — *and not as the Scribes.*’ ^{f1210}

CHAPTER 19

THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM, —HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.

(St. ~~<408>~~ Matthew 8:1, 5-15; St. ~~<408>~~ Mark 3:20, 21; St. ~~<408>~~ Luke 7:1-10.)

WE are once again in Capernaum. It is remarkable how much, connected not only with the Ministry of Jesus, but with His innermost Life, gathers around that little fishing town. In all probability its prosperity was chiefly due to the neighboring Tiberias, which Herod Antipas ^{fi211} had built, about ten years previously. Noteworthy is it also, how many of the most attractive characters and incidents in the Gospel-history are connected with that Capernaum, which, as a city, rejected its own real glory, and, like Israel, and for the same reason, at last incurred a prophetic doom commensurate to its former privileges. {St. ~~<408>~~ Luke 10:15.}

But as yet Capernaum was still 'exalted up to heaven.' Here was the home of that believing Court-official, whose child Jesus had healed. {St. John 5.} Here also was the household of Peter; and here the paralytic had found, together with forgiveness of his sins, health of body. Its streets, with their outlook on the deep blue Lake, had been thronged by eager multitudes in search of life to body and soul. Here Matthew-Levi had heard and followed the call of Jesus; and here the good Centurion had in stillness learned to love Israel, and serve Israel's King, and built with no niggard hand that Synagogue, most splendid of those yet exhumed in Galilee, which had been consecrated by the Presence and Teaching of Jesus, and by prayers, of which the conversion of Jairus, its chief ruler, seems the blessed answer. And now, from the Mount of Beatitudes, it was again to His temporary home at Capernaum that Jesus retired. {St. ~~<408>~~ Mark 3:19-21.} Yet not either to solitude or to rest. For, of that multitude which had hung entranced on His Words many followed Him, and there was now such constant pressure around Him, that, in the zeal of their attendance upon the wants and demands of those who hungered after the Bread of Life, alike Master and disciples found not leisure so much as for the necessary sustenance of the body.

The circumstances, the incessant work, and the all-consuming zeal which even 'His friends' could but ill understand, led to the apprehension — the

like of which is so often entertained by well-meaning persons in all ages, in their practical ignorance of the all-engrossing but also sustaining character of engagements about the Kingdom — that the balance of judgment might be overweighted, and high reason brought into bondage to the poverty of our earthly frame. In its briefness, the account of what these ‘friends,’ or rather ‘those from Him’ — His home — said and did, is most pictorial. On tidings reaching them, ^{f1212} with reiterated, growing, and perhaps Orientally exaggerating details, they hastened out of their house in a neighboring street ^{f1213} to take possession of Him, as if He had needed their charge. It is not necessary to include the Mother of Jesus in the number of those who actually went. Indeed, the later express mention of His ‘Mother and brethren’ {St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 3:31.} seems rather opposed to the supposition. Still less does the objection deserve serious refutation, ^{f1214} that any such procedure, assumedly, on the part of the Virgin-Mother, would be incompatible with the history of Jesus’ Nativity. For, all must have felt, that ‘the zeal’ of God’s House was, literally, ‘consuming’ Him, and the other view of it, that it was setting on fire, not the physical, but the psychical framework of His humiliation, seems in no way inconsistent with what loftiest, though as yet dim, thought had come to the Virgin about her Divine Son. On the other hand, this idea, that He was ‘beside Himself,’ afforded the only explanation of what otherwise would have been to them well-nigh inexplicable. To the Eastern mind especially this want of self-possession, the being ‘beside’ oneself, would point to possession by another — God or Devil. It was on the ground of such supposition that the charge was so constantly raised by the Scribes, and unthinkingly taken up by the people, that Jesus was mad, and had a devil: not a demoniacal possession, be it marked, but possession by the Devil, in the absence of self-possessedness. And hence our Lord characterized this charge as really blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. And this also explains how, while unable to deny the reality of His Works, they could still resist their evidential force.

However that incident may for the present have ended, it could have caused but brief interruption to His Work. Presently there came the summons of the heathen Centurion and the healing of His servant, which both St. Matthew and St. Luke record, as specially bearing on the progressive unfolding of Christ’s Mission. Notably — these two Evangelists; and notably — with variations due to the peculiar standpoint of their narratives. No really serious difficulties will be encountered in

trying to harmonize the details of these two narratives; that is, if any one should attach importance to such precise harmony. At any rate, we cannot fail to perceive the reason of these variations. *Meyer* regards the account of St. Luke as the original, *Keim* that of St. Matthew — both on subjective rather than historical grounds. ^{f1215} But we may as well note, that the circumstance, that the event is passed over by St. Mark, militates against the favorite modern theory of the Gospels being derived from an original tradition (what is called the ‘original Mark,’ *Ur-Marcus*). ^{f1216}

If we keep in view the historical object of St. Matthew, as primarily addressing himself to Jewish, while St. Luke wrote more especially for Gentile readers, we arrive, at least, at one remarkable outcome of the variations in their narratives. Strange to say, the Judæan Gospel gives the pro-Gentile, the Gentile narrative the pro-Jewish, presentation of the event. Thus, in St. Matthew the history is throughout sketched as personal and direct dealing with the heathen Centurion on the part of Christ, while in the Gentile narrative of St. Luke the dealing with the heathen is throughout indirect, by the intervention of Jews, and on the ground of the Centurion’s spiritual sympathy with Israel. Again, St. Matthew quotes the saying of the Lord which holds out to the faith of Gentiles a blessed equality with Israel in the great hope of the future, while it puts aside the mere claim of Israel after the flesh, and dooms Israel to certain judgment. On the other hand, St. Luke omits all this. A strange inversion it might seem, that the Judæan Gospel should contain what the Gentile account omits, except for this, that St. Matthew argues with his countrymen the real standing of the Gentiles, while St. Luke pleads with the Gentiles for sympathy and love with Jewish modes of thinking. The one is not only an exposition, but a justification, of the event as against Israel; the other an *Eirenicon*, as well as a touching representation of the plea of the younger with his elder brother at the door of the Father’s House.

But the fundamental truth in both accounts is the same; nor is it just to say that in the narrative the Gentiles are preferred before Israel. So far from this, their faith is only put on an equality with that of believing Israel. It is not Israel, but Israel’s fleshly claims and unbelief, that are rejected; and Gentile faith occupies, not a new position outside Israel, but shares with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob the fulfilment of the promise made to their faith. Thus we have here the widest Jewish universalism, the true interpretation of Israel’s hope; and this, even by the admission of our opponents, ^{f1217} not as a later addition, but as forming part of Christ’s original teaching. But if

so, it revives, only in accentuated manner, the question: Whence this essential difference between the teaching of Christ on this subject, and that of contemporary Rabbinism.

Yet another point may be gained from the admissions of negative criticism, at least on the part of its more thoughtful representatives. *Keim* is obliged to acknowledge the authenticity of the narrative. It is immaterial here which 'recension' of it may be regarded as the original. The Christ *did* say what the Gospels represent! But *Strauss* has shown, that in such case any natural or semi-natural explanation of the healing is impossible.

Accordingly, the 'Trilemma' left is: either Christ was really what the Gospels represent Him, or He was a daring enthusiast, or (saddest of all) He must be regarded as a conscious impostor. If either of the two last alternatives were adopted, it would, in the first instance, be necessary to point out some ground for the claim of such power on the part of Jesus. What could have prompted Him to do so? Old Testament precedent there was none; certainly not in the cure of Naaman by Elisha.^{f1218} And Rabbinic parallelism there was none.

For, although a sudden cure, and at a distance, is related in connection with a Rabbi, {Ber. 34 *b.*} all the circumstances are absolutely different. In the Jewish story recourse was, indeed, had to a Rabbi; but for prayer that the sick might be healed of God, not for actual healing by the Rabbi. Having prayed, the Rabbi informed the messengers who had come to implore his help, that the fever had left the sick. But when asked by them whether he claimed to be a prophet, he expressly repudiated any prophetic knowledge, far more any supernatural power of healing, and explained that liberty in prayer always indicated to him that his prayer had been answered. All analogy thus failing, the only explanation left to negative criticism, in view of the admitted authenticity of the narrative, is, that the cure was the result of the psychical influence of the Centurion's faith and of that of his servant. But what, in that case, of the words which Jesus admittedly spoke? Can we, as some would have it, rationally account for their use by the circumstance that Jesus had had experience of such psychical influences on disease? or that Christ's words were, so to speak, only an affirmation of the Centurion's faith — something between a 'benedictory wish' and an act? Surely, suggestions like these carry their own refutation.

Apart, then, from explanations which have been shown untenable, what is the impression left on our minds of an event, the record of which is

admitted to be authentic? The heathen Centurion is a real historical personage. He was captain of the troop quartered in Capernaum, and in the service of Herod Antipas. We know that such troops were chiefly recruited from Samaritans and Gentiles of Caesarea. {*Jos. Ant.* 19:9. 1, 2.} Nor is there the slightest evidence that this Centurion was a 'proselyte of righteousness.' The accounts both in St. Matthew and in St. Luke are incompatible with this idea. A 'proselyte of righteousness' could have had no reason for not approaching Christ directly, nor would he have spoken of himself as 'unfit' that Christ should come under his roof. But such language quite accorded with Jewish notions of a *Gentile*, since the houses of Gentiles were considered as defiled, and as defiling those who entered them. {*Ohal* 28:7.} On the other hand, the 'proselytes of righteousness' were in all respects equal to Jews, so that the words of Christ concerning Jews and Gentiles, as reported by St. Matthew, would not have been applicable to them. The Centurion was simply one who had learned to love Israel and to reverence Israel's God; one who, not only in his official position, but from love and reverence, had built that Synagogue, of which, strangely enough, now after eighteen centuries, the remains,^{f1198} in their rich and elaborate carvings of cornices and entablatures, of capitals and niches, show with what liberal hand he had dealt his votive offerings.

We know too little of the history of the man, to judge what earlier impulses had led him to such reverence for Israel's God. There might have been something to incline him towards it in his early upbringing, perhaps in Caesarea; or in his family relationships; perhaps in that very servant (possibly a Jew) whose implicit obedience to his master seems in part to have led him up to faith in analogous submission of all things to the behests of Christ. The circumstances, the times, the place, the very position of the man, make such suppositions rational, even suggested them. In that case, his whole bearing would be consistent with itself, and with what we know of the views and feelings of the time. In the place where the son of his fellow official at the Court of Herod had been healed by the Word of Jesus, spoken at a distance, in the Capernaum which was the home of Jesus and the scene of so many miracles, it was only what we might expect, that in such case he should turn to Jesus and ask His help. Quiet consistent with his character is the straightforwardness of his expectancy, characteristically illustrated by his military experience, what *Bengel* designates as the wisdom of his faith beautifully shining out in the bluntness of the soldier. When he had learned to own Israel's God, and to believe in the absolute

unlimited power of Jesus, no such difficulties would come to him, nor, assuredly, such cavils rise, as in the minds of the Scribes, or even of the Jewish laity. Nor is it even necessary to suppose that, in his unlimited faith in Jesus, the Centurion had distinct apprehension of His essential Divinity. In general, it holds true, that, throughout the Evangelic history, belief in the Divinity of our Lord was the outcome of experience of His Person and Work, not the condition and postulate of it, as is the case since the Pentecostal descent of the Holy Ghost and His indwelling in the Church.

In view of these facts, the question with the Centurion would be: not, *Could* Jesus heal his servant, but, *Would* He do so? And again, this other specifically: Since, so far as he knew, no application from any in Israel, be it even publican or sinner, had been doomed to disappointment, would he, as a Gentile, be barred from share in this blessing? was he ‘unworthy,’ or, rather, ‘unfit’ for it? Thus this history presents a crucial question, not only as regarded the character of Christ’s work, but the relation to it of the Gentile world. Quiet consist with this, nay — its necessary outcome — were the scruples of the Centurion to make direct, personal application to Jesus. In measure as he revered Jesus, would these scruples, from his own standpoint, increase. As the houses of Gentiles were ‘unclean,’ {Ohal 18:7} entrance. Into them, and still more familiar fellowship, would ‘defile.’ The Centurion must have known this; and the higher he placed Jesus on the pinnacle of Judaism, the more natural was it for him to communicate with Christ through the elders of the Jews, and not to expect the Personal Presence of the Master, even if the application to him were attended with success. And here it is important (for the criticism of this history) to mark that, alike in the view of the Centurion, and even in that of the Jewish elders who under-took his commission, Jesus as yet occupied the purely Jewish stand-point.

Closely considered. whatever verbal differences, there is not any *real* discrepancy in this respect between the Judæan presentation of the event in St. Matthew and the fuller Gentile account of it by St. Luke. From both narratives are led to infer that the house of the Centurion was not in Capernaum itself, but in its immediate neighborhood, probably on the road to Tiberias. And so in St. ~~4187~~ Matthew 8:7, we read the words of our Savior when consenting: ‘I, having come, will heal him;’ just as in St. Luke’s narrative a space of time intervenes, in which intimation is conveyed to the Centurion, when he sends ‘friends’ to arrest Christ’s actual coming into his house. {St. ~~4186~~ Luke 7:6.} Nor does St. Matthew speak of

any actual request on the part of the Centurion, even though at first sight his narrative seems to imply a personal appearance. {St. ^{f1185}Matthew 8:5.} The general statement ‘beseeching Him’ — although it is not added in what manner, with what words, nor for what special thing — must be explained by more detailed narrative of the embassy of Jewish Elders. ^{f1220} There is another marked agreement in the seeming difference of the two accounts. In St. Luke’s narrative, the second message of the Centurion embodies two different expressions, which our Authorized Version unfortunately renders by the same word. It should read: ‘Trouble not Thyself, for I am not fit (Levitically speaking) that Thou shouldest enter under my roof;’ Levitically, or Judaistically speaking, my house is not a fit place for Thy entrance; ‘Wherefore neither did I judge myself worthy (spiritually, morally, religiously) to come unto Thee.’ Now, markedly, in St. Matthew’s presentation of the same event to the Jews, this latter ‘worthiness’ is omitted, and we only have St. Luke’s first term, ‘fit’ (ἱκανός) ‘I am not fit that thou shouldest come under my roof,’ my house is unfitting Thine entrance. This seems to bear out the reasons previously indicated for the characteristic peculiarities of the two narratives.

But in their grand leading features the two narratives entirely agree. There is earnest supplication for his sick, seemingly dying servant. ^{f1221} Again, the Centurion in the fullest sense believes in the power of Jesus to heal, in the same manner as he knows his own commands as an officer would be implicitly obeyed; for, surely, no thoughtful reader would seriously entertain the suggestion, that the military language of the Centurion only meant, that he regarded disease as caused by evil demons or noxious power who obeyed Jesus, as soldiers or servants do their officer or master. Such might have been the underlying Jewish view of the times; but the fact, that in this very thing Jesus contrasted the faith of the Gentile with that of Israel, indicates that the language in question must be taken in its obvious sense. But in his self-acknowledged ‘unfitness’ lay the real ‘fitness’ of this good soldier for membership with the true Israel; and his deep-felt ‘unworthiness’ the real ‘worthiness’ (the *ejusdem ponderis*) for ‘the Kingdom’ and its blessings. It was this utter disclaimer of all claim, outward or inward, which prompted that absoluteness of trust which deemed all things possible with Jesus, and marked the real faith of the true Israel. Here was one, who was in the state described in the first clauses of the ‘Beatitudes,’ and to whom came the promise of the second clauses; because Christ *is* the connecting link between the two, and because He

consciously was such to the Centurion, and, indeed, the only possible connecting link between them.

And so we mark it, in what must be regarded as the high-point in this history, so far as its teaching to us all, and therefore the reason of its record in the New Testament, is concerned: that participation in the blessedness of the kingdom is not connected with any outward relationship towards it, nor belongs to our inward consciousness in regard to it; but is granted by the King to that faith which in deepest simplicity realizes, and holds fast by Him. And yet, although discarding every Jewish claim to them — or, it may be, in our days, everything that is merely *outwardly* Christian — not outside, still less beyond, what was the hope of the Old Testament, nor in our days the expectancy of the Church, but are literally its fulfilment; the sitting down ‘*with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob* in the Kingdom of Heaven.’ Higher than, and beyond this not even Christ’s provision can take us.

But for the fuller understanding of the words of Christ, the Jewish modes of thought, which He used in illustration, required to be briefly explained. It was common belief, that in the day of the Messiah redeemed Israel would be gathered to a great feast, together with the patriarchs and heroes of the Jewish faith. This notion, which was but a coarsely literal application of such prophetic figures as in ²⁰³⁶Isaiah 25:6, had perhaps yet another yet another and deeper meaning. As each weekly Sabbath was to be honored by a feast, in which the best which the family could procure was to be placed on the board, so would the world’s great Sabbath be marked by a feast in which the Great Householder, Israel’s King, would entertain His household and Guests. Into the painfully, and, from the notions of the times, grossly realistic description of this feast, ^{f1222} it is needless here to enter. One thing, however, was clear: Gentiles could have no part in that feast. In fact, the shame and anger of ‘these’ foes on seeing the ‘table spread’ for this Jewish feast was among the points specially noticed as fulfilling the predictions of ⁴⁹³⁵Psalms 23:5 {Bemid R. 21, ed. Warsh 4, p. 85 *a*, 57 *a*.} On this point, then, the words of Jesus in reference to the believing Centurion formed the most marked contrast to Jewish teaching.

In another respect also we mark similar contrariety. When our Lord consigned the unbelieving to ‘outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth,’ he once more used Jewish language, only with opposite application of it. *Gehinnom* — of which the entrance, marked by ever

ascending smoke, was in the valley of Hinnom, between two palm trees — lay beyond ‘the mountains of darkness.’ {Tamid 32 *b*.} It was a place of darkness, {Targ. on ~~1~~1 Samuel 2:9, ~~1882~~Psalm 88:12.} to which, in the day of the Lord, {Amos. 5:20.} the Gentiles would be consigned. On the other hand, the merit of circumcision would in the day of the Messiah deliver Jewish sinners from Gehinnom. {u. s. nine lines higher up.} It seems a moot question, whether the expression ‘outer darkness’^{f1223} may not have been intended to designate — besides the darkness outside the lighted house of the Father, and even beyond the darkness of Gehinnom — a place of hopeless, endless night. Associated with it is ‘weeping’^{f1224} and the gnashing of teeth.’ In Rabbinic thought the former was connected with sorrow,^{f1225} the latter almost always with anger^{f1226} — not, as generally supposed, with anguish.

To complete our apprehension of the contrast between the views of the Jews and the teaching of Jesus, we must bear in mind that, as the Gentiles could not possibly share in the feast of the Messiah, so Israel had claim and title to it. To use Rabbinic terms, the former were ‘children of Gehinnom,’ but Israel ‘children of the Kingdom,’ {St. ~~1882~~Matthew 8:12.} or, in strictly Rabbinic language, ‘royal children,’ {Shabb. 14:4.} children of God,’ ‘of heaven,’ {Ab. 3:14 comp. Jer. Kidd. 61 *c* middle.} ‘children of the upper chamber’ (the *Aliyah*) {Sanh. 97 *b*; Succ. 45 *b*.} and ‘of the world to come.’ {Jer. Ber. 13 *d*, end.} In fact, in their view, God had first sat down on His throne as King, when the hymn of deliverance (~~1219~~Exodus 15:1) was raised by Israel — the people which took upon itself that yoke of the Law which all other nations of the world had rejected. {Pesiqta 16 *b*; Shem. R. 23.}

Never, surely, could the Judaism of His hearers have received more rude shock than by this inversion of all their cherished beliefs. There was a feast of Messianic fellowship, a recognition on the part of the King of all His faithful subjects, a joyous festive gathering with the fathers of the faith. But this fellowship was not of outward, but of spiritual kinship. There were ‘children of the Kingdom, and there was an ‘outer darkness’ with its anguish and despair. But this childship was of the Kingdom, such as He had opened it to all believers; and that outer darkness theirs, who had only outward claims to present. And so this history of the believing Centurion is at the same time an application of the ‘Sermon on the Mount’ — in this also aptly following the order of its record — and a further carrying out of its teaching. Negatively, it differentiated the Kingdom from Israel; while,

positively, it placed the hope of Israel, and fellowship with its promises, within reach of all faith, whether of Jew or Gentile. He Who taught such new and strange truth could never be called a mere reformer of Judaism. There cannot be 'reform,' where all the fundamental principles are different. Surely He was the Son of God, the Messiah of men, Who, in such surrounding, could so speak to Jew and Gentile of God and His Kingdom. And surely also, He, Who could so bring spiritual life to the dead, could have no difficulty by the same word, 'in the self-same hour,' to restore life and health to the servant of him, whose faith had inherited the Kingdom. The first grafted tree of heathendom that had so blossomed could not shake off unripe fruit. If the teaching of Christ was new and was true, so must His work have been. And in this lies the highest vindication of this miracle, that He is the Miracle.

CHAPTER 20

THE RAISING OF THE YOUNG MAN OF NAIN — THE MEETING OF LIFE AND DEATH.

(St. ~~ⲁⲓⲓⲓ~~ Luke 7:11-17.)

THAT early spring-tide in Galilee was surely the truest realization of the picture in the Song of Solomon, when earth clad herself in garments of beauty, and the air was melodious with songs of new life. { ~~ⲁⲓⲓⲓ~~ Song of Solomon 2:11-13. } It seemed as if each day marked a widening circle of deepest sympathy and largest power on the part of Jesus; as if each day also brought fresh surprise, new gladness; opened hitherto unthought-of possibilities, and pointed Israel far beyond the horizon of their narrow expectancy. Yesterday it was the sorrow of the heathen Centurion which woke an echo in the heart of the Supreme Commander of life and death; faith called out, owned, and placed on the high platform of Israel's worthies. To-day it is the same sorrow of a Jewish mother, which touches the heart of the Son of Mary, and appeals to where denial is unthinkable. In that Presence grief and death cannot continue. As the defilement of a heathen house could not attach to Him, Whose contact changed the Gentile stranger into a true Israelite, so could the touch of death not render unclean Him, Whose Presence vanquished and changed it into life. Jesus could not enter Nain, and its people pass Him to carry one dead to the burying.

For our present purpose it matters little, whether it was the very 'day after the healing of the Centurion's servant, or 'shortly afterwards,' ^{f1227} that Jesus left Capernaum for Nain. Probably it was the morrow of that miracle, and the fact that 'much people,' or rather 'a great multitude,' followed Him, seems confirmatory of it. The way was long — as we reckon, more than twenty-five miles; but, even if it was all taken on foot, there could be no difficulty in reaching Nain ere the evening, when so often funerals took place. Various roads lead to, and from Nain; ^{f1228} that which stretches to the Lake of Galilee and up to Capernaum is quite distinctly marked. It is difficult to understand, how most of those who have visited the spot could imagine the place, where Christ met the funeral procession, to have been the rock-hewn tombs to the *west* of Nain and towards Nazareth. ^{f1229} For,

from Capernaum the Lord would not have come that way, but approach it from the north-east by Endor. Hence there can be little doubt, that Canon *Tristram* correctly identifies the now unfenced burying-ground, about ten minutes' walk to the east of Nain, as that whither, on that spring afternoon, they were carrying the widow's son.^{f1230} On the path leading to it the Lord of Life for the first time burst open the gates of death.

It is all desolate now. A few houses of mud and stone with low doorways, scattered among heaps of stones and traces of walls, is all that remains of what even these ruins show to have been once a city, with walls and gates.^{f1231} The rich gardens are no more, the fruit trees cut down, 'and there is a painful sense of desolation' about the place, as if the breath of judgment had swept over it. And yet even so we can understand its ancient name of Nain, 'the pleasant,'^{f1232} which the Rabbis regarded as fulfilling that part of the promise to Issachar: 'he saw the land that it was pleasant.'^{f1233} From the elevation on which the city stood we look northwards, across the wide plain, to wooded Tabor, and in the far distance to snow-capped Hermon. On the left (in the west) rise the hills beyond which Nazareth lies embosomed; to the right is Endor; southwards Shunem, and beyond it the Plain of Jezreel. By this path, from Endor, comes Jesus with His disciples and the great following multitude. Here, near by the city gate, on the road that leads eastwards to the old burying-ground, has this procession of the 'great multitude,' which accompanied the Prince of Life, met that other 'great multitude' that followed the dead to his burying. Which of the two shall give way to the other? We know what ancient Jewish usage would have demanded. For, of all the duties enjoined, none more strictly enforced by every consideration of humanity and piety, even by the example of God Himself, than that of comforting the mourners and showing respect to the dead by accompanying him to the burying. {Ber. 18 a.}^{f1234} The popular idea, that the spirit of the dead hovered about the unburied remains, must have given intensity to such feelings.

Putting aside later superstitions, so little has changed in the Jewish rites and observances about the dead,^{f1235} that from Talmudic and even earlier sources,^{f1236} we can form a vivid conception of what had taken place in Nain. The watchful anxiety; the vain use of such means as were known, or within reach of the widow; the deepening care, the passionate longing of the mother to retain her one treasure, her sole earthly hope and stay; then the gradual fading out of the light, the farewell, the terrible burst of sorrow: all these would be common features in any such picture. But here

we have, besides, the Jewish thoughts of death and after death; knowledge just sufficient to make afraid, but not to give firm consolation, which would make even the most pious Rabbi uncertain of his future; {Ber. 28 *b.*} and then the desolate thoughts connected in the Jewish mind with childlessness. We can realize it all: how Jewish ingenuity and wisdom would resort to remedies real or magical; how the neighbors would come in with reverent step, feeling as if the very *Shekhinah* were unseen at the head of the pallet in that humble home; {Nedar. 40 a, lines 6 and 7 from bottom.} how they would whisper sayings about submission, which, when realization of God's love is wanting, seem only to stir the heart to rebellion against absolute power; and how they would resort to the prayers of those who were deemed pious in Nain. {Ber. 5:5.}

But all was in vain. And now the well-known blast of the horn has carried tidings, that once more the Angel of Death has done his dire behest. {Moed K. 27 *b.*} In passionate grief the mother has rent her upper garment. {Jer. Moed. K. 83 *d.*} The last sad offices have been rendered to the dead. The body has been laid on the ground; hair and nails have been cut, {Moed K. 8 *b.*} and the body washed, anointed, and wrapped in the best the widow could procure; for, the ordinance which directed that the dead should be buried in 'wrappings' (*Takhrikhin*), or as they significantly called it, the 'provision for the journey' (*Zevadatha*), {Rosh haSh 17 a and other wise.} of the most inexpensive, linen, is of later date than our period. It is impossible to say, whether the later practice already prevailed, of covering the body with metal, glass, or salt, and laying it either upon earth or salt. {Shabb. 151 *b.*; Semach. I.}

And now the mother was left *Oneneth* (moaning, lamenting), a term which distinguished the mourning before from that after burial.^{f1237} She would sit on the floor, neither eat meat, nor drink wine. What scanty meal she would take, must be without prayer, in the house of a neighbor, or in another room, or at least with her back to the dead. {Jer. Ber. 5 *d.*} Pious friends would render neighborly offices, or busy themselves about the near funeral. If it was deemed duty for the poorest Jew, on the death of his wife, to provide at least two flutes and one mourning woman, {Kethub. 4:4.} we may feel sure that the widowed mother had not neglected what, however incongruous or difficult to procure, might be regarded as the last tokens of affection. In all likelihood the custom obtained even then, though in modified form, to have funeral orations at the grave. For, even if charity provided for an unknown wayfarer the simplest funeral, mourning-women

would be hired to chant in weird strains the lament: 'Alas, the lion! alas. the hero!' or similar words, {Mass. Semach. 1:9.} while great Rabbis were wont to bespeak for themselves a warm funeral oration' (*Hesped*, or *Hespeda*). ^{fi238} For, from the funeral oration a man's fate in the other world might be inferred; {Shabb. 153 *a.*} and, indeed, 'the honor of a sage was in his funeral oration.' {Moed K. 25 *a.*} and in this sense the Talmud answers the question, whether a funeral oration is intended to honor the survivors or the dead. {Sanh. 46 *b.*}

But in all this painful pageantry there was nothing for the heart of the widow, bereft of her only child. We can follow in spirit the mournful procession, as it started from the desolate home. As it issued, chairs and couches were reversed, and laid low. Outside, the funeral orator, if such was employed, preceded the bier, proclaiming the good deeds of the dead. {Shabb. 153 *a.*} Immediately before the dead came the women, this being peculiar to Galilee, {Shabb. 153 *a.*} the Midrash giving this reason of it, that woman had introduced death into the world. {Ber. R. 17 end.} The body was not, as afterwards in preference, {Ber. 19 *a.*} carried in an ordinary coffin of wood (*Aron*), if possible, cedarwood — on one occasion, at least, made with holes beneath; {Jer. Kil 32 *b.*; Ber. R. 100.} but laid on a bier, or in an open coffin (*Mittah*). In former times a distinction had been made in these biers between rich and poor. The former were carried on the so-called Dargash, as it were, in state, while the poor were conveyed in a receptacle made of wickerwork (*Kelibha* or *Kelikhah*), having sometimes at the foot what was termed 'a horn,' to which the body was made fast. {Par. 12:9.} But this distinction between rich and poor was abolished by Rabbinic ordinance, and both alike, if carried on a bier, were laid in that made of wickerwork. {Moed K. 27 *a* and *b.*} Commonly, though not in later practice, the face of the dead body was uncovered. {Semach. *c.* 8.} The body lay with its face turned up, and his hands folded on the breast. We may add, that when a person had died unmarried or childless, it was customary to put into the coffin something distinctive of them, such as pen and ink, or a key. Over the coffins of bride or bridegroom a baldachino was carried. Sometimes the coffin was garlanded with myrtle. {Bez. 6 *a* Nidd. 37 *a.*} In exceptional cases we read of the use of incense, {Moed K. 27 *b.*; Ber. 53 *a.*} and even of a kind of libation. {Jer. Sheq. 2:7.}

We cannot, then, be mistaken in supposing that the body of the widow's son was laid on the 'bed' (*Mittah*), or in the 'willow basket,' already

described (*Kelibha*, from *Kelubh*).^{f1239} Nor can we doubt that the ends of handles were borne by friends and neighbors, different parties of bearers, all of them unshod, at frequent intervals relieving each other, so that as many as possible might share in the good work. {Ber. 3:1.} During these pauses there was loud lamentation; but this custom was not observed in the burial of women. Behind the bier walked the relatives, friends, and then the sympathizing ‘multitude.’ For it was deemed like mocking one’s Creator not to follow the dead to his last resting-place, and to all such want of reverence ^{<1076>}Proverbs 17:5 was applied. {Ber. 18 *a*.} If one were absolutely prevented from joining the procession, although for its sake all work, even study, should be interrupted, reverence should at least be shown by rising up before the dead. {Jer. Sot. 17 *b*, end.} And so they would go on to what the Hebrews beautifully designated as the ‘house of assembly’ or ‘meeting,’ the ‘hostelry,’ the ‘place of rest,’ or ‘of freedom,’ the ‘field of weepers,’ the ‘house of eternity,’ or ‘of life.’

We can now transport ourselves into that scene. Up from the city close by came this ‘great multitude’ that followed the dead, with lamentations, wild chants of mourning women,^{f1240} accompanied by flutes and the melancholy tinkle of cymbals, perhaps by trumpets, {Keth. 17 *a*; Moed K. 27 *b* ^{f1241}} amidst expressions of general sympathy. Along the road from Endor streamed the great multitude which followed the ‘Prince of Life.’ Here they met: Life and Death. The connecting link between them was the deep sorrow of the widowed mother. He recognized her as she went before the bier, leading him to the grave whom she had brought into life. He recognized her, but she recognized Him not, had not even seen Him. She was still weeping; even after He had hastened a step or two in advance of His followers, quite close to her, she did not heed Him, and was still weeping. But, ‘beholding her,’ the Lord ^{f1242} ‘had compassion on her.’ Those bitter, silent tears which blinded her eyes were strongest language of despair and utmost need, which never in vain appeals to His heart, Who has borne our sorrows. We remember, by way of contrast, the common formula used at funerals in Palestine, ‘Weep with them, all ye who are bitter of heart!’ {Moed K. 8 *a*, lines 7 and 8 from bottom.} It was not so that Jesus spoke to those around, nor to her, but characteristically: ‘Be not weeping.’ ^{f1243} And what He said, that He wrought. He touched the bier — perhaps the very wicker basket in which the dead youth lay. He dreaded not the greatest of all defilements — that of contact with the dead, {Kei. i.} which Rabbinitism, in its elaboration of the letter of the Law, had

surrounded with endless terrors. His was other separation than of the Pharisees: not that of submission to ordinances, but of conquest of what made them necessary.

And as He touched the bier, they who bore it stood still. They could not have anticipated what would follow. But the awe of the coming wonder — as it were, the shadow of the opening gates of life, had fallen on them. One word of sovereign command, ‘and he that was dead sat up, and began to speak.’ Not of that world of which he had had brief glimpse. For, as one who suddenly passes from dream-vision to waking, in the abruptness of the transition, loses what he had seen, so he, who from that dazzling brightness was hurried back to the dim light to which his vision had been accustomed. It must have seemed to him, as if he woke from long sleep. Where was he now? who those around him? what this strange assemblage? and Who He, Whose Light and Life seemed to fall upon him?

And still was Jesus the link between the mother and the son, who had again found each other. And so, in the truest sense, ‘He gave him ^{f1244} to his mother.’ Can any one doubt that mother and son henceforth owned, loved, and trusted Him as the true Messiah? If there was no moral motive for this miracle, outside Christ’s sympathy with intense suffering and the bereavement of death, was there no moral result as the outcome of it? If mother and son had not called upon Him before the miracle, would they not henceforth and for ever call upon Him? And if there was, so to speak, inward necessity, that Life Incarnate should conquer death — symbolic and typic necessity of it also — was not everything here congruous to the central fact in this history? The simplicity and absence of all extravagant details; the Divine calmness and majesty on the part of the Christ, so different from the manner in which legend would have colored the scene, even from the intense agitation which characterized the conduct of an Elijah, an Elisha, or a Peter, in somewhat similar circumstances; and, lastly, the beauteous harmony where all is in accord, from the first touch of compassion till when, forgetful of the bystanders, heedless of ‘effect,’ He gives the son back to his mother, are not all these worthy of the event, and evidential of the truth of the narrative?

But, after all, may we regard this history as real — and, if so, what are its lessons? ^{f1245} On one point, at least, all serious critics are now agreed. It is impossible to ascribe it to exaggeration, or to explain it on natural grounds. The only alternative is to regard it either as true, or as *designedly* false. Be

it, moreover, remembered, that not only one Gospel, but *all*, relate some story of raising the dead — whether that of this youth, of Jairus' daughter, or of Lazarus. They also all relate the Resurrection of the Christ, which really underlies those other miracles. But if this history of the raising of the young man is false, what motive can be suggested for its invention, for motive there must have been for it? Assuredly, it was no part of Jewish expectancy concerning the Messiah, that He would perform such a miracle. And negative criticism has admitted, ^{f1246} that the differences between this history and the raising of the dead by Elijah or Elisha are so numerous and great, that these narratives cannot be regarded as suggesting that of the raising of the young man of Nain. We ask again: Whence, then, this history, if it was not true? It is an ingenious historical suggestion, rather an admission by negative criticism ^{f1247} — that so insignificant, and otherwise unknown, a place as Nain would not have been fixed upon as the site of this miracle, if some great event had not occurred there which made lasting impression on the mind of the Church. What was that event, and does not the reading of this record carry conviction of its truth? Legends have not been so written. Once more, the miracle is described as having taken place, not in the seclusion of a chamber, nor before a few interested witnesses, but in sight of the great multitude which had followed Jesus, and of that other great multitude which came from Cana. In this twofold great multitude was there none, from whom the enemies of Christianity could have wrung contradiction, if the narrative was false? Still further, the history is told with such circumstantiality of details, as to be inconsistent with the theory of a later invention. Lastly, no one will question, that belief in the reality of such 'raising from the dead' was a primal article in the faith of the primitive Church, for which — as a fact, not a possibility — all were ready to offer up their lives. Nor should we forget that, in one of the earliest apologies addressed to the Roman Emperor, *Quadratus* appealed to the fact, that, of those who had been healed or raised from the dead by Christ, some were still alive, and all were well known. {Euseb. Hist. ~~2008~~ Ecclesiastes 4:3.} On the other hand, the only real ground for rejecting this narrative is disbelief in the Miraculous, including, of course, rejection of the Christ as the Miracle of Miracles. But is it not vicious reasoning in a circle, as well as begging the question, to reject the Miraculous because we discredit the Miraculous? and does not such rejection involve much more of the incredible than faith itself?

And so, with all Christendom, we gladly take it, in simplicity of faith, as a true record by true men — all the more, that they who told it knew it to be so incredible, as not only to provoke scorn, {<4473>Acts 17:32; 26:8; <4652>1 Corinthians 15:12-19.} but to expose them to the charge of cunningly devising fables. {<6016>2 Peter 1:16.} But they who believe, see in this history, how the Divine Conqueror, in His accidental meeting with Death, with mighty arm rolled back the tide, and how through the portals of heaven which He opened stole in upon our world the first beam of the new day. Yet another — in some sense lower, in another, practically higher — lesson do we learn. For, this meeting of the two processions outside the gate of Nain *was* accidental, yet not in the conventional sense. Neither the arrival of Jesus at that place and time, nor that of the funeral procession from Nain, nor their meeting, was either designed or else miraculous. Both happened in the natural course of natural events, but their concurrence συγκυρία^{f1248} *was designed*, and directly God-caused. In this God-caused, designed concurrence of events, in themselves ordinary and natural, lies the mystery of special Providences, which, to whomsoever they happen, he may and should regard them as miracles and answer to prayer. And this principle extends much farther: to the prayer for, and provision of, daily bread, nay — to mostly all things, so that, to those who have ears to hear, all things around speak in parables of the kingdom of Heaven.

But on those who saw this miracle at Nain fell the fear^{f1249} of the felt Divine Presence, and over their souls swept the hymn of Divine praise: fear, because^{f1250} a great Prophet was risen up among them; praise because God had visited^{f1251} His people. And further and wider spread the wave — over Judaea, and beyond it, until it washed, and broke in faint murmur against the prison-walls, within which the Baptist awaited his martyrdom. Was He then the ‘Coming One?’ and, if so, why did, or how could, those walls keep His messenger within grasp of the tyrant?^{f1252}

CHAPTER 21

THE WOMAN WHICH WAS A SINNER

(St. ^{<476>}Luke 7:36-50.)

THE precise date and place of the next recorded event in this Galilean journey of the Christ are left undetermined. It can scarcely have occurred in the quiet little town of Nain, indeed, is scarcely congruous with the scene which had been there enacted. And yet it must have followed almost immediately upon it. We infer this, not only from the silence of St. Matthew, which in this instance might have been due, not to the temporary detention of that Evangelist in Capernaum, while the others had followed Christ to Nain, but to what may be called the sparingness of detail in the Gospel-narratives, each Evangelist relating mostly only one in a group of kindred events. ^{f1253} But other indications determine our inference. The embassy of the Baptist's disciples (which will be described in another connection ^{f1254} undoubtedly followed on the raising of the young man of Nain. This embassy would scarcely have come to Jesus in Nain. It probably reached Him on His farther Missionary journey, to which there seems some reference in the passage in the First Gospel {St. ^{<411>}Matthew 11:20-30} which succeeds the account of that embassy. The actual words there recorded can, indeed, scarcely have been spoken at that time. They belong to a later period on that Mission-journey, and mark more fully developed opposition and rejection of the Christ than in those early days. Chronologically, they are in their proper place in St. Luke's Gospel, {St. ^{<203>}Luke 10:13-22} where they follow in connection with that Mission of the Seventy, which, in part at least, was prompted by the growing enmity to the Person of Jesus. On the other hand, this Mission of the Seventy, is not recorded by St. Matthew. Accordingly, he inserts those prophetic denunciations which, according to the plan of his Gospel, could not have been omitted, at the beginning of this Missionary journey, because it marks the beginning of that systematic opposition, {St. ^{<411>}Matthew 11:16-19} the full development of which, as already stated, prompted the Mission of the Seventy.

Yet, even so, the impression left upon us by St. ^{<412>}Matthew 11:20-30 (which follows on the account of the Baptist's embassy) is, that Jesus was

on a journey, and it may well be that those precious words of encouragement and invitation, spoken to the burdened and wearily laboring, {St. ^{<1128>}Matthew 11:28-30} formed part, perhaps the substance, of His preaching on that journey. Truly these were ‘good tidings,’ and not only to those borne down by weight of conscious sinfulness or deep sorrow, who wearily toiled towards the light of far-off peace, or those dreamt-of heights where some comprehensive view might be gained of life with its labors and pangs. ‘Good news,’ also, to them who would fain have ‘learned’ according to their capacity, but whose teachers had weighted ‘the yoke of the Kingdom’ ^{f1255} to a heavy burden, and made the Will of God to them labor, weary and unaccomplishable. But, whether or not spoken at that special time, we cannot fail to recognize their special suitableness to the ‘forgiven sinner’ in the Pharisee’s house, {St. ^{<1176>}Luke 7:36} and their inward, even if not outward, connection with her history.

Another point requires notice. It is how, in the unfolding of His Mission to Man, the Christ progressively placed Himself in antagonism to the Jewish religious thought of His time, from out of which He had historically sprung. In this part of His earthly course the antagonism appeared, indeed, so to speak, in a positive rather than negative form, that is, rather in what He affirmed than in what He combated, because the opposition to Him was not yet fully developed; whereas in the second part of His course it was, for a similar reason, rather negative than positive. From the first this antagonism was there in what He taught and did; and it appeared with increasing distinctness in proportion as He taught. We find it in the whole spirit and bearing of what he did and said — in the house at Capernaum, in the Synagogues, with the Gentile Centurion, at the gate of Nain, and especially here, in the history of the much forgiven woman who had much sinned. A Jewish Rabbi could not have so acted and spoken; he would not even have understood Jesus; nay, a Rabbi, however gentle and pitiful, would in word and deed have taken precisely the opposite direction from that of the Christ.

As St. Gregory expresses it, this is perhaps a history more fit to be wept over than commented upon. For comments seem so often to interpose between the simple force of a narrative and our hearts, and few events in the Gospel-history have been so blunted and turned aside as this history, through verbal controversies and dogmatic wrangling.

The first impression on our minds is, that the history itself is but a fragment. We must try to learn from its structure, where and how it was broken off. We understand the infinite delicacy that left her unnamed, the record of whose ‘much forgiveness’ and great love had to be joined to that of her much sin. And we mark, in contrast, the coarse clumsiness which, without any reason for the assertion, to meet the cravings of morbid curiosity, or for saint-worship, has associated her history with the name of Mary Magdalene. ^{f1256} Another, and perhaps even more painful, mistake is the attempt of certain critics to identify this history with the much later anointing of Christ at Bethany, {St. ~~406~~ Matthew 26:6 etc. and parallels.} and to determine which of the two is the simpler, and which the more ornate — which the truer of the accounts, and whence, or why each case there was a ‘Simon’ — perhaps the commonest of Jewish names; a woman who anointed; and that Christ, and those who were present, spoke and acted in accordance with other passages in the Gospel-history: ^{f1257} that is, true to their respective histories. But, such twofold anointing — the first, at the beginning of His works of mercy, of the Feet by a forgiven, loving sinner on whom the Sun had just risen; the second, of His Head, by a loving disciple, when the full-orbed Sun was setting in blood, at the close of His Ministry — is, as in the twofold purgation of the Temple at the beginning and close of His Work, only like the completing of the circle of His Life.

The invitation of Simon the Pharisee to his table does not necessarily indicate, that he had been impressed by the teaching of Jesus, any more than the supposed application to his case of what is called the ‘parable’ of the much and the little forgiven debtor implies, that he had received from the Savior spiritual benefit, great or small. If Jesus had taught in the ‘city,’ and, as always, irresistibly drawn to Him the multitude, it would be only in accordance with the manners of the time if the leading Pharisee invited the distinguished ‘Teacher’ to his table. As such he undoubtedly treated Him. {St. ~~404~~ Luke 7:40} The question in Simon’s mind was, whether He was more than ‘Teacher’ — even ‘Prophet;’ and that such question rose within him indicates, not only that Christ openly claimed a position different from that of Rabbi, and that His followers regarded Him at least as a prophet, but also, within the breast of Simon, a struggle in which strong Jewish prejudice was bearing down the mighty impression of Christ’s Presence.

They were all sitting, or rather ‘lying’ ^{f1258} — the Mishnah sometimes also calls it ‘sitting down and leaning’ — around the table, the body resting on

the couch, the feet turned away from the table in the direction of the wall, while the left elbow rested on the table. And now, from the open courtyard, up the verandah-step, perhaps through an antechamber, {Ab. 4:16} and by the open door, passed the figure of a woman into the festive reception-room and dining-hall — the *Teraglin* (*triclinium*) of the Rabbis.

^{f1259} How did she obtain access? Had she mingled with the servants, or was access free to all — or had she, perhaps, known the house and its owner?

^{f1260} It little matters — as little as whether she ‘had been,’ or ‘was’ up to that day, ‘a sinner,’ ^{f1261} in the terrible acceptation of the term. But we must bear in mind the greatness of Jewish prejudice against any conversation with woman, however lofty her character, fully to realize the absolute incongruity on the part of such a woman in seeking access to the Rabbi, Whom so many regarded as the God-sent Prophet.

But this, also, is evidential, that here we are far beyond the Jewish standpoint. To this woman it was not incongruous, because to her Jesus had, indeed, been the Prophet sent from God. We have said before that this story is a fragment; and here, also, as in the invitation of Simon to Jesus, we have evidence of it. She had, no doubt, heard His words that day. What He had said would be, in substance, if not in words: ‘Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.... Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart..... Ye shall find rest unto your souls.’ This *was* to her the Prophet sent from God with the good news that opened even to her the Kingdom of Heaven, and laid its yoke upon her, not bearing her down to very hell, but easy of wear and light of burden. She knew that it was all as He said, in regard to the heavy load of her past; and, as she listened to those Words, and looked on that Presence, she learned to believe that it was all as He had promised to the heavy burdened. And she had watched, and followed Him afar off to the Pharisee’s house. Or, perhaps, if it be thought that she had not that day heard for herself, still, the sound of that message must have reached her, and wakened the echoes of her heart. And still it was: Come to *Me*; learn of *Me*; I will give rest. What mattered all else to her in the hunger of her soul, which had just tasted of that Heavenly Bread?

The shadow of her form must have fallen on all who sat at meat. But none spake; nor did she heed any but One. Like heaven’s own music, as Angels’ songs that guide the wanderer home, it still sounded in her ears. There are times when we forget all else in one absorbing thought; when men’s opinions, nay — our own feelings of shame — are effaced by that one

Presence; when the ‘Come to *Me*; learn of *Me*; I will give you rest,’ are the all in all to us. Then it is, that the fountains of the Great Deep within are broken open by the wonder-working rod, with which God’s Messenger to us — the better Moses — has struck our hearts. She had come that day to ‘learn’ and to ‘find rest.’ What mattered it to her who was there, or what they thought? There was only One Whose Presence she dared not encounter, not from fear of Him, but from knowledge of herself. It was He to Whom she had come. And so she ‘stood behind at His Feet.’ She had brought with her an *alabastron* (phial, or flask, commonly of alabaster) of perfume. ^{f1262} It is a coarse suggestion, that this had originally been bought for a far different purpose. We know that perfumes were much sought after, and very largely in use. Some, such as true balsam, were worth double their weight in silver; others, like the spikenard (whether as juice or unguent, along with other ingredients), though not equally costly, were also ‘precious.’ We have evidence that perfumed oils, notably oil of rose, {Shebh. 7:6.} and of the iris plant, but chiefly the mixture known in antiquity as *foliatum*, were largely manufactured and used in Palestine. {Jer. Demai 22 *b*.} A flask with this perfume was worn by women round the neck, and hung down below the breast (the *Tselochith shel Palyeton*). {Ab. S. 35 *b*.} So common was its use as to be allowed even on the Sabbath. {Shabb. 6:3.} This ‘flask’ (possibly the *Chumarta de Philon* of Gitt. 69 *b*) — not always of glass, but of silver or gold, probably often also of alabaster — containing ‘*palyeton*’ (evidently, the *foliatum* of Pliny) was used both to sweeten the breath and perfume the person. Hence it seems at least not unlikely, that the *alabastron* which she brought, who loved so much, was none other than the ‘flask of *foliatum*,’ so common among Jewish women. ^{f1263}

As she stood behind Him at His Feet, reverently bending, a shower of tears, like sudden, quick summer-rain, that refreshes air and earth, ‘bedewed’ ^{f1264} His Feet. As if surprised, or else afraid to awaken His attention, or defile Him by her tears, she quickly ^{f1265} wiped them away with the long tresses of her hair that had fallen down and touched Him, ^{f1266} as she bent over His Feet. Nay, not to wash them in such impure waters had she come, but to show such loving gratefulness and reverence as in her poverty she could, and in her humility she might offer. And, now that her faith had grown bold in His Presence, she is continuing ^{f1267} to kiss those Feet which had brought to her the ‘good tidings of peace,’ and to anoint them out of the *alabastron* round her neck. And still she spake not, nor yet

He. For, as on her part silence seemed most fitting utterance, so on His, that He suffered it in silence was best and most fitting answer to her.

Another there was whose thoughts, far other than hers or the Christ's, were also unuttered. A more painful contrast than that of 'the Pharisee' in this scene, can scarcely be imagined. We do not insist that the designation 'this Man,' {ver. 39.} given to Christ in his spoken thoughts, or the manner in which afterwards he replied to the Savior's question by a supercilious 'I suppose,' or 'presume,' {ver. 43.} necessarily imply contempt. But they certainly indicate the mood of his spirit. One thing, at least, seems now clear to this Pharisee: If 'this Man,' this strange, wandering, popular idol, with His strange, novel ways and words, Whom in politeness he must call 'Teacher,' ^{f1268} Rabbi, *were* a Prophet, He would have known who the woman was, and, if He had known who she was, then would He never have allowed such approach. So do we, also, often argue as to what He would do, if He knew. But He *does* know; and it is just because He knoweth that He doeth what, from our lower standpoint, we cannot understand. Had He been a *Rabbi*, He would certainly, and had he been merely a Prophet, He would probably, have repelled such approach. The former, if not from self-righteousness, yet from ignorance of sin and forgiveness; the latter, because such homage was more than man's due. ^{f1269} But, He was more than a prophet, the Savior of sinners; and so she might quietly weep over His Feet, and then quickly wipe away the 'dew' of the 'better morning,' and then continue to Kiss His Feet and to anoint them.

And yet Prophet He also was, and in far fuller sense than Simon could have imagined. For, He had read Simon's unspoken thoughts. Presently He would show it to him; yet not, as we might, by open reproof, that would have put him to shame before his guests, but with infinite delicacy towards His host, and still in manner that he could not mistake. What follows is not, as generally supposed, a parable but an illustration. Accordingly, it must in no way be pressed. With this explanation vanish all the supposed difficulties about the Pharisees being 'little forgiven,' and hence 'loving little.' To convince Simon of the error of his conclusion, that, if the life of that woman had been known, the prophet must have forbidden her touch of love, Jesus entered into the Pharisee's own modes of reasoning. Of two debtors, one of whom owned ten times as much as the other, ^{f1270} who would best love the creditor ^{f1271} who had freely ^{f1250} forgiven them? ^{f1273} Though to both the debt might have been equally impossible of discharge,

and both might love equally, yet a *Rabbi* would, according to his Jewish notions, say, that he would love most to whom most had been forgiven. If this was the undoubted outcome of Jewish theology — the so much for so much — let it be applied to the present case. If there were much benefit, there would be much love; if little benefit, little love. And conversely: in such case much love would argue much benefit; little love, small benefit. Let him then apply the reasoning by marking this woman, and contrasting her conduct with his own. To wash the feet of a guest, to give him the kiss of welcome, and especially to anoint him, ^{f1274} were not, indeed, necessary attentions at a feast. All the more did they indicate special care, affection, and respect. ^{f1275} None of these tokens of deep regard had marked the merely polite reception of Him by the Pharisee. But, in a twofold climax of which the intensity can only be indicated, ^{f1276} the Savior now proceeds to show, how different it had been with her, to whom, for the first time, He now turned! On Simon's own reasoning, then, he must have received but little, she much benefit. Or, to apply the former illustration, and now to reality: 'Forgiven have been her sins, the many' ^{f1277} — not in ignorance, but with knowledge of their being 'many.' This, by Simon's former admission, would explain and account for her much love, as the effect of much forgiveness. On the other hand, though in delicacy the Lord does not actually express it — this other inference would also hold true, that Simon's little love showed that 'little is being forgiven.' ^{f1278}

What has been explained will dispose of another controversy which, with little judgment and less taste, has been connected with this marvellous history. It must not be made a question as between Romanist and Protestant, nor as between rival dogmatists, whether love had nay meritorious part in her forgiveness, or whether, as afterwards stated, her 'faith' had 'saved' her. Undoubtedly, her faith had saved her. What she had heard from His lips, what she knew of Him, she had believed. She had believed in 'the good tidings of peace' which He had brought, in the love of God, and His Fatherhood of pity to the most sunken and needy; in Christ, as the Messenger of Reconciliation and Peace with God; in the Kingdom of Heaven which He had so suddenly and unexpectedly opened to her, from out of whose unfolded golden gates Heaven's light had fallen upon her, Heaven's voices had come to her. She had believed it all: the Father, the Son — Revealer, the Holy Ghost — Revealing. And it *had* saved her. When she came to that feast, and stood behind with humbled, loving gratefulness and reverence of heart-service, she *was* already saved.

She needed not to be forgiven: she had been forgiven. And it was because she was forgiven that she bedewed His Feet with the summer-shower of her heart, and, quickly wiping away the flood with her tresses, continued kissing and anointing them. All this was the impulse of her heart, who, having come in heart, still came to Him, and learned of Him, and found rest to her soul. In that early springtide of her new-born life, it seemed that, as on Aaron's rod, leaf, bud, and flower were all together in tangled confusion of rich forthbursting. She had not yet reached order and clearness; perhaps, in the fulness of her feelings, knew not how great were her blessings, and felt not yet that conscious rest which grows out of faith in the forgiveness which it obtains.

And this was now the final gift of Jesus to her. As formerly for the first time He had turned so now for the first time He spoke to her — and once more with tenderest delicacy. 'Thy sins have been forgiven' ^{f1279} — not, *are* forgiven, and not now — 'the many.' Nor does He now heed the murmuring thoughts of those around, who cannot understand Who this is that forgiveth sins also. But to her, and truly, though not literally, to them also, and to us, He said in explanation and application of it all: 'Thy faith has saved thee: go into peace.' ^{f1280} Our logical dogmatics would have had it: 'go in peace;' more truly He, '*into* peace'. ^{f1281} And so she, the first who had come to Him for spiritual healing the, first of an unnumbered host, went out into the better light, into peace of heart, peace of faith, peace of rest, and into the eternal peace of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of the Heaven of the kingdom hereafter and for ever.

CHAPTER 22

THE MINISTRY OF LOVE, THE BLASPHEMY OF HATRED, AND THE MISTAKES OF EARTHLY AFFECTION — THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM — HEALING OF THE DEMONIZED DUMB — PHARISAIC CHARGE AGAINST CHRIST — THE VISIT OF CHRIST'S MOTHER AND BRETHREN

(St. ~~4081~~ Luke 8:1-3; St. ~~4082~~ Matthew 9:32-35; St. ~~4082~~ Mark 3:22, etc.;
St. ~~4026~~ Matthew 12:46-50 and parallels.)

HOWEVER interesting and important to follow the steps of our Lord on His journey through Galilee, and to group in their order the notices of it in the Gospels, the task seems almost hopeless. In truth, since none of the Evangelists attempted, should we not say, ventured — to write a 'Life' of the Christ, any strictly historical arrangement lay outside their purpose. Their point of view was that of the internal, rather than the external development of this history. And so events, kindred in purpose, discourses bearing on the same subject, or parables pointing to the same stretch of truth, were grouped together; or, as in the present instance, the unfolding teaching of Christ and the growing opposition of His enemies exhibited by joining together notices which, perhaps, belong to different periods. And the lesson to us is, that, just the Old Testament gives neither the national history of Israel, nor the biography of its heroes, but a history of the Kingdom of God in its progressive development, so the Gospels present not a 'Life of Christ,' but the history of the Kingdom of God in its progressive manifestation.

Yet, although there are difficulties connected with details, we can trace in outline the general succession of events. We conclude, that Christ was now returning to Capernaum from that Missionary journey {St. ~~4081~~ Luke 8:1-3; St. ~~4085~~ Matthew 9:35.} of which Nain had been the southernmost point. On this journey He was attended, not only by the Twelve, but by loving grateful women, who ministered to Him of their substance. Among them three are specially named. 'Mary, called Magdalene,' had received from Him special benefit of healing to body and soul. ^{f1282} Her designation as Magdalene was probably derived from her native city, Magdala, ^{f1283} just as several Rabbis are spoken of in the Talmud as 'Magdalene' (*Magdelaah*, or

Magdelaya^{f1284}). Magdala, which was a Sabbath-day's journey from Tiberias, {Jer. Erub. 22 *d*, end.} was celebrated for its dyeworks, {Ber. R. 79.} and its manufactories of fine woolen textures, of which eighty are mentioned. {Jer. Taan. 69 *a*, line 15 from bottom.} Indeed, all that district seems to have been engaged in this industry.^{f1285} It was also reputed for its traffic in turtle-doves and pigeons for purifications — tradition, with its usual exaggeration of numbers, mentioning three hundred such shops. Accordingly, its wealth was very great, and it is named among the three cities whose contributions were so large as to be sent in a wagon to Jerusalem. {Jer. Taan. 69 *a*.} But its moral corruption was also great, and to this the Rabbis attributed its final destruction. {Jer. Taan. u.s.; Midr. on ~~AND~~ Lamentations 2:2, ed. Warsh. p. 67 *b* middle.} Magdala had a Synagogue. {Midr. on ~~AND~~ Ecclesiastes 10:8, ed. Warsh p. 102 *b*.} ^{f1286} Its name was probably derived from a strong tower which defended its approaches, or served for outlook. This suggestion is supported by the circumstance, that what seems to have formed part, or a suburb of Magdala,^{f1287} bore the names of 'Fish-tower' and 'Tower of the Dyers.' One at least, if not both these towers, would be near the landing-place, by the Lake of Galilee, and overlook its waters. The necessity for such places of outlook and defense, making the town a *Magdala*, would be increased by the proximity of the magnificent plain of Gennesaret, of which Josephus speaks in such rapturous terms. {Jewish War 3:10.} Moreover, only twenty minutes to the north of Magdala descended the so-called 'Valley of Doves' (the Wady Hamam), through which passed the ancient caravan-road that led over Nazareth to Damascus. The name 'valley of doves' illustrates the substantial accuracy of the Rabbinic descriptions of ancient Magdala. Modern travelers (such as Dean *Stanley*, Professor *Robinson*, *Farrar*, and others) have noticed the strange designation 'Valley of Doves' without being able to suggest the explanation of it, which the knowledge of its traffic in doves for purposes of purification at once supplies. Of the many towns and villages that dotted the shores of the Lake of Galilee, all have passed away except Magdala, which is still represented by the collection of mud hovels that bears the name of Mejdél. The ancient watch-tower which gave the place its name is still there, probably standing on the same site as that which looked down on Jesus and the Magdalene. To this day Magdala is celebrated for its springs and rivulets, which render it specially suitable for dyeworks; while the shell-fish with which these waters and the Lake are said to abound, {*Baedeker's* Palastina, pp. 268, 269.} might supply some of the dye.^{f1288}

Such details may help us more clearly to realize the home, and with it, perhaps, also the upbringing and circumstances of her who not only ministered to Jesus in His Life, but, with eager avarice of love, watched ‘afar off’ His dying moments, {St. ^{<175>}Matthew 27:56.} and then sat over against the new tomb of Joseph in which His Body was laid. {ver. 61.} And the terrible time which followed she spent with her like-minded friends, who in Galilee had ministered to Christ, {St. ^{<255>}Luke 23:55.} in preparing those ‘spices and ointments’ {ver. 56.} which the Risen Savior would never require. For, on that Easter-morning the empty tomb of Jesus was only guarded by Angel-messengers, who announced to the Magdalene and Joanna, as well as the other women, {St. ^{<240>}Luke 24:10.} the gladsome tidings that His foretold Resurrection had become a reality. But however difficult the circumstances may have been, in which the Magdalene came to profess her faith in Jesus, those of *Joanna* (the Hebrew *Yochani* {Seb. 62 *b.*}) must have been even more trying. She was the wife of *Chuza*, Herod’s Steward ^{f1289} — possibly, though not likely, the Court-official whose son Jesus had healed by the word spoken in Cana. {St. ^{<345>}John 4:46-54.} The absence of any reference to the event seems rather opposed to this supposition. Indeed, it seems doubtful, whether *Chuza* was a Jewish name. In Jewish writings ^{f1290} the designation (*azwk*) {Yebam. 70 *a.*} seems rather used as a by-name (‘little pitcher’) for a small, insignificant person, than as a proper name. ^{f1291} Only one other of those who ministered to Jesus is mentioned by name. It is *Susanna*, the ‘lily.’ The names of the other loving women are not written on the page of earth’s history, but only on that of the ‘Lamb’s Book of Life.’ And they ‘ministered to Him of their substance.’ So early did eternal riches appear in the grab of poverty; so soon did love to Christ find its treasure in consecrating it to His Ministry. And ever since has this been the law of His Kingdom, to our great humiliation and yet greater exaltation in fellowship with Him.

It was on this return-journey to Capernaum, probably not far from the latter place, that the two blind men had their sight restored. {St. ^{<1027>}Matthew 9:27-31.} It was then, also, that the healing of the demonized dumb took place, which is recorded in St. ^{<1032>}Matthew 9:32-35, and alluded to in St. ^{<1032>}Mark 3:22-30. This narrative must, of course, not be confounded with the somewhat similar event told in St. ^{<1022>}Matthew 12:22-32, and in St. ^{<2114>}Luke 11:14-26. The latter occurred at a much later period in our Lord’s life, when, as the whole context shows, the opposition of the

Pharisaic party had assumed much larger proportions, and the language of Jesus was more fully denunciatory of the character and guilt of His enemies. That charge of the Pharisees, therefore, that Jesus cast out the demons through the Prince of the demons, {St. ^{<4084>}Matthew 9:34.} as well as His reply to it, will best be considered when it shall appear in its fullest development. This all the more, that we believe at least the greater part of our Lord's answer to their blasphemous accusation, as given in St. Mark's Gospel, {St. ^{<4023>}Mark 3:23-30.} to have been spoken at that later period.

f1292

It was on this return-journey to Capernaum from the uttermost borders of Galilee, when for the first time He was not only followed by His twelve Apostles, but attended by the loving service of those who owed their all to His Ministry, that the demonized dumb was restored by the casting out of the demon. Even these circumstances show that a new stage in the Messianic course had begun. It is characterized by fuller unfolding of Christ's teaching and working, and *pari passu*, by more fully developed opposition of the Pharisaic party. For the two went together, nor can they be distinguished as cause or effect. That new stage, as repeatedly noted, had opened on His return from the 'Unknown Feast' in Jerusalem, whence He seems to have been followed by the Pharisaic party. We have marked it so early as the call of the four disciples by the Lake of Galilee. But its first activity appeared at the healing of the paralytic in Capernaum, when, for the first time, we noticed the presence and murmuring of the Scribes, and, for the first time also, the distinct declaration about the forgiveness of sins on the part of Jesus. The same twofold element appeared in the call of the publican Matthew, and the cavil of the Pharisees at Christ's subsequent eating and drinking with 'sinners.' It was in further development of this separation from the old and now hostile element, that the twelve Apostles were next appointed, and that distinctive teaching of Jesus addressed to the people in the 'Sermon on the Mount,' which was alike a vindication and an appeal. On the journey through Galilee, which now followed, the hostile party does not seem to have actually attended Jesus; but their growing, and now outspoken opposition is heard in the discourse of Christ about John the Baptist after the dismissal of his disciples, {St. ^{<4016>}Matthew 11:16-19.} while its influence appears in the unspoken thoughts of Simon the Pharisee.

But even before these two events, that had happened which would induce the Pharisaic party to increased measures against Jesus. It has already been suggested, that the party, as such, did not attend Jesus on His Galilean

journey. But we are emphatically told, that tidings of the raising of the dead at Nain had gone forth into Judaea. {St. ^{<1717>}Luke 7:17.} No doubt they reached the leaders at Jerusalem. There seems just sufficient time between this and the healing of the demonized dumb on the return-journey to Capernaum, to account for the presence there of those Pharisees, {St. ^{<1084>}Matthew 9:34.} who are expressly described by St. Mark {St. ^{<1132>}Mark 3:32.} as ‘the Scribes which came down from Jerusalem.’

Other circumstances, also, are thus explained. Whatever view the leaders at Jerusalem may have taken of the raising at Nain, it could no longer be denied that miracles were wrought by Jesus. At least, what to us seem miracles, yet not to them, since, as we have seen, ‘miraculous’ cures and the expelling of demons lay within the sphere of their ‘extraordinary ordinary’ — were not miracles in our sense, since they were, or professed to be, done by their ‘own children.’ The mere fact, therefore, of such cures, would present no difficulty to them. To *us* a single well-ascertained miracle would form irrefragable evidence of the claims of Christ; to them it would not. They could believe in the ‘miracles,’ and yet not in the Christ. To them the question would not be, as to us, whether they were miracles, but, By what power, or in what Name, He did these deeds? From our standpoint, their opposition to the Christ would — in view of His Miracles — seem not only wicked, but rationally inexplicable. But ours was not their point of view. And here, again, we perceive that it was enmity of the *Person* and *Teaching* of Jesus which led to the denial of His claims. The inquiry: By what Power Jesus did these works? they met by the assertion, that it was through that of Satan, or the Chief of the Demons. They regarded Jesus, as not only temporarily, but permanently, possessed by a demon, that is, as the constant vehicle of Satanic influence. And this demon was, according to them, none other than Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. {St. ^{<1132>}Mark 3:22}. Thus, in their view, it was really Satan who acted in and through Him; and Jesus, instead of being recognized as the Son of God, was regarded as an incarnation of Satan; instead of being owned as the Messiah, was denounced and treated as the representative of the Kingdom of Darkness. All this, because the Kingdom which He came to open, and which He preached, was precisely the opposite of what they regarded as the Kingdom of God. Thus it was the essential contrariety of Rabbinism to the Gospel of the Christ that lay at the foundation of their conduct towards the Person of Christ. We venture to assert, that this accounts for the whole after-history up to the Cross.

Thus viewed, the history of Pharisaic opposition appears not only consistent, but is, so to speak, morally accounted for. Their guilt lay in treating that as Satanic agency which was of the Holy Ghost; and this, because they were of their father the Devil, and knew not, nor understood, nor yet loved the Light, their deeds being evil. They were not children of the light, but of that darkness which comprehended Him not Who was the Light. And now we can also understand the growth of active opposition to Christ. Once arrived at the conclusion, that the miracles which Christ did were due to the power of Satan, and that He was the representative of the Evil One, their course was rationally and morally chosen. To regard every fresh manifestation of Christ's Power as only a fuller development of the power of Satan, and to oppose it with increasing determination and hostility, even to the Cross: such was henceforth the natural progress of this history. On the other hand, such a course once fully settled upon, there would, and could, be no further reasoning with, or against it on the part of Jesus. Henceforth His Discourses and attitude to such Judaism must be chiefly denunciatory, while still seeking — as, from the inward necessity of His Nature and the outward necessity of His Mission, He must, to save the elect remnant from this 'untoward generation,' and to lay broad and wide the foundations of the future Church. But the old hostile Judaism must henceforth be left to the judgment of condemnation, except in those tears of Divine pity which the Jew-King and Jewish Messiah wept over the Jerusalem that knew not the day of its visitation.

But all this, when the now beginning movement shall have reached its full proportions. {St. ^{<1022>}Matthew 12:22 etc.; St. ^{<1114>}Luke 11:14 etc.} For the present, we mark only its first appearance. The charge of Satanic agency was, indeed, not quite new. It had been suggested, that John the Baptist had been under demoniacal influence, and this cunning pretext for resistance to his message had been eminently successful with the people. {St. ^{<1117>}Matthew 11:17, 18; St. ^{<1073>}Luke 7:31-32.} The same charge, only in much fuller form, was not raised against Jesus. As 'the multitude marvelled, saying, it was never so seen in Israel,' the Pharisees, without denying the facts, had this explanation of them, to be presently developed to all its terrible consequences: that, both as regarded the casting out of the demon from the dumb man and all similar works, Jesus wrought it 'through the Ruler of the Demons.' {St. ^{<1083>}Matthew 9:33, 34.} ^{f1293}

And so the edge of this manifestation of the Christ was blunted and broken. But their besetment of the Christ did not cease. It is to this that we

attribute the visit of ‘the mother and brethren’ of Jesus, which is recorded in the three Synoptic Gospels. {St. ^{<126>}Matthew 12:46 etc.; St. ^{<103>}Mark 3:31 etc. St. ^{<189>}Luke 8:19 etc.} Even this circumstances shows its decisive importance. It forms a parallel to the former attempts of the Pharisees to influence the disciples of Jesus, {St. ^{<101>}Matthew 9:11.} and then to stir up the hostility of the disciples of John. {U.S. ver. 14.} *both of which are recorded by the three Evangelists.* It also brought to light another distinctive characteristic of the Mission of Jesus. We place this visit of the ‘mother and brethren’ of Jesus immediately after His return to Capernaum, and we attribute it to Pharisaic opposition, which either filled those relatives of Jesus with fear for His safety, or made them sincerely concerned about His proceedings. Only if it meant some kind of interference with His Mission, whether prompted by fear or affection, would Jesus have so disowned their relationship.

But it meant more than this. As always, the positive went side by side with the negative. Without going so far, as with some of the Fathers, to see pride or ostentation in this, that the Virgin-Mother summoned Jesus to her outside the house, since the opposite might as well have been her motive, we cannot but regard the words of Christ as the sternest prophetic rebuke of all Mariolatry, prayer for the Virgin’s intercession, and, still more, of the strange doctrines about her freedom from actual and original sin, up to their prurient sequence in the dogma of the ‘Immaculate Conception.’

On the other hand, we also remember the deep reverence among the Jews for parents, which found even exaggerated expression in the Talmud. {Jer. Peah 1:1.} ^{f1294} And we feel that, of all in Israel, He, Who was their King, could not have spoken nor done what might even seem disrespectful to a mother. There must have been higher meaning in His words. That meaning would be better understood after His Resurrection. But even before that it was needful, in presence of interference or hindrance by earthly relationships, even the nearest and tenderest, and perhaps all the more in their case, to point to the higher and stronger spiritual relationship. And beyond this, to still higher truth. For, had He not entered into earthly kinship solely for the sake of the higher spiritual relationship which He was about to found; and was it not, then, in the most literal sense, that not those in nearest earthly relationship, but they who sat ‘about Him, nay — whoever shall do the will of God,’ were really in closest kinship with Him? Thus, it was not that Christ set lightly by His Mother, but that He confounded not the means with the end, nor yet surrendered the spirit for

the letter of the Law of Love, when, refusing to be arrested or turned aside from His Mission, even for a moment,^{f1295} He elected to do the Will of His Father rather than neglect it by attending to the wishes of the Virgin-Mother. As *Bengel* aptly puts it: He contemns not the Mother, but He places the Father first.^{f1296} And this is ever the right relationship in the Kingdom of Heaven!

CHAPTER 23

NEW TEACHING ‘IN PARABLES’ — THE PARABLES TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LAKE OF GALILEE, AND THOSE TO THE DISCIPLES IN CAPERNAUM

(St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓ~~ Matthew 13:1-52; St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓ~~ Mark 4:1-34; St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓ~~ Luke 8:4-18.)

WE are once more with Jesus and His disciples by the Lake of Galilee. We love to think that it was in the early morning, when the light laid its golden shadows on the still waters, and the fresh air, untainted by man, was fragrant of earth's morning sacrifice, when no voice of human discord marred the restfulness of holy silence, nor broke the Psalm of Nature's praise. It was a spring morning too, and of such spring-time as only the East, and chiefly the Galilean Lake, knows — nor of mingled sunshine and showers, of warmth and storm, clouds and brightness, when life seems to return slowly and feebly to the palsied limbs of our northern climes, but when at the warm touch it bounds and throbs with the vigor of youth. The imagery of the ‘Sermon on the Mount’ indicates that winter's rain and storms were just past. Under that sky Nature seems to meet the coming of spring by arraying herself in a garb more glorious than Solomon's royal pomp. Almost suddenly the blood-red anemones, the gay tulips, the spotless narcissus, and the golden ranunculus ^{f1297} deck with wondrous richness the grass of the fields — alas! so soon to wither {u.s. 6:28-30.}, —while all trees put forth their fragrant promise of fruit. {7:16-20.} As the imagery employed in the Sermon on the Mount confirmed the inference, otherwise derived, that it was spoken during the brief period after the winter rains, when the ‘lilies’ decked the fresh grass, so the scene depicted in the Parables spoken by the Lake of Galilee indicates a more advanced season, when the fields gave first promise of a harvest to be gathered in due time. And as we know that the barley-harvest commenced with the Passover, we cannot be mistaken in supposing that the scene is laid a few weeks before that Feast.

Other evidence of this is not wanting. From the opening verses {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓ~~ Matthew 13:1, 2} we infer, that Jesus had gone forth from ‘the house’ with His disciples only, and that, as He sat by the seaside, the gathering multitude had obliged Him to enter a ship, whence He spake unto them

many things in Parables. That this parabolic teaching did not follow, far less, was caused by, the fully developed enmity of the Pharisees, {St. ~~Matthew~~ 12:24 etc.} ^{f1298} will appear more clearly in the sequel.

Meantime it should be noticed, that the first series of Parables (those spoken by the Lake of Galilee) bear no distinct reference to it. In this respect we mark an ascending scale in the three series of Parables, spoken respectively at three different periods in the History of Christ, and with reference to three different stages of Pharisaic opposition and popular feeling. The first series is that, {St. Matthew 13.} when Pharisaic opposition had just devised the explanation that His works were of demoniac agency, and when misled affection would have converted the ties of earthly relationship into bonds to hold the Christ. To this there was only one reply, when the Christ stretched out His Hand over those who had learned, by following Him, to do the Will of His Heavenly Father, and so become His nearest of kin. This was the real answer to the attempt of His mother and brethren; that to the Pharisaic charge of Satanic agency. And it was in this connection that, first to the multitude, then to His disciples, the first series of Parables was spoken, which exhibits the elementary truths concerning the planting of the Kingdom of God, its development, reality, value, and final vindication.

In the second series of Parables we mark a different stage. The fifteen Parables of which it consists {St. Luke 10-16, 18, *passim*} were spoken after the Transfiguration, on the descent into the Valley of Humiliation. They also concern the Kingdom of God, but, although the prevailing characteristic is still *parenetic*, ^{f1299} or, rather, *Evangelic*, they have a controversial aspect also, as against some vital, active opposition to the Kingdom, chiefly on the part of the Pharisees. Accordingly, they appear among 'the Discourses' of Christ, {St. Luke 11-14} and are connected with the climax of Pharisaic opposition as presented in the charge, in its most fully developed form, that Jesus was, so to speak, the Incarnation of Satan, the constant medium and vehicle of his activity. {St. ~~Luke~~ 11:14-36; St. ~~Matthew~~ 12:22-45; St. ~~Mark~~ 3:22-30} This *was* the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. All the Parables spoken at that period bear more or less direct reference to it, though, as already stated, as yet in positive rather than negative form, the *Evangelic* element in them being primary, and the judicial only secondary.

This order is reversed in the third series, consisting of eight Parables. {St. Matthew 18, 20, 21, 22, 24 25; St. Luke 19}. Here the controversial has

not only the ascendancy over the Evangelic element, but the tone has become judicial, and the Evangelic element appears chiefly in the form of certain predictions connected with the coming end. The Kingdom of God is presented in its final stage of ingathering, separation, reward and loss, as, indeed, we might expect in the teaching of the Lord immediately before His final rejection by Israel and betrayal into the hands of the Gentiles.

This internal connection between the Parables and the History of Christ best explains their meaning. Their artificial grouping (as by mostly all modern critics ^{f1300}) is too ingenious to be true. One thing, however, is common to all the Parables, and forms a point of connection between them. They are all occasioned by some unreceptiveness on the part of the hearers, and that, even when the hearers are professing disciples. This seems indicated in the reason assigned by Christ to the disciples for His use of parabolic teaching: that unto them it was 'given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God, but unto them it was that are without, all these things are done in parables.' {St. ~~4041~~ Mark 4:11} And this may lead up to such general remarks on the Parables as are necessary for their understanding.

Little information is to be gained from discussing the etymology of the word *Parable*. ^{f1301} The verb from which it is derived means *to project*; and the term itself, the placing of one thing by the side of another. Perhaps no other mode of teaching was so common among the Jews ^{f1302} as that by Parables. Only in their case, they were almost entirely illustrations of what had been said or taught; ^{f1303} while, in the case of Christ, they served as the foundation for His teaching. In the one case, the light of earth was cast heavenwards, in the other, that of heaven earthwards; in the one case, it was intended to make spiritual teaching appear Jewish and national, in the other to convey spiritual teaching in a form adapted to the standpoint of the hearers. This distinction will be found to hold true, even in instances where there seems the closest parallelism between a Rabbinic and an Evangelic Parable. On further examination, the difference between them will appear not merely one of degree, but of kind, or rather of standpoint. This may be illustrated by the Parable of the woman who made anxious search for her lost coin, {St. ~~4178~~ Luke 15:8-10} which there is an almost literal Jewish parallel. {In the Midrash on ~~2006~~ Song of Solomon 1:1} But, whereas in the Jewish Parable the moral is, that a man ought to take much greater pains in the study of the Torah than in the search for coin, since the former procures an eternal reward, while the coin would, if found, at most only procure temporary enjoyment, the Parable of Christ is intended to set

forth, not the merit of study or of works, but the compassion of the Savior in seeking the lost, and the joy of Heaven in his recovery. It need scarcely be said, that comparison between such Parables, as regards their spirit, is scarcely possible, except by way of contrast. ^{f1304}

But, to return. In Jewish writings a Parable (*Mimshal, Mashal, Mathla*) is introduced by some such formula as this: 'I will tell thee a parable' **I cm dl I wcma** 'To what is the thing like? To one,' etc. Often it begins more briefly, thus: 'A Parable. To what is the thing like?' or else, simply: 'To what is the thing like?' Sometimes even this is omitted and the Parable is indicated by the preposition 'to' at the beginning of the illustrative story. Jewish writers extol Parables, as placing the meaning of the Law within range of the comprehension of all men. The 'wise King' had introduced this method, the usefulness of which is illustrated by the Parable of a great palace which had many doors, so that people lost their way in it, till one came who fastened a ball of thread at the chief entrance, when all could readily find their way in and out. {Midr. on ²⁰⁰⁰Song of Solomon 1:1} Even this will illustrate what has been said of the difference between Rabbinic Parables and those employed by our Lord.

The general distinction between a Parable and a Proverb, Fable and Allegory, cannot here be discussed at length. ^{f1305} It will sufficiently appear from the character and the characteristics of the Parables of our Lord. That designation is, indeed, sometimes applied to what are not Parables, in the strictest sense; while it is wanting where we might have expected it. Thus, in the Synoptic Gospels illustrations, {St. ⁴⁰²²Matthew 24:32; St. ⁴⁰²³Mark 3:23; St. ⁴⁰²⁵Luke 5:36} and even proverbial sayings, such as 'Physician, heal thyself,' {St. ⁴⁰²³Luke 4:23} or that about the blind leading the blind, {St. ⁴⁰²⁵Matthew 15:15} are designated Parables. Again, the term 'Parable,' although used in our Authorized Version, does not occur in the original of St. John's Gospel; and this, although not a few illustrations used in that Gospel might, on superficial examination, appear to be Parables. The term must, therefore, be here restricted to special conditions. The first of these is, that all Parables bear reference to well-known scenes, such as those of daily life; or to events, either real, or such as every one would expect in given circumstances, or as would be in accordance with prevailing notions. ^{f1306}

Such pictures, familiar to the popular mind, are in the Parable connected with corresponding spiritual realities. Yet, here also, there is that which

distinguishes the Parable from the mere illustration. The latter conveys no more than — perhaps not so much as — that which was to be illustrated; while the Parable conveys this and a great deal beyond it to those, who can follow up its shadows to the light by which they have been cast. In truth, Parables are the outlined shadows — large, perhaps, and dim — as the light of heavenly things falls on well-known scenes, which correspond to, and have their higher counterpart in spiritual realities. For, earth and heaven are twin-parts of His works. And, as the same law, so the same order, prevails in them; and they form a grand unity in their relation to the Living God Who reigneth. And, just as there is ultimately but one Law, one Force, one Life, which, variously working, effects and affects all the Phenomenal in the material universe, however diverse it may seem, so is there but one Law and Life as regards the intellectual, moral, nay — and the spiritual. One Law, Force, and Life, binding the earthly and the heavenly into a Grand Unity — the outcome of the Divine Unity, of which it is the manifestation. Thus things in earth and heaven are kindred, and the one may become to us Parables of the other. And so, if the place of our resting be Bethel, they become Jacob's ladder, by which those from heaven come down to earth, and those from earth ascend to heaven.

Another characteristic of the Parables, in the stricter sense, is that in them the whole picture or narrative is used in illustration of some heavenly teaching, and not merely one feature or phase of it, ^{f1307} as in some of the parabolic illustrations and proverbs of the Synoptists, or the parabolic narratives of the Fourth Gospel. Thus, in the parabolic illustrations about the new piece of cloth on the old garment, {St. ~~455~~ Luke 5:36.} about the blind leading the blind, {St. ~~459~~ Luke 6:39.} about the forth-putting of leaves on the fig-tree; {St. ~~462~~ Matthew 24:32.} or in the parabolic proverb, 'Physician, heal thyself;' {St. ~~463~~ Luke 4:23.} or in such parabolic narratives of St. John, as about the Good Shepherd, {St. ~~301~~ John 10.} or the Vine {St. ~~315~~ John 15.} — in each case, only one part is selected as parabolic. On the other hand, even in the shortest Parables, such as those of the seed growing secretly, {St. ~~406~~ Mark 4:26-29.} the leaven in the meal, {St. ~~413~~ Matthew 13:33.} and the pearl of great price, {vv. 45, 46.} the picture is *complete*, and has not only in one feature, but in its whole bearing, a counterpart in spiritual realities. But, as shown in the Parable of the seed growing secretly, {St. ~~406~~ Mark 4:26-29.} it is not necessary that the Parable should always contain some narrative, provided that not only one feature, but the whole thing related, have its spiritual application.

In view of what has been explained, the arrangement of the Parables into *symbolical* and *typical* ^{f1308} can only apply to their form, not their substance. In the first of these classes a scene from nature or from life serves as basis for exhibiting the corresponding spiritual reality. In the latter, what is related serves as type *τύπος*, not in the ordinary sense of that term, but in that not unfrequent in Scripture: as example — whether for imitation, {^{<5187>}Philippians 3:17; ^{<5012>}1 Timothy 4:12.} or in warning. {^{<5006>}1 Corinthians 10:6. 11.} In the typical Parables the illustration lies, so to speak, on the outside; in the symbolical, within the narrative or scene. The former are to be applied; the latter must be explained.

It is here that the characteristic difference between the various classes of hearers lay. All the Parables, indeed, implied some background of opposition, or else of unreceptiveness. In the record of this first series of them, {St. Matthew 13.} the fact that Jesus spake to the people in Parables, {St. ^{<4038>}Matthew 13:3, and parallels.} and *only* in Parables, {St. ^{<4034>}Matthew 13:34; St. ^{<4033>}Mark 4:33, 34.} is strongly marked. It appears, therefore, to have been the first time that this mode of popular teaching was adopted by him. ^{f1309} Accordingly, the disciples not only expressed their astonishment, but inquired the reason of this novel method. {St. ^{<4030>}Matthew 13:10, and parallels.} The answer of the Lord makes a distinction between those to whom it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom, and those to whom all things were done in Parables. But, evidently, this method of teaching could not have been adopted for the people, in contradistinction to the disciples, and as a judicial measure, since even in the first series of Parables three were addressed to the disciples, after the people had been dismissed. {St. ^{<4035>}Matthew 13:36, 44-52.} On the other hand, in answer to the disciples, the Lord specially marks this as the difference between the teaching vouchsafed to them and the Parables spoken to the people, that the designed effect of the latter was judicial: to complete that hardening which, in its commencement, had been caused by their voluntary rejection of what they had heard. {St. ^{<4013>}Matthew 11:13-17.} But, as not only the people, but the disciples also, were taught by Parables, the hardening effect must not be ascribed to the parabolic mode of teaching, now for the first time adopted by Christ. Nor is it a sufficient answer to the question, by what this darkening effect, and hence hardening influence, of the Parable on the people was caused, that the first series, addressed to the multitude, {St. ^{<4035>}Matthew 13:1-9, 24-33.} consisted of a cumulation of Parables, without any hint as to their meaning or

interpretation. ^{f1310} For, irrespective of other considerations, these Parables were at least as easily understood as those spoken immediately afterwards to the disciples, on which, similarly, no comment was given by Jesus. On the other hand, to us at least, it seems clear, that the ground of the different effect of the Parables on the unbelieving multitude and on the believing disciples was not objective, or caused by the substance or form of these Parables, but subjective, being caused by the different standpoint of the two classes of hearers toward the Kingdom of God.

This explanation removes what otherwise would be a serious difficulty. For, it seems impossible to believe, that Jesus had adopted a special mode of teaching for the purpose of concealing the truth, which might have saved those who heard Him. His words, indeed, indicate that such *was* the effect of the Parables. But they also indicate, with at least equal clearness, that the cause of this hardening lay, not in the parabolic method of teaching, but in the state of spiritual insensibility at which, by their own guilt, they had previously arrived. Through this, what might, and, in other circumstances, would, have conveyed spiritual instruction, necessarily became that which still further and fatally darkened and dulled their minds and hearts. Thus, their own hardening merged into the judgment of hardening. {St. ~~4033~~ Matthew 13:13-15.}

We are now in some measure able to understand, why Christ now for the first time adopted parabolic teaching. Its reason lay in the altered circumstances of the case. All his former teaching had been plain, although initial. In it He had set forth by Word, and exhibited by fact (in miracles), that Kingdom of God which He had come to open to all believers. The hearers had now ranged themselves into two parties. Those who, whether temporarily or permanently (as the result would show), had admitted these premises, so far as they understood them, were His professing disciples. On the other hand, the Pharisaic party had now devised a consistent theory, according to which the acts, and hence also the teaching, of Jesus, were of Satanic origin. Christ must still preach the Kingdom; for that purpose had he come into the world. Only, the presentation of that Kingdom must now be for *decision*. It must separate the two classes, leading the one to clearer understanding of the mysteries of the Kingdom — of what not only seems, but to our limited thinking really *is*, mysterious; while the other class of hearers would now regard these mysteries as wholly unintelligible, incredible, and to be rejected. And the ground of this lay in the respective positions of these two classes towards the Kingdom. ‘Whosoever hath, to

him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.' And the mysterious manner in which they were presented in Parables was alike suited to, and corresponded with, the character of these 'mysteries of the Kingdom,' now set forth, not for initial instruction, but for final decision. As the light from heaven falls on earthly objects, the shadows are cast. But our perception of them, and its mode, depend on the position which we occupy relatively to that Light.

And so it was not only best, but most merciful, that these mysteries of substance should now, also, be presented as mysteries of form in Parables. Here each would see according to his standpoint towards the Kingdom. And this was in turn determined by previous acceptance or rejection of that truth, which had formerly been set forth in a plain form in the teaching and acting of the Christ. Thus, while to the opened eyes and hearing ears of the one class would be disclosed that, which prophets and righteous men of old had desired but not attained, to them who had voluntarily cast aside what they had, would only come, in their seeing and hearing, the final judgment of hardening. So would it be to each according to his standpoint. To the one would come the grace of final revelation, to the other the final judgment which, in the first place, had been of their own choice, but which, as they voluntarily occupied their position relatively to Christ, had grown into the fulfilment of the terrible prediction of Esaias concerning the final hardening of Israel. {~~2009~~ Isaiah 6:9, 10.}

Thus much in general explanation. The record of the first series of Parables {St. Matthew 13.} contains three separate accounts: that of the Parables spoken to the people; that of the reason for the use of parabolic teaching, and the explanation of the first Parables (both addressed to the disciples); and, finally, another series of Parables spoken to the disciples. To each of these we must briefly address ourselves.

On that bright spring morning, when Jesus spoke from 'the ship' to the multitude that crowded the shore, He addressed to them these *four Parables*: concerning Him Who sowed, ^{f1311} concerning the Wheat and the Tares, concerning the Mustard-Seed, and concerning the Leaven. The first, or perhaps the two first of these, must be supplemented by what may be designated as a fifth Parable, that of the Seed growing unobservedly. This is the only Parable of which St. Mark alone has preserved the record. {St. ~~4005~~ Mark 4:26-29.} All these Parables refer, as is expressly stated, to the

Kingdom of God; that is, not to any special phase or characteristic of it, but to the Kingdom itself, or, in other words, to its history. They are all such as befit an open-air address at that season of the year, in that locality, and to those hearers. And yet there is such gradation and development in them as might well point upwards and onwards.

The first Parable is that of Him Who sowed. We can almost picture to ourselves the Savior seated in the prow of the boat, as He points His hearers to the rich plain over against Him, where the young corn, still in the first green of its growing, is giving promise of harvest. Like this is the Kingdom of Heaven which He has come to proclaim. Like what? Not yet like that harvest, which is still in the future, but like that field over there. The Sower ^{f1312} has gone forth to sow the Good Seed. If we bear in mind a mode of sowing peculiar (if we are not mistaken) to those times, the Parable gains in vividness. According to Jewish authorities there was twofold sowing, as the seed was either cast by the hand (**dy t l wpm**) or by means of cattle (**myrwwc t l wpm** {Arach. 25 *a*, line 18 from bottom.}). In the latter case, a sack with holes was filled with corn and laid on the back of the animal, so that, as it moved onwards, the seed was thickly scattered.

Thus it might well be, that it would fall indiscriminately on beaten roadway, ^{f1313} on stony places but thinly covered with soil, or where the thorns had not been cleared away, or undergrowth from the thorn-hedge crept into the field, ^{f1314} as well as on good ground. The result in each case need not here be repeated. But what meaning would all this convey to the Jewish hearers of Jesus? How could this sowing and growing be like the Kingdom of God? Certainly not in the sense in which they expected it. To them it was only a rich harvest, when all Israel would bear plenteous fruit. Again, what was the Seed, and who the Sower? or what could be meant by the various kinds of soil and their unproductiveness?

To us, as explained by the Lord, all this seems plain. But to them there could be no possibility of understanding, but much occasion for misunderstanding it, unless, indeed, they stood in right relationship to the 'Kingdom of God.' The initial condition requisite was to believe that Jesus was the Divine Sower, and His Word the Seed of the Kingdom: no other Sower than He, no other Seed of the Kingdom than His Word. If this were admitted, they had at least the right premises for understanding 'this mystery of the Kingdom.' According to Jewish view the Messiah was to appear in outward pomp, and by display of power to establish the

Kingdom. But this was the very idea of the Kingdom, with which Satan had tempted Jesus at the outset of His Ministry. ^{f1315} In opposition to it was this ‘mystery of the Kingdom,’ according to which it consisted in reception of the Seed of the Word. That reception would depend on the nature of the soil, that is, on the mind and heart of the hearers. The Kingdom of God was *within*: it came neither by a display of power, nor even by this, that Israel, or else the Gospel-hearers, were the field on which the Seed of the Kingdom was sown. *He* had brought the Kingdom: the Sower had gone forth to sow. This was of free grace — the Gospel. But the seed might fall on the roadside, and so perish without even springing up. Or it might fall on rocky soil, and so spring up rapidly, but wither before it showed promise of fruit. Or it might fall where thorns grew along with, and more rapidly than, it. And so it would, indeed, show promise of fruit; the corn might appear in the ear; but that fruit would not come to ripeness (‘bring no fruit to perfection’ {St. ~~4014~~ Luke 8:14.}), because the thorns growing more rapidly would choke the corn. Lastly, to this threefold faultiness of soil, through which the seed did not spring up at all, or merely sprung up, or just reached the promise, but not the perfection of fruit, corresponded a threefold degree of fruit-bearing in the soil, according to which it brought forth thirtyfold, sixtyfold, or an hundredfold, in the varying measure of its capacity.

If even the disciples failed to comprehend the whole bearing of this ‘Mystery of the Kingdom,’ we can believe how utterly strange and un-Jewish such a Parable of the Messianic Kingdom must have sounded to them, who had been influenced by the Pharisaic representations of the Person and Teaching of Christ. And yet the while these very hearers were, unconsciously to themselves, fulfilling what Jesus was speaking to them in the Parable!

Whether or not the Parable recorded by St. Mark alone, {St. ~~4006~~ Mark 4:26-29.} concerning the Seed growing unobservedly, was spoken afterwards in private to the disciples, or, as seems more likely, at the first, and to the people by the sea-shore, this appears the fittest place for inserting it. If the first Parable, concerning the Sower and the Field of Sowing, would prove to all who were outside the pale of discipleship a ‘mystery,’ while to those within it would unfold knowledge of the very mysteries of the Kingdom, this would even more fully be the case in regard to this second or supplementary Parable. In it we are only viewing that portion of the field, which the former Parable had described as good soil.

‘So is the Kingdom of God, as if a man had cast the seed on the earth, and slept and rose, night and day, and the seed sprang up and grew: how, he knows not himself. Automatous ^{f1316} [self-acting] the earth beareth fruit: first blade, then ear, then full wheat in the ear! But when the fruit presents itself, immediately he sendeth forth ^{f1317} the sickle, because the harvest is come.’ The meaning of all this seems plain. As the Sower, after the seed has been cast into the ground, can do no more; he goes to sleep at night, and rises by day, the seed the meanwhile growing, the Sower knows not how, and as his activity ceases till the time that the fruit is ripe, when immediately he thrusts in the sickle — so is the Kingdom of God. The seed is sown; but its growth goes on, dependent on the law inherent in seed and soil, dependent also on Heaven’s blessing of sunshine and showers, till the moment of ripeness, when the harvest-time is come. We can only go about our daily work, or lie down to rest, as day and night alternate; we see, but know not the *how* of the growth of the seed. Yet, assuredly it will ripen, and when that moment has arrived, immediately the sickle is thrust in, for the harvest is come. And so also with *the* Sower. His outward activity on earth was in the sowing, and it will be in the harvesting. What lies between them is of that other Dispensation of the Spirit, till He again send forth His reapers into His field. But all this must have been to those ‘without’ a great mystery, in no wise compatible with Jewish notions; while to them ‘within’ it proved a yet greater, and very needful unfolding of the mysteries of the Kingdom, with very wide application of them.

The ‘mystery’ is made still further mysterious, or else it is still further unfolded, in the next Parable concerning the Tares sown among the Wheat. According to the common view, these Tares represent what is botanically known as the ‘bearded Darnel’ (*Lolium temulentum*), a poisonous rye-grass, very common in the East, ‘entirely like wheat until the ear appears,’ or else (according to some), the ‘creeping wheat’ or ‘couch-grass’ (*Triticum repens*), of which the roots creep underground and become intertwined with those of the wheat. But the Parable gains in meaning if we bear in mind that, according to ancient Jewish (and, indeed, modern Eastern) ideas, the Tares were *not* of different seed, {Kil. 1:1.} but only a degenerate kind of wheat. {Jer. Kil. 26 *d.*} Whether in legend or symbol, Rabbinism has it that even the ground had been guilty of fornication before the judgment of the Flood, so that when wheat was sown tares sprang up. {Ber. R. 28 ed. Warsh. p. 53 *a*, about the middle.} The Jewish hearers of Jesus would, therefore, think of these tares as degenerate kind of wheat,

originally sprung at the time of the Flood, through the corruptness of the earth, but now, alas! so common in their fields; wholly indistinguishable from the wheat, till the fruit appeared: noxious, poisonous, and requiring to be separated from the wheat, if the latter was not to become useless.

With these thoughts in mind, let us now try to realize the scene pictured. Once more we see the field on which the corn is growing — we know not how. The sowing time is past. ‘The Kingdom of Heaven is become ^{f12318} like to a man who sowed good seed in his field. But in the *time* that men sleep came his enemy and over-sowed tares ^{f1319} in (upon) the midst ^{f1320} of the wheat, and went away.’ Thus far the picture is true to nature, since such deeds of enmity were, and still are, common in the East. And so matters would go on unobserved, since, whatever kind of ‘tares’ may be meant, it would, from their likeness, be for some time impossible to distinguish them from the wheat. ‘But when the herbage grew and made fruit, then appeared (became manifest) also the tares.’ What follows is equally true to fact, since, according to the testimony of travellers, most strenuous efforts are always made in the East to weed out the tares. Similarly, in the parable, the servants of the householder are introduced as inquiring whence these tares had come; and on the reply: ‘A hostile person has done this,’ they further ask: ‘Wilt thou then that we go (straightway) and gather them together?’ The absence of any reference to the rooting up or burning the tares, is intended to indicate, that the only object which the servants had in view was to keep the wheat pure and unmixed for the harvest. But this their final object would have been frustrated by the procedure, which their inconsiderate zeal suggested. It would, indeed, have been quite possible to distinguish the tares from the wheat — and the Parable proceeds on this very assumption — for, by their fruit they would be known. But in the present instance separation would have been impossible, without, at the same time, uprooting some of the wheat. For, the tares had been sown right into the midst, and not merely by the side, of the wheat; and their roots and blades must have become intertwined. And so they must grow together to the harvest. Then such danger would no longer exist, for the period of growing was past, and the wheat had to be gathered into the barn. Then would be the right time to bid the reapers first gather the tares into bundles for burning, that afterwards the wheat, pure and unmixed, might be stored in the garner.

True to life as the picture is, yet the Parable was, of all others, perhaps the most un-Jewish, and therefore mysterious and unintelligible. Hence the

disciples specially asked explanation of this only, which from its main subject they rightly designated as the Parable ‘of the Tares.’ {St. ~~4036~~ Matthew 13:36.} Yet this was also perhaps the most important for them to understand. For already ‘the Kingdom of Heaven is become like’ this, although the appearance of fruit has not yet made it manifest, that tares have been sown right into the midst of the wheat. But they would soon have to learn it in bitter experience and as a grievous temptation, {St. ~~4036~~ John 6:66-70.} and not only as regarded the impressionable, fickle multitude, nor even the narrower circle of professing followers of Jesus, but that, alas! in their very midst there was a traitor And they would have to learn it more and more in the time to come, as we have to learn it to all ages, till the ‘Age-’ or ‘AEon-completion.’ ^{f1321} Most needful, yet most mysterious also, is this other lesson, as the experience of the Church has shown, since almost every period of her history has witnessed, not only the recurrence of the proposal to make the wheat unmixed, while growing, by gathering out the tares, but actual attempts towards it. All such have proved failures, because the field is the wide ‘world,’ not a narrow sect; because the tares have been sown into the midst of the wheat, and by the enemy; and because, if such gathering were to take place, the roots and blades of tares and wheat would be found so intertwined, that harm would come to the wheat. But why try to gather the tares together, unless from undiscerning zeal? Or what have we, who are only the owner’s servants, to do with it, since we are not bidden of Him? The ‘AEon-completion’ will witness the harvest, when the separation of tares and wheat may not only be accomplished with safety, but shall become necessary. For the wheat must be garnered in the heavenly storehouse, and the tares bound in bundles to be burned. Then the harvesters shall be the Angels of Christ, the gathered tares ‘all the stumbling-blocks and those who do the lawlessness,’ and their burning the casting of them ‘into the oven of the fire.’ ^{f1322}

More mysterious still, and, if possible, even more needful, was the instruction that the Enemy who sowed the tares was the Devil. To the Jews, nay, to us all, it may seem a mystery, that in ‘the Messianic Kingdom of Heaven’ there should be a mixture of tares with the wheat, the more mysterious, that the Baptist had predicted that the coming Messiah would thoroughly purge His floor. But to those who were capable of receiving it, it would be explained by the fact that the Devil was ‘the Enemy’ of Christ, and of His Kingdom, and that he had sowed those tares. This would, at the same time, be the most effective answer to the Pharisaic charge, that Jesus

was the Incarnation of Satan, and the vehicle of his influence. And once instructed in this, they would have further to learn the lessons of faith and patience, connected with the fact that the good seed of the Kingdom grew in the field of the world, and hence that, by the very conditions of its existence, separation by the hand of man was impossible so long as the wheat was still growing. Yet that separation would surely be made in the great harvest, to certain, terrible loss of the children of the wicked one, ^{f1323} and to the 'sun-like forthshining' in glory of the righteous in the Kingdom prepared by their Father.

The first Parables were intended to present the mysteries of the Kingdom as illustrated by the sowing, growing, and intermixture of the Seed. The concluding two Parables set forth another equally mysterious characteristic of the Kingdom: that of its development and power, as contrasted with its small and weak beginnings. In the Parable of the Mustard-seed this is shown as regards the relation of the Kingdom to the outer world; in that of the Leaven, in reference to the world within us. The one exhibits the *extensiveness*, the other the *intensiveness*, of its power; in both cases at first hidden, almost imperceptible, and seemingly wholly inadequate to the final result. Once more we say it, that such Parables must have been utterly unintelligible to all who did not see in the humble, despized, Nazarene, and in His teaching, the Kingdom. But to those whose eyes, ears and hearts had been opened, they would carry most needed instruction and most precious comfort and assurance. Accordingly, we do not find that the disciples either asked or received an interpretation of these Parables.

A few remarks will set the special meaning of these Parables more clearly before us. Here also the illustrations used may have been at hand. Close by the fields, covered with the fresh green or growing corn, to which Jesus had pointed, may have been the garden with its growing herbs, bushes and plants, and the home of the householder, whose wife may at that moment have been in sight, busy preparing the weekly provision of bread. At any rate, it is necessary to keep in mind the *homeliness* of these illustrations. The very idea of Parables implies, not strict scientific accuracy, but popular pictorialness. It is characteristic of them to present vivid sketches that appeal to the popular mind, and exhibit such analogies of higher truths as can be readily perceived by all. Those addressed were not to weigh every detail, either logically or scientifically, but at once to recognize the aptness of the illustration as presented to the popular mind. Thus, as regards the first of these two Parables, the seed of the mustard-plant passed in popular

parlance as the smallest of seeds.^{f1324} In fact, the expression, ‘small as a mustard-seed,’ had become proverbial, and was used, not only by our Lord, {St. ^{<4172>}Matthew 17:20.} but frequently by the Rabbis, to indicate the smallest amount, such as the least drop of blood, {Ber. 31 *a.*} the least defilement, {Nidd. 5:2.} or the smallest remnant of sun-glow in the sky. {Vayyik. R. 31, ed. Warsh., vol. 3 p. 48 *a.*} ‘But when it is grown, it is greater than the garden-herbs.’ Indeed, it looks no longer like a large garden-herb or shrub, but ‘becomes,’ or rather, appears like, ‘a tree’ — as St. Luke puts it, ‘a great tree,’ {St. ^{<2138>}Luke 13:18, 19.} of course, not in comparison with other trees, but with garden-shrubs. Such growth of the mustard seed was also a fact well known at the time, and, indeed, still observed in the East.^{f1325}

This is the first and main point in the Parable. The other, concerning the birds which are attracted to its branches and ‘lodge’ — literally, ‘make tents’^{f1326} — there, or else under the shadow of it, {St. ^{<4102>}Mark 4:32.} is subsidiary. Pictorial, of course, this trait would be, and we can the more readily understand that birds would be attracted to the branches or the shadow of the mustard-plant, when we know that mustard was in Palestine mixed with, or used as food for pigeons, {Jer. Shabb. 16 *c.*} and presumably would be sought by other birds. And the general meaning would the more easily be apprehended, that a tree, whose wide-spreading branches afforded lodgment to the birds of heaven, was a familiar Old Testament figure for a mighty kingdom that gave shelter to the nations. {^{<3516>}Ezekiel 31:6, 12; ^{<2042>}Daniel 4:12, 14, 21, 22.} Indeed, it is specifically used as an illustration of the Messianic Kingdom. {^{<3173>}Ezekiel 17:23.} Thus the Parable would point to this, so full of mystery to the Jews, so explanatory of the mystery to the disciples: that the Kingdom of Heaven, planted in the field of the world as the smallest seed, in the most humble and unpromising manner, would grow till it far outstripped all other similar plants, and gave shelter to all nations under heaven.

To this *extensive* power of the Kingdom corresponded its intensive character, whether in the world at large or in the individual. This formed the subject of the last of the Parables addressed at this time to the people, that of the Leaven. We need not here resort to ingenious methods of explaining ‘the three measures,’ or *Seahs*, of meal in which the leaven was hid. Three *Seahs* were an Ephah, {Men. 7.} of which the exact capacity differed in various districts. According to the so-called ‘wilderness,’ or original Biblical, measurement, it was supposed to be a space holding 432

eggs, {Erub. 8:2; 83 *a.*} while the Jerusalem ephah was one-fifth, and the Sepphoris (or Galilean) ephah two-fifths, or, according to another authority, one-half larger. ^{f1327} To mix 'three measures' of meal was common in Biblical, as well as in later times. {Comp. ~~0186~~Genesis 18:6; ~~0069~~Judges 6:19; ~~0024~~1 Samuel 1:24; *Jos. Ant.* 9:4, 5; Babha B. 9 *a.*, etc.} Nothing further was therefore conveyed than the common process of ordinary, everyday life. And in this, indeed, lies the very point of the Parable, that the Kingdom of God, when received within, would seem like leaven hid, but would gradually pervade, assimilate, and transform the whole of our common life.

With this most un-Jewish, and, to the unbelieving multitude, most mysterious characterization of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Savior dismissed the people. Enough had been said to them and for them, if they had but ears to hear. And now He was again alone with the disciples 'in the house' at Capernaum, to which they had returned. {St. ~~0136~~Matthew 13:36; comp. ver. 10, and St. ~~0040~~Mark 4:10.} Many new and deeper thoughts of the Kingdom had come to them. But why had He so spoken to the multitude, in a manner so different, as regarded not only the form, but even the substance of His teaching? And did they quite understand its solemn meaning themselves? More especially, who was the enemy whose activity would threaten the safety of the harvest? Of that harvest they had already heard on the way through Samaria. {St. ~~0045~~John 4:35.} And what were those 'tares,' which were to continue in their very midst till the judicial separation of the end? To these questions Jesus now made answer. His statement of the reason for adopting in the present instance the parabolic mode of teaching would, at the same time, give them farther insight into those very mysteries of the Kingdom which it had been the object of these Parables to set forth. ^{f1328} His unsolicited explanation of the details of the first Parable would call attention to points that might readily have escaped their notice, but which, for warning and instruction, it most behooved them to keep in view.

The understanding of the first Parable seems to have shown them, how much hidden meaning this teaching conveyed, and to have stimulated their desire for comprehending what the presence and machinations of the hostile Pharisees might, in some measure, lead them to perceive in dim outline. Yet it was not to the Pharisees that the Lord referred. The Enemy was the Devil; the field, the world; the good seed, the children of the Kingdom; the tares, the children of the Wicked One. And most markedly

did the Lord, in this instance, not explain the Parable, as the first one, in its details, but only indicate, so to speak, the stepping-stones for its understanding. This, not only to train the disciples, but because, unlike the first Parable — that of the Tares would only in the future and increasingly unfold its meaning.

But even this was not all. The disciples had now knowledge concerning the mysteries of the Kingdom. But that Kingdom was not matter of the understanding only, but of personal apprehension. This implied discovery of its value, personal acquisition of it, and surrender of all to its possession. And this mystery of the Kingdom was next conveyed to the disciples in those Parables specially addressed to, and suited only for, them.

Kindred, or rather closely connected, as are the two Parables of the Treasure hid in the Field and of the Pearl of Great Price — now spoken to the disciples — their differences are sufficiently marked. In the first, one who must probably be regarded as intending to buy a, if not this, field, discovers a treasure hidden there, and in his joy parts with all else to become owner ^{f1329} of the field and of the hidden treasure which he had so unexpectedly found. Some difficulty has been expressed in regard to the morality of such a transaction. In reply it may be observed, that it was, at least, in entire accordance with Jewish law. {B. Mets. 25 a, b.} ^{f1330} If a man had found a treasure in loose coins among the corn, it would certainly be his, if he bought the corn. If he had found it on the ground, or in the soil, it would equally certainly belong to him, if he could claim ownership of the soil, and even if the field were not his own, unless others could prove their right to it. The law went so far as to adjudge to the purchaser of fruits anything found among these fruits. This will suffice to vindicate a question of detail, which, in any case, should not be too closely pressed in a parabolic history.

But to resume our analysis. In the second Parable we have a wise merchantman who travels in search of pearls, and when he finds one which in value exceeds all else, he returns and sells all that he has, in order to buy this unique gem. The supreme value of the Kingdom, the consequent desire to appropriate it, and the necessity of parting with all else for this purpose, are the points common to this and the previous Parable. But in the one case, it is marked that this treasure is hid from common view in the field, and the finder makes unexpected discovery of it, which fills him with joy. In the other case, the merchantman is, indeed, in search of pearls, but he

has the wisdom to discover the transcendent value of this one gem, and the yet greater wisdom to give up all further search and to acquire it at the surrender of everything else. Thus, two different aspects of the Kingdom, and two different conditions on the part of those who, for its sake, equally part with all, are here set before the disciples.

Nor was the closing Parable of the Draw-net less needful Assuredly it became, and would more and more become, them to know, that mere discipleship — mere inclusion in the Gospel-net — was not sufficient. That net let down into the sea of this world would include much which, when the net was at last drawn to shore, would prove worthless or even hurtful. To be a disciple, then, was not enough. Even here there would be separation. Not only the tares, which the Enemy had designedly sown into the midst of the wheat, but even much that the Gospel-net, cast into the sea, had inclosed, would, when brought to land, prove fit only to be cast away, into ‘the oven of the fire where there is the wailing and the gnashing of teeth.’

So ended that spring-day of first teaching in Parables, to the people by the Lake, and in the house at Capernaum to the disciples. Dim, shadowy outlines, growing larger and more faint in their tracings to the people; shadowy outlines, growing brighter and clearer to all who were disciples. Most wondrous instruction to all, and in all aspects of it; which even negative critics admit to have really formed part of Christ’s own original teaching. But if this be the case, we have two questions of decisive character to ask. Undoubtedly, these Parables were un-Jewish. This appears, not only from a comparison with the Jewish views of the Kingdom, but from the fact that their meaning was unintelligible to the hearers of Jesus, and from this, that, rich as Jewish teaching is in Parables, none in the least parallel to them can be adduced. ^{f1331} Our first question, therefore, is: Whence this un-Jewish and anti-Jewish teaching concerning the Kingdom on the part of Jesus of Nazareth?

Our second question goes still farther. For, if Jesus was not a Prophet, and, if a Prophet, then also the Son of God, yet no more strangely unexpected prophecy, minutely true in all its details, could be conceived, than that concerning His Kingdom which His parabolic description of it conveyed. Has not History, in the strange, unexpected fulfilling of that which no human ingenuity at the time could have forecast, and no pen have described with more minute accuracy of detail, proved Him to be more

than a mere man, One sent from God, the Divine King of the Divine Kingdom, in all the vicissitudes which such a Divine Kingdom must experience when set up upon earth?

CHAPTER 24

CHRIST STILLS THE STORM ON THE LAKE OF GALILEE.

(St. ~~4188~~ Matthew 8:18, 23-27; St. ~~4105~~ Mark 4:35-41; St. ~~4182~~ Luke 8:22-25.)

It was the evening of that day of new teaching, and once more great multitudes were gathering to Him. What more, or, indeed, what else, could He have said to those to whom He had all that morning spoken in Parables, which hearing they had not heard nor understood? It was this, rather than weariness after a long day's working, which led to the resolve to pass to the other side. To merely physical weariness Jesus never subordinated his work. If, therefore, such had been the motive, the proposal to withdraw for rest would have come from the disciples, while here the Lord Himself gave command to pass to the other side. In truth, after that day's teaching it was better, alike for these multitudes and for His disciples that He should withdraw. And so 'they took Him even as He was' — that is, probably without refreshment of food, or even preparation of it for the journey. This indicates how readily, nay — eagerly, the disciples obeyed the behest.

Whether in their haste they heeded not the signs of the coming storm; whether they had the secret feeling, that ship and sea which bore such burden were safe from tempest; or, whether it was one of those storms which so often rise suddenly, and sweep with such fury over the Lake of Galilee, must remain undetermined. He was in 'the ship' ^{f1333} — whether that of the sons of Jonas, or of Zebedee — the well-known boat, which was always ready for His service, whether as pulpit, resting-place, or means of journeying. But the departure had not been so rapid as to pass unobserved; and the ship was attended by other boats, which bore those that would fain follow Him. In the stern of the ship, on the low bench where the steersman sometimes takes rest, was pillowed the Head of Jesus. Weariness, faintness, hunger, exhaustion, asserted their mastery over His true humanity. He, Whom earliest Apostolic testimony {Phil. 2:6.} proclaimed to have been in 'the form of God,' slept. Even this evidences the truth of the whole narrative. If Apostolic tradition had devised this narrative to exhibit His Divine Power, why represent Him as faint and asleep in the ship; and, if it would portray Him as deeply sleeping for very weariness, how could it ascribe to Him the power of stilling the storm by

His rebuke? Each of these by themselves, but not the two in their combination, would be as legends are written. Their coincidence is due to the incidence of truth. Indeed, it is characteristic of the History of the Christ, and all the more evidential that it is so evidently undesigned in the structure of the narrative, that every deepest manifestation of His Humanity is immediately attended by highest display of His Divinity, and each special display of His Divine Power followed by some marks of His true Humanity. Assuredly, no narrative could be more consistent with the fundamental assumption that He is the God-Man.

Thus viewed, the picture is unspeakably sublime. Jesus is asleep, for very weariness and hunger, in the stern of the ship, His head on that low wooden bench, while the heavens darken, the wild wind swoops down those mountain-gorges, howling with hungry rage over the trembling sea; the waves rise and toss, and lash and break over the ship, and beat into it, and the white foam washes at His feet His Humanity here appears as true as when He lay cradled in the manger; His Divinity, as when the sages from the East laid their offerings at His Feet. But the danger is increasing — ‘so that the ship was now filling.’ {St. ^{<4067>}Mark 4:37.} They who watched it, might be tempted to regard the peaceful rest of Jesus, not as indicative of Divine Majesty as it were — sublime consciousness of absolute safety — because they did not fully realize Who He was. In that case it would, therefore, rather mean absolute weakness in not being able, even at such a time, to overcome the demands of our lower nature; real indifference, also, to their fate — not from want of sympathy, but of power. In short, it might lead up to the inference that the Christ was a no-Christ, and the Kingdom of which he had spoken in Parables, not His, in the sense of being identified with His Person.

In all this we perceive already, in part, the internal connection between the teaching of that day and the miracle of that evening. Both were quite novel: the teaching by Parables, and then the help in a Parable. Both were founded on the Old Testament: the teaching on its predictions, {^{<2069>}Isaiah 6:9, 10.} the miracle on its proclamations of the special Divine Manifestations in the sea; {^{<3949>}Psalms 106:9; 107:25; ^{<2510>}Isaiah 51:10; ^{<3006>}Nahum 1:4-7; ^{<3888>}Habakkuk 3:8.} and both show that everything depended on the view taken of the Person of the Christ. Further teaching comes to us from the details of the narrative which follows. It has been asked, with which of the words recorded by the Synoptists the disciples had wakened the Lord: with those of entreaty to save them, {St. Matthew and St. Luke.} or with those

of impatience, perhaps uttered by Peter himself? {St. Mark.} But why may not both accounts represent what had passed? Similarly, it has been asked, which came first — the Lord's rebuke of the disciples, and after it that of the wind and sea, {St. Matthew} or the converse? {St. Mark and St. Luke.} But, may it not be that each recorded that first which had most impressed itself on his mind? — St. Matthew, who had been in the ship that night, the needful rebuke to the disciples; St. Mark and St. Luke, who had heard it from others, {St. Mark probably from St. Peter.} the help first, and then the rebuke?

Yet it is not easy to understand what the disciples had really expected, when they wakened the Christ with their 'Lord, save us — we perish!' Certainly, not that which actually happened, since not only wonder, but fear, came over them ^{f1333} as they witnessed it. Probably theirs would be a vague, undefined belief in the unlimited possibility of all in connection with the Christ. A belief this, which seems to us quite natural as we think of the gradually emerging, but still partially cloud-capped height of His Divinity, of which, as yet, only the dim outlines were visible to them. A belief this, which also accounts for the co-existing, not of disbelief, nor even of unbelief, but of inability of apprehension, which, as we have seen, characterized the bearing of the Virgin-Mother. And it equally characterized that of the disciples up to the Resurrection-morning, bringing them to the empty tomb, and filling them with unbelieving wonder that the tomb was empty. Thus, we have come to that stage in the History of the Christ when, in opposition to the now formulated charge of His enemies as to His Person, neither His Teaching nor His Working could be fully understood, except so far as his Personality was understood — that He was of God and Very God. And so we are gradually reaching on towards the expediency and the need of the coming of the Holy Ghost to reveal that mystery of His Person. Similarly, the two great stages in the history of the Church's learning were: the first — to come to knowledge of what He was, by experience of what He did; the second — to come to experience of what He did and does, by knowledge of what He is. The former, which corresponds, in the Old Testament, to the patriarchal age, is that of the period when Jesus was on earth; the second, which answers to the history of Israel, is that of the period after His Ascension into Heaven and the Descent of the Holy Ghost.

When 'He was awakened' {St. ~~4088~~ Mark 4:38.} by the voice of His disciples, 'He rebuked the wind and the sea,' as Jehovah had of old

{ <949> Psalm 106:9; — <3004> Nahum 1:4. } just as He had ‘rebuked the fever, {St. <409> Luke 4:39.} and the paroxysm of the demonized. {St. <4025> Mark 9:25.} For, all are His creatures, even when lashed to frenzy of the ‘hostile power.’ And the sea He commanded as if it were a sentient being: ‘Be silent! Be silenced!’ And immediately the wind was bound, the panting waves throbbed into stillness, and a great calm of rest fell upon the Lake. For, when Christ sleepeth, there is storm; when He waketh, great peace. But over these men who had erst wakened Him with their cry, now crept wonderment, awe, and fear. No longer, as at His first wonder-working in Capernaum, was it: ‘*What* is this?’ {St. <4027> Mark 1:27.} but ‘*Who*, then, is this?’ ^{f1334} And so the grand question, which the enmity of the Pharisees had raised, and which, in part, had been answered in the Parables of teaching, was still more fully and practically met in what, not only to the disciples, but to all time, was a Parable of help. And Jesus also did wonder, but at that which alone could call forth His wonder — the unreachingness of their faith: where was it? and how was it, they had no faith?

Thus far the history, related, often almost in the same words, by the three Evangelists. On all sides the narrative is admitted to form part of the primitive Evangelic tradition. But if so, then, even on the showing of our opponents, it must have had some foundation in an event surpassing the ordinary facts in the history of Jesus. Accordingly, of all negative critics, at most only two venture to dismiss it as unfounded on fact. But such a bold assumption would rather increase than diminish the difficulty. For, if legend it be, its invention and insertion into the primitive record must have had some historical reason. Such, however, it is absolutely impossible here to trace. The Old Testament contains no analogous history which it might have been wished to imitate; Jewish Messianic expectancy afforded no basis for it; and there is absolutely no Rabbinic parallel ^{f1335} which could be placed by its side. Similar objections apply to the suggestion of exaggeration of some real event (*Keim*). For, the essence of the narrative lies in its details, of which the origin and the universal acceptance in the primitive belief of the Church have to be accounted for. Nor is the task of those negative critics more easy, who, admitting the foundation in fact for this narrative, have suggested various theories to account for its miraculous details. Most of these explanations are so unnatural, ^{f1336} as only to point the contrast between the ingenuity of the nineteenth century and the simple, vivid language of the original narrative. For it seems equally impossible to regard it as based either on a misunderstanding of the words

of Jesus during a storm (*Paulus*), or on the calm faith of Jesus when even the helmsman despaired of safety (*Schenkel*), or to represent it as only in some way a symbol of analogous mental phenomena (*Ammon*, *Schleiermacher*, *Hase*, *Weiszacker*, and others). The very variety of explanations proposed, of which not one agrees with the others, shows, that none of them has proved satisfactory to any but their own inventors. And of all it may be said, that they have no foundation whatever in the narrative itself. Thus the only alternative left is either wholly to reject, or wholly to accept, the narrative.

If our judgment is to be determined by the ordinary rules of historical criticism, we cannot long be in doubt which of these propositions is true. Here is a narrative, which has the *consensus* of the three Evangelists; which admittedly formed part of the original Evangelic tradition; for the invention of which no specific motive can possibly be assigned; and which is told with a simplicity of language and a pictorial vividness of detail that carry their own evidence. Other corroborative points, such as the unlikeliness of the invention of such a situation for the Christ, or of such bearing of the disciples, have been previously indicated. Absolute historical demonstration of the event is, of course, in the nature of things impossible. But, besides the congruousness to the Parabolic teaching which had preceded this Parabolic miracle, and the accord of the Savior's rebuke with His mode of silencing the hostile elements on other occasions, some further considerations in evidence may be offered to the thoughtful reader.

For, first, in this 'dominion over the sea,' we recognize, not only the fullest refutation of the Pharisaic misrepresentation of the Person of Christ, but the realization in the Ideal Man of the ideal of man as heaven-destined, {~~ROM~~ Psalm 8:4-8.} and the initial fulfilment of the promise which this destination implied. 'Creation' has, indeed, been 'made subject to vanity;' {~~ROM~~ Romans 8:20.} but this 'evil,' which implies not merely decay but rebellion, was directly due to the Fall of man, and will be removed at the final 'manifestation of the sons of God.' And here St. Paul so far stands on the same ground as Jewish theology, which also teaches that 'although all things were created in their perfectness, yet when the first Adam sinned, they were corrupted.' {Ber. R. 12.} Christ's dominion over the sea was, therefore, only the Second and Unfallen Adam's real dominion over creation, and the pledge of its restoration, and of our dominion in the future. And this seems also to throw fresh light on Christ's *rebuke*, whether of storm, disease, or demoniac possession. Thus there is a grand

consistency in this narrative, as regards the Scriptural presentation of the Christ.

Again, the narrative expresses very markedly, that the interposition of Christ, alike in itself, and in the manner of it, was wholly unexpected by, indeed, contrary to the expectation of, the disciples. This also holds true in regard to other of the great manifestations of Christ, up to His Resurrection from the dead. This, of course, proves that the narrative was not founded on existing Jewish ideas. But there is more than this. The gratuitous introduction of traits which, so far from glorifying, would rather detract from a legendary Christ, while at the same time they seriously reflect on the disciples, presumably the inventors of the legend, appears to us wholly inconsistent with the assumption that the narrative is spurious.

Nor ought we to overlook another circumstance. While we regard the narrative as that of an historical occurrence — indeed, because we do so — we cannot fail to perceive its permanent symbolic and typical bearing. It were, indeed, impossible to describe either the history of the Church of Christ, or the experience of individual disciples, more accurately, or with wider and deeper capability of application, than in the Parable of this Miracle. And thus it is morally true to all ages; just because it was historically true at the first.^{f1337} And as we enter on this field of contemplation, many views open to us. The true Humanity of the Savior, by the side of His Divine Power; the sleeping Jesus and the Almighty Word of rebuke and command to the elements, which lay them down obedient at His feet: this sharp-edged contrast resolved into a higher unity, how true is it to the fundamental thought of the Gospel-History! Then this other contrast of the failure of faith, and then the excitement of the disciples; and of the calm of the sleeping, and then the Majesty of the wakening Christ. And, lastly, yet this third contrast of the helplessness and despondency of the disciples and the Divine certitude of conscious Omnipotence.

We perceive only difficulties and the seemingly impossible, as we compare what may be before us with that which we consciously possess. He also makes this outlook: but only to know and show, that with Him there can be no difficulty, since all is His, and all may be ours, since He has come for our help and is in the ship. One thing only He wonders at, the shortcomings of our faith; and one thing only makes it impossible for Him to help, our unbelief.

CHAPTER 25

AT GERASA — THE HEALING OF THE DEMONISHED.

(St. ~~4088~~ Matthew 8:28-34; St. ~~4101~~ Mark 5:1-20; St. ~~4185~~ Luke 8:26-39.)

THAT day of wonders was not yet ended. Most writers have, indeed, suggested, that the healing of the demonized on the other side took place at early dawn of the day following the storm on the Lake. But the distance is so short that, even making allowance for the delay by the tempest, the passage could scarcely have occupied the whole night.^{f1338} This supposition would be further confirmed, if ‘the evening’ when Jesus embarked was what the Jews were wont to call ‘the first evening,’ that is, the time when the sun was declining in the heaven, but before it had actually set, the latter time being ‘the second evening.’^{f1339} For, it seems most unlikely that multitudes would have resorted to Jesus at Capernaum after ‘the second evening, or that either the disciples or other boats would have put to sea after nightfall. On the other hand, the scene gains in grandeur — has, so to speak, a fitting background — if we suppose the Savior and His disciples to have landed on the other side late in the evening, when perhaps the silvery moon was shedding her pale light on the weird scene, and laying her halo around the shadows cast upon the sea by the steep cliff down which the herd of swine hurried and fell. This would also give time afterwards for the dispersion, not only into ‘the city,’ but into ‘the country’ of them who had fed the swine. In that case, of course, it would be in the early morning that the Gerasenes afterwards resorted to Jesus and that He again returned to Capernaum. And, lastly this would allow sufficient time for those miracles which took place on that same day in Capernaum after His return thither. Thus, all the circumstances lead us to regard the healing of the demonized at Gerasa as a night-scene, immediately on Christ’s arrival from Capernaum, and after the calming of the storm at sea.

It gives not only life to the narrative, but greatly illustrates it, that we can with confidence describe the exact place where our Lord and His disciples touched the other shore. The ruins right over against the plain of Gennesaret, which still bear the name of *Kersa* or *Gersa*, must represent the ancient Gerasa.^{f1340} This is the correct reading in St. Mark’s, and

probably in St. Luke's, perhaps also in St. Matthew's Gospel.^{f1341} The locality entirely meets the requirements of the narrative. About a quarter of an hour to the south of Gersa is a steep bluff, which descends abruptly on a narrow ledge of shore. A terrified herd running down this cliff could not have recovered its foothold, and must inevitably have been hurled into the Lake beneath. Again, the whole country around is burrowed with limestone caverns and rock-chambers for the dead, such as those which were the dwelling of the demonized. Altogether the scene forms a fitting background to the narrative.

From these tombs the demonized, who is specially singled out by St. Mark and St. Luke, as well as his less prominent companion, {St. ^{<4083>}Matthew 8:28.} came forth to meet Jesus. Much that is both erroneous and misleading has been written on Jewish Demonology. According to common Jewish superstition, the evil spirits dwelt especially in lonely desolate places, and also among tombs.^{f1342} We must here remember what has previously been explained as to the confusion in the consciousness of the demonized between their own notions and the ideas imposed on them by the demons. It is quite in accordance with the Jewish notions of the demonized, that, according to the more circumstantial account of St. Luke, he should feel as it were driven into the deserts, and that he was in the tombs, while, according to St. Mark, he was 'night and day in the tombs and in the mountains,' the very order of the words indicating the notion (as in Jewish belief), that it was chiefly at night that evil spirits were wont to haunt burying-places.

In calling attention to this and similar particulars, we repeat, that this must be kept in view as characteristic of the demonized, that they were incapable of separating their own consciousness and ideas from the influence of the demon, their own identity being merged, and to that extent lost, in that of their tormentors. In this respect the demonized state was also kindred to madness. Self-consciousness, or rather what may be termed *Individuism*, i.e. the consciousness of distinct and independent individuality, and with it the power of self-origination in matters mental and moral (which some might term an aspect of free volition), distinguish the human soul from the mere animal spirit. But in maniacal disease this power is in abeyance, or temporarily lost through physical causes, such as disease of the brain as the medium of communication between the mind and the world of sense; disease of the nervous system, through which ordinarily impressions are conveyed to and from the *sensorium*; or disease of both brain and nervous

system, when previously existing impressions on the brain (in memory, and hence possibly imagination) may be excited without corresponding outward causes. If in such cases the absolute power of self-origination and self-action is lost to the mind, habits of sin and vice (or moral disease) may have an analogous effect as regards moral freedom — the power of moral self-origination and action. In the demonized state the two appear combined, the cause being neither disease nor vice, but the presence of a superior power of evil. This loss of individuism, and the subjection of one's identity to that of the demon might, while it lasted, be called *temporary* 'possession,' in so far as the mental and moral condition of the person was for the time not one of freedom and origination, but in the control of the possessing demon.

One practical inference may even now be drawn from this somewhat abstruse discussion. The language and conduct of the demonized, whether seemingly his own, or that of the demons who influenced him, must always be regarded as a mixture of the Jewish-human and the demoniacal. The demonized speaks and acts as a Jew under the control of a demon. Thus, if he chooses solitary places by day, and tombs by night, it is not that demons really preferred such habitations, but that the Jews imagined it, and that the demons, acting on the existing consciousness, would lead him, in accordance with his preconceived notions, to select such places. Here also mental disease offers points of analogy. For, the demonized would speak and act in accordance with his previous (Jewish) demonological ideas. He would not become a new man, but be the old man, only under the influence of the demon, just as in mania a person truly and consistently speaks and acts, although under the false impressions which a diseased brain conveys to him. The fact that in the demonized state a man's identity was not superseded, but controlled, enables us to account for many phenomena without either confounding demonism with mania, or else imputing to our Lord such accommodation to the notions of the times, as is not only untenable in itself, but forbidden even by the language of the present narrative.

The description of the demonized, coming out of the tombs to meet Jesus as He touched the shore at Gerasa, is vivid in the extreme. His violence, the impossibility of control by others, ^{f1343} the absence of self-control, ^{f1344} his homicidal, ^{f1345} and almost suicidal, ^{f1346} frenzy, are all depicted. Evidently, it was the object to set forth the extreme degree of the demonized state. Christ, Who had been charged by the Pharisees with

being the embodiment and messenger of Satan, is here face to face with the extreme manifestation of demoniac power and influence. It is once more, then, a Miracle in Parable which is about to take place. The question, which had been raised by the enemies, is about to be brought to the issue of a practical demonstration. We do not deny that the contest and the victory, this miracle, nay — the whole series of miracles of which it forms part, are extraordinary, even in the series of Christ's miracles. Our explanation proceeds on the very ground that such was, and must have been, the case. The teaching by Parables, and the parabolic miracles which follow, form, so to speak, an ascending climax, in contrast to the terrible charge which by-and-by would assume the proportions of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and issue in the betrayal and judicial murder of Jesus. There are critical epochs in the history of the Kingdom of God, when the power of evil, standing out in sharpest contrast, challenges that overwhelming manifestation of the Divine, as such, to bear down and crush that which opposes it. Periods of that kind are characterized by miraculous interposition of power, unique even in Bible-history. Such a period was, under the Old Testament, that of Elijah and Elisha, with its altogether exceptional series of miracles; and, under the New Testament, that after the first formulated charge of the Pharisees against the Christ.

With irresistible power the demonized was drawn to Jesus, as He touched the shore at Gerasa. As always, the first effect of the contact was a fresh paroxysm, ^{f1347} but in this peculiar case not physical, but moral. As always also, the demons knew Jesus, and His Presence seemed to constrain their confession of themselves — and therefore of Him. As in nature the introduction of a dominant element sometimes reveals the hidden presence of others, which are either attracted or repelled by it, so the Presence of Christ obliged the manifestation, and, in the case of these evil spirits, the self-confession, of the powers of evil. In some measure it is the same still. The introduction of grace brings to light and experience sin hitherto unknown, and the new life brings consciousness of, and provokes contest with, evil within, of which the very existence had previously been unsuspected. In the present instance the immediate effect was homage, {St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 5:6; St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 8:28.} which presently manifested itself in language such as might have been expected.

Here also it must be remembered, that both the act of homage, or 'worship,' and the words spoken, were not the outcome either of the demonized only, nor yet of the demons only, but a combination of the two:

the control of the demons being absolute over the man such as he was. *Their* language led to *his* worship; *their* feelings and fears appeared in *his* language. It was the self-confession of the *demons*, when obliged to come into His Presence and do homage, which made the *man* fall down and, in the well-known Jewish formula, recorded by the three Evangelists, say: 'What have I to do with Thee,' or rather, 'What between me and Thee' — what have we in common (*Mah li valakh*)? Similarly, although it was consciousness of subjection and fear in His Presence, on the part of the demons, which underlay the adjuration not to inflict torment on them, yet the language itself, as the text shows, was that of the demonized, and the form in which their fear expressed itself was that of *his* thinking. The demons, in their hold on their victim, could not but own their inferiority, and apprehend their defeat and subjection, especially on such an occasion; and the Jew, whose consciousness was under their control, not unified, but identified with it — exclaimed: 'I adjure Thee by God, that Thou torment me not.'

This strange mixture of the demoniac with the human, or rather, this expression of underlying demoniac thought in the forms and modes of thinking of the Jewish victim, explains the expressed fear of present actual torment, or, as St. Matthew, who, from the briefness of his account, does not seem to have been an eye-witness, expresses it: 'Thou art come to torment us before the time;' and possibly also for the 'adjuration by God.' ^{f1348} For, as immediately on the homage and protestation of the demonized: 'What between me and Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of the Most High God?' Christ had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man, it may have been, that in so doing He had used the Name of the Most High God; or else the 'adjuration' itself may have been the form in which the Jewish speaker clothed the consciousness of the demons, with which his own was identified.

It may be conjectured, that it was partly in order to break this identification, or rather to show the demonized that it was not real, and only the consequence of the control which the demons had over him, that the Lord asked his name. To this the man made answer, still in the dual consciousness, 'My name is Legion: for we are many.' ^{f1349} Such might be the subjective motive for Christ's question. Its objective reason may have been to show the power of the demoniac possession in the present instance, thus marking it as an altogether extreme case. The remembrance, that the answer is once more in the forms of Jewish thinking, enables us to

avoid the strange notion (whether it express the opinion of some, or the difficulties of others), that the word ‘Legion’ conveys the idea of six thousand armed and strong warriors of evil. ^{f1350} For, it was a common Jewish idea, that, under certain circumstances, ‘a legion of hurtful spirits’ ^{f1351} (of course not in the sense of a Roman legion) ‘were on the watch for men, saying: When shall he fall into the hands of one of these things, and be taken?’ {Ber. 51 a. }

This identification of the demons with the demonized, in consequence of which he thought with their consciousness, and they spoke not only through him but in his forms of thinking, may also account for the last and most difficult part of this narrative. Their main object and wish was not to be banished from the country and people, or, as St. Luke puts it — again to ‘depart into the abyss.’ Let us now try to realize the scene. On the very narrow strip of shore, between the steep cliff that rises in the background and the Lake, stand Jesus with His disciples and the demonized. The wish of the demons is not to be sent out of the country — not back into the abyss. The one is the cliff overhead, the other the Lake beneath: so, symbolically, and, to the demonized, really. Up on that cliff a great herd of swine is feeding; up that cliff, therefore, is ‘into the swine;’ and this also agrees with Jewish thoughts concerning uncleanness. The rendering of our Authorized Version, {St. ~~41513~~ Mark 5:13.} that, in reply to the demoniac entreaty, ‘forthwith Jesus gave them leave,’ has led to misunderstanding. The distinction here to be made is, though narrow, yet real and important. The verb, which is the same in all the three Gospels, would be better rendered by ‘suffered’ than by ‘gave them leave.’ With the latter we associate positive permission. None such was either asked or given. The Lord suffered it — that is, He did not actually hinder it. ^{f1352} He only ‘said unto them, Go!’

What followed belongs to the phenomena of supersensuous influences upon animals, of which many instances are recorded, but the *rationale* of which it is impossible to explain. How the unclean spirits could enter into the swine, is a question which cannot be entertained till we shall know more of the animal soul than is at present within our range. This, however, we can understand, that under such circumstances a panic would seize the herd, that it would madly rush down the steep on which it could not arrest itself, and so perish in the sea. And this also we can perceive, how the real object of the demons was thus attained; how they did not leave the country, when Christ was entreated to leave it.

The weird scene over which the moon had shed her ghostlike light, was past. The unearthly utterances of the demonized, the wild panic among the herd on the cliff, the mad rush down the steep, the splashing waters as the helpless animals were precipitated into the Lake — all this makes up a picture, unsurpassed for vivid, terrible realism. And now sudden silence has fallen on them. From above, the keepers of the herd had seen it all — alike what had passed with the demonized, and then the issue in the destruction of the herd. From the first, as they saw the demonized, for fear of whom ‘no man might pass that way,’ running to Jesus, they must have watched with eager interest. In the clear Eastern air not a word that was spoken could have been lost. And now in wild terror they fled, into Gerasa — into the country round about, to tell what had happened.

It is morning, and a new morning-sacrifice and morning-Psalm are about to be offered. He that had erst been the possession of foul and evil spirits — a very legion of them — and deprived of his human individuality, is now ‘sitting at the feet of Jesus,’ learning of Him, ‘clothed and in his right mind.’ He has been brought to God, restored to self, to reason, and to human society — and all this by Jesus, at Whose Feet he is gratefully, humbly sitting, ‘a disciple.’ Is He not then the Very Son of God? Viewing this miracle, as an historical fact, viewing it as a Parabolic Miracle, viewing it also as symbolic of what has happened in all ages — is He not the Son of the Most High God? And is there not now, on His part, in the morning-light the same calmness and majesty of conscious Almighty Power as on the evening before, when He rebuked the storm and calmed the sea?

One other point as regards the healing of this demonism deserves special consideration. Contrary to what was commonly the case, when the evil spirits came out of the demonized, there was no paroxysm of *physical* distress. Was it then so, that the more complete and lasting the demoniac possession, the less of purely physical symptoms attended it?

But now from town and country have they come, who had been startled by the tidings which those who fed the swine had brought. We may contrast the scene with that of the shepherds when on Bethlehem’s plains the great revelation had come to them, and they had seen the Divine Babe laid in the manger, and had worshipped. Far other were the tidings which these herdsmen brought, and their effect. It is not necessary to suppose, that their request that Jesus would depart out of their coasts was prompted only by the loss of the herd of swine.^{f1352} There could be no doubt in their

minds, that One possessing supreme and unlimited power was in their midst. Among men superstitious, and unwilling to submit absolutely to the Kingdom which Christ brought, there could only be one effect of what they had heard, and now witnessed in the person of the healed demonized — awe and fear! The ‘Depart from me, for I am a sinful man,’ is the natural expression of a mind conscious of sin when brought into contact with the Divine, Whose supreme and absolute Power is realized as hostile. And this feeling would be greatly increased, in measure as the mind was under the influence of superstitious fears.

In such place and circumstances Jesus could not have continued. And, as He entered the ship, the healed demonized humbly, earnestly entreated, that he might go with his Savior. It would have seemed to him, as if he could not bear to lose his new found happiness; as if there were calm, safety, and happiness only in His Presence; not far from Him — not among those wild mountains and yet wilder men. Why should he be driven from His fellowship, who had so long been an outcast from that of his fellow-men, and why again left to himself? So, perhaps, should we have reasoned and spoken; so too often do we reason and speak, as regards ourselves or those we love. Not so He Who appoints alike our discipline and our work. To go back, now healed, to his own, and to publish there, in the city, nay — through the whole of the large district of the ten confederate cities, the Decapolis — how great things Jesus had done for him, such was henceforth to be his life-work. In this there would be both safety and happiness.

‘And all men did marvel.’ And presently Jesus Himself came back into that Decapolis, where the healed demonized had prepared the way for Him. ^{f1354}

CHAPTER 26

THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN— CHRIST’S PERSONAL APPEARANCE — THE RAISING OF JAIRUS’ DAUGHTER

(St. ~~408~~ Matthew 9:18-26; St. ~~412~~ Mark 5:21-43; St. ~~480~~ Luke 8:40-56.)

THERE seems remarkable correspondence between the two miracles which Jesus had wrought on leaving Capernaum and those which He did on His return. In one sense they are complementary to each other. The stilling of the storm and the healing of the demonized were manifestations of the absolute power inherent in Christ; the recovery of the woman and the raising of Jairus’ daughter, evidence of the absolute efficacy of faith. The unlikelieness of dominion over the storm, and of command over a legion of demons, answers to that of recovery obtained in such a manner, and of restoration when disease had passed into actual death. Even the circumstances seem to correspond, though at opposite poles; in the one case, the Word spoken to the unconscious element, in the other the touch of the unconscious Christ; in the one case the absolute command of Christ over a world of resisting demons, in the other absolute certainty of faith as against the hostile element, of actual fact. Thus the Divine character of the Savior appears in the absoluteness of His Omnipotence, and the Divine character of His Mission in the all-powerfulness of faith which it called forth.

On the shore at Capernaum many were gathered on the morning after the storm. It may have been, that the boats which had accompanied His had returned to friendly shelter, ere the storm had risen to full fury, and had brought anxious tidings of the storm out on the Lake. There they were gathered now in the calm morning, friends eagerly looking out for the well-known boat that bore the Master and His disciples. And as it came in sight, making again for Capernaum, the multitude also would gather in waiting for the return of Him, Whose words and deeds were indeed mysteries, but mysteries of the Kingdom. And quickly, as He again stepped on the well-known shore, was He welcomed, surrounded, soon ‘thronged,’ inconveniently pressed upon, ^{f1355} by the crowd, eager, curious, expectant. It seemed as if they had been all ‘waiting for Him,’ and He had been away all too long for their impatience. The tidings rapidly spread, and reached

two homes where His help was needed; where, indeed, it alone could now be of possible avail. The two most nearly concerned must have gone to seek that help about the same time, and prompted by the same feelings of expectancy. Both Jairus, the Ruler of the Synagogue, and the woman suffering these many years from disease, had faith. But the weakness of the one arose from excess, and threatened to merge into superstition, while the weakness of the other was due to defect, and threatened to end in despair. In both cases faith had to be called out, tried, purified, and so perfected; in both the thing sought for was, humanely speaking, unattainable, and the means employed seemingly powerless; yet, in both, the outward and inward results required were obtained through the power of Christ, and by the peculiar discipline to which, in His all-wise arranging, faith was subjected.

It sounds almost like a confession of absolute defeat, when negative critics (such as *Keim*) have to ground their mythical explanation of this history on the supposed symbolical meaning of what they designate as the fictitious name of the Ruler of the Synagogue — *Jair*, ‘he will give light’ {*Jesu 5 Nazar. 2:2*, p. 472.} — and when they {*Strauss, Leben Jesu 2 p. 135.*} further appeal to the correspondence between the age of the maiden and the years (twelve) during which the woman had suffered from the bloody flux. This coincidence is, indeed, so trivial as not to deserve serious notice; since there can be no conceivable connection between the age of the child and the duration of the woman’s disease, nor, indeed, between the two cases, except in this, that both appealed to Jesus. As regards the name *Jairus*, the supposed symbolism is inapt; while internal reasons are opposed to the hypothesis of its fictitiousness. For, it seems most unlikely that St. Mark and St. Luke would have rendered the discovery of ‘a myth’ easy by needlessly breaking the silence of St. Matthew, and giving the name of so well-known a person as a Synagogue-ruler of Capernaum. And this the more readily, that the name, though occurring in the Old Testament, and in the ranks of the Nationalist party in the last Jewish War, {*Jos. Jewish War 6:1. 8*, close.} was apparently not a common one.^{f1356} But these are comparatively small difficulties in the way of the mythical interpretation.

Jairus, one of the Synagogue-rulers^{f1357} of Capernaum, had an only daughter,^{f1358} who at the time of this narrative had just passed childhood, and reached the period when Jewish Law declared a woman of age.^{f1359} Although St. Matthew, contracting the whole narrative into briefest summary, speaks of her as dead at the time of Jarius’ application to Jesus,

the other two Evangelists, giving fuller details, describe her as on the point of death, literally, ‘at the last breath’ (*in extremis*).^{f1360} Unless her disease had been both sudden and exceedingly rapid, which is barely possible, it is difficult to understand why her father had not on the previous day applied to Jesus, if his faith had been such as is generally supposed. But if, as the whole tenor of the history shows, his faith had been only general and scarcely formed, we can account the more easily for the delay. Only in the hour of supreme need, when his only child lay dying, did he resort to Jesus. There was need to perfect such faith, on the one side into perseverance of assurance, and on the other into energy of trustfulness. The one was accomplished through the delay caused by the application of the woman, the other by the supervention of death during this interval.

There was nothing unnatural or un-Jewish in the application of this Ruler to Jesus. He must have known of the healing of the son of the Court-official, and of the servant of the Centurion, there or in the immediate neighborhood — as it was said, by the mere word of Christ. For there had been no imposition of silence in regard to them, even had such been possible. Yet in both cases the recovery might be ascribed by some to coincidence, by others to answer of prayer. And perhaps this may help us to understand one of the reasons for the prohibition of telling what had been done by Jesus, while in other instances silence was not enjoined. Of course, there were occasions — such as the raising of the young man at Nain and of Lazarus — when the miracle was done so publicly, that a command of this kind would have been impossible. But in other cases may this not be the line of demarcation, that silence was *not* enjoined when a result was achieved which, according to the notions of the time, *might* have been attributed to other than direct Divine Power, while in the latter cases^{f1361} publicity was (whenever possible) forbidden? And this for the twofold reason, that Christ’s Miracles were intended to aid, not to supersede, faith; to direct to the Person and Teaching of Christ, as that which proved the benefit to be real and Divine; not to excite the carnal Jewish expectancies of the people, but to lead in humble discipleship to the Feet of Jesus. In short, if only those were made known which would not necessarily imply *Divine* Power (according to Jewish notions), then would not only the distraction and tumult of popular excitement be avoided, but in each case faith in the Person of Christ be still required, ere the miracles were received as evidence of His Divine claims.^{f1362} And this need of faith was the main point.

That, in view of his child's imminent death, and with the knowledge he had of the 'mighty deeds' commonly reported of Jesus, Jairus should have applied to Him, can the less surprise us, when we remember how often Jesus must, with consent and by invitation of this Ruler, have spoken in the Synagogue; and what irresistible impression His words had made. It is not necessary to suppose, that Jairus was among those elders of the Jews who interceded for the Centurion; the form of his present application seems rather opposed to it. But after all, there was nothing in what he said which a Jew in those days might not have spoken to a Rabbi, who was regarded as Jesus must have been by all in Capernaum who believed not the horrible charge, which the Judæan Pharisees had just raised. Though we cannot point to any instance where the laying on of a great Rabbi's hands was sought for healing, such, combined with prayer, would certainly be in entire accordance with Jewish views at the time. The confidence in the result, expressed by the father in the accounts of St. Mark and St. Matthew, is not mentioned by St. Luke. And perhaps, as being the language of an Eastern, it should not be taken in its strict literality as indicating actual conviction on the part of Jairus, that the laying on of Christ's Hands would certainly restore the maiden.

Be this as it may, when Jesus followed the Ruler to his house, the multitude 'thronging Him' in eager curiosity, another approached Him from out that crowd, whose inner history was far different from that of Jairus. The disease from which this woman had suffered for twelve years would render her Levitically 'unclean.' It must have been not unfrequent in Palestine, and proved as intractable as modern science has found it, to judge by the number and variety of remedies prescribed, and by their character. On one leaf of the Talmud {Shabb. 110 *a* and *b*.} not less than eleven different remedies are proposed, of which at most only six can possibly be regarded as astringents or tonics, while the rest are merely the outcome of superstition, to which resort is had in the absence of knowledge.^{f1363} But what possesses real interest is, that, in all cases where astringents or tonics are prescribed, it is ordered, that, while the woman takes the remedy, she is to be addressed in the words: 'Arise (*Qum*) from thy flux.' It is not only that psychical means are apparently to accompany the therapeutical in this disease, but the coincidence in the command, Arise (*Qum*), with the words used by Christ in raising Jairus' daughter is striking. But here also we mark only contrast to the magical cures of the Rabbis. For Jesus neither used remedies, nor spoke the word *Qum* to her who had

come ‘in the press behind’ to touch for her healing ‘the fringe of His outer garment.’

As this is almost the only occasion on which we can obtain a glimpse of Christ’s outward appearance and garb, it may be well to form such accurate conception of it, as is afforded by a knowledge of the dress of the ancient Hebrews. The Rabbis laid it down as a rule, that the learned ought to be most careful in their dress. It was a disgrace if a scholar walked abroad with clouted shoes; ^{f1364} to wear dirty clothes deserved death; {Shabb. 114 *a*} for ‘the glory of God was man, and the glory of man was his dress.’ This held specially true of the Rabbi, whose appearance might otherwise reflect on the theological profession. It was the general rule to eat and drink below (or else according to) a man’s means, but to dress and lodge above them. {Babha Mez. 52 *a*; Chull. 84 *b*.} ^{f1365} For, in these four things a man’s character might be learned; at his cups, in many matters, when he was angry and by his ragged dress. Nay, ‘The clothing of the wife of a *Chabher* (learned associate) is of greater importance than the life of the ignorant (rustic), for the sake of the dignity of the learned’ {Jer. Horay. 48 *a*, 4 lines from bottom.} Accordingly, the Rabbis were wont to wear such dress by which they might be distinguished. At a latter period they seem at their ordination to have been occasionally arrayed in a mantle of gold-stuff. {Babha Mez. 85 *a*.} Perhaps a distinctive garment, most likely a head-gear, was worn, even by ‘rulers’ (‘the elder,’ [^]*qz*), at their ordination. ^{f1366} The Palestinian *Nasi*, or President of the Sanhedrin, also had a distinctive dress, {Ber. 28 *a*.} and the head of the Jewish community in Babylon a distinctive girdle. ^{f1367}

In referring to the dress which may on a sabbath be saved from a burning house — not, indeed, by carrying it, but by successively putting it on, no fewer than eighteen articles are mentioned. {Shabb 120 *d*; Jer. Shabb. 15 *d*}. If the meaning of all the terms could be accurately ascertained, we should know precisely what the Jews in the second century, and presumably earlier, wore, from the shoes and stockings on their feet to the gloves ^{f1368} on the hands. Unfortunately, many of these designations are in dispute. Nor must it be thought that, because there are eighteen names, the dress of an Israelite consisted of so many separate pieces. Several of them apply to different shapes or kinds of the same under or upper garments, while the list indicates their extreme number and variety rather than the ordinary dress worn. The latter consisted, to judge by the directions given for undressing and dressing in the bathroom, of six, or perhaps more

generally, of five articles: the shoes, the head-covering, the *Tallith* or upper cloak, the girdle, the *Chalug* or under-dress, and the *Aphqarsin* or innermost covering. {Deiekh Erest R. x p. 33 d.} As regarded shoes, a man should sell his very roof-tree for them, ^{f1369} although he might have to part with them for food if he were in a weak condition through blood-letting. {Shabb. 129 a; comp. Pes. 112 a.} But it was not the practice to provide more than one pair of shoes, {Jer. Shabb. 6:2} and to this may have referred the injunction {St. ~~<000>~~ Matthew 10:10} of Christ to the Apostle not to provide shoes for their journey, or else to the well-known distinction between shoes (*Manalim*) and sandals (*Sandalim*). The former, which were sometimes made of very coarse material, covered the whole foot, and were specially intended for winter or rainy weather; while the sandals, which only protected the soles and sides of the feet, were specially for summer use. {B. Bathra 58 a, lines 2 and 3 from top.}

In regard to the covering of the head, it was deemed a mark of disrespect to walk abroad, or to pass a person, with bared head. ^{f1370} Slaves covered their heads in presence of their heads in presence of their masters, and the Targum Onkelos indicates Israel's freedom by paraphrasing the expression they 'went out with a high hand' {~~<048>~~ Exodus 14:8.} by 'with uncovered head' ^{f1371} The ordinary covering of the head was the so-called *Sudar* (or Sudarium), a kerchief twisted into a turban, and which might also be worn round the neck. A kind of hat was also in use, either of light material or of felt (*Aphilyon shel rosh*, or *Philyon*). {Kel. 39:1.} The *Sudar* was twisted by Rabbis in a peculiar manner to distinguish them from others. {Pes. 111 b. See also the somewhat profane etymology of *arws* in Shabb. 77 b, *yh rws wyaryl* } We read besides of a sort of cap or hood attached to some kinds of outer or of inner garments.

Three, or else four articles commonly constituted the dress of the body. First came the under-garment, commonly the *Chalug* or the *Kittuna* ^{f1372} (The Biblical *Kethoneth*), from which latter some have derived the word 'cotton.' The *Chalug* might be of linen or of wool. {Jer. Shan. 20 c, bottom.} The sages wore it down to the feet. It was covered by the upper garment or *Tallith* to within about a handbreath. The *Chalug* lay close to the body, and had no other opening than that round the neck and for the arms. At the bottom it had a kind of hem. To possess only one such 'coat' or inner garment was a mark of poverty. {Meod. K.14 a.} Hence, when the Apostles were sent on their temporary mission, they were directed not

to take 'two coats.' {St. ^{<1000>}Matthew 10:10, and parallels.} Closely similar to, if not identical with, the *Chaluq*, was the ancient garment mentioned in the Old Testament as *Kethoneth*, to which the Greek 'Chiton' (χιτών) corresponds. As the garment which our Lord wore, {St. ^{<6023>}John 19:23.} ^{f1373} and those of which He spoke to His Apostles are designated by that name, we conclude that it represents the well-known *Kethoneth* or Rabbinic *Kittuna*. This might be of almost any material, even leather, though it was generally of wool or flax. It was sleeved, close-fitting, reached to the ankles, and was fastened round the loins, or just under the breast, by a girdle. One kind of the latter, the *Pundah* or *Aphundah*, ^{f1374} was provided with pockets or other receptacles, ^{f1375} and hence might not be worn outside by those who went into the Temple, {Jer. Ber. 14 c, top.} probably to indicate that he who went to worship should not be engaged in, nor bear mark of, any other occupation.

Of the two other garments mentioned as parts of a man's *toilette*, the *Aphqarsin* or *Aphikarsus* seems to have been an article of luxury rather than of necessity. Its precise purpose is difficult to determine. A comparison of the passages in which the term occurs conveys the impression, that it was a large kerchief used partly as a head-gear, and which hung down and was fastened under the right arm. {Kel. 29:1; Ber. 23 b; 24 b, in the sense of kerchief worn in an accessible position; Pesiq. 15 b, as lying close to the body and yet contracting dust; Jer. Ber. 4 c, line 14 from top, as used for wrapping the upper part of the body.} ^{f1376} Probably it was also used for the upper part of the body. But the circumstance that, unlike the other articles of dress, it need not be rent in mourning, {Jer. Moed, K. 83 d.} and that, when worn by females, it was regarded as a mark of wealth, {Nidd. 48 l.} shows that it was not a necessary article of dress, and hence that, in all likelihood, it was not worn by Christ. It was otherwise with the *upper garment*. Various shapes and kinds of such were in use, from the coarser *Boresin* and *Bardessin*, — the modern *Burnoose* — upwards. The *Gelima* was a cloak of which 'the border,' or 'hem,' is specially mentioned (אמיל ג יל ופּיבּוּ). {Sanh. 102 b, and often.} The *Gunda* was a peculiarly Pharisaic garb. {Sot. 22 b.} But the upper garment which Jesus wore would be either the so-called *Goltha*, or, most likely, the *Tallith*. Both the *Goltha* {Jer, Sanh. 28 c.} and the *Tallith* {Menach. 37 b.} were provided, on the four borders, with the so-called *Tsitsith*, or 'fringes.' These were attached to the four corners of the outer dress, in supposed fulfilment of the command, ^{<41538>}Numbers 15:38-41;

¹⁵²¹²Deuteronomy 22:12. At first, this observance seems to have been comparatively simple. The question as to the number of filaments on these ‘fringes’ was settled in accordance with the teaching of the School of Shammai. Four filaments (not three, as the Hillelites proposed), each of four finger-lengths (these, as later tradition put it, doubled), and attached to the four corners of what must be a strictly square garment — such were the earliest rules on the subject. {Siphre, ed. Friedmann, p. 117 *a*.} The Mishnah leaves it still a comparatively open question, whether these filaments were to be blue or white. {Menach. 4:1.} But the Targum makes a strong point of it as between Moses and Korah, that there was to be a filament of hyacinth color among four of white. {Targ. Ps., Jon. on ¹⁴¹⁴²Numbers 16:2.} It seems even to imply the peculiar symbolical mode of knotting them at present in use. {u. s. on ¹⁴¹⁵⁸Numbers 15:38.} Further symbolic details were, of course, added in the course of time. ^{f1377} As these fringes were attached to the corners of any square garment, the question, whether the upper garment which Jesus wore was the *Goltha* or the *Tallith*, is of secondary importance. But as all that concerns His Sacred Person is of deepest interest, we may be allowed to state our belief in favor of the *Tallith*. Both are mentioned as distinctive dresses of teachers, but the *Goltha* (so far as it differed from the *Tallith*) seems the more peculiarly Rabbinic.

We can now form an approximate idea of the outward appearance of Jesus on that spring-morning amidst the throng at Capernaum. He would, we may safely assume, go about in the ordinary, although not in the more ostentatious, dress, worn by the Jewish teachers of Galilee. His head-gear would probably be the *Sudar* (Sudarium) would into a kind of turban, or perhaps the *Maaphoreth*, ^{f1378} which seems to have served as a covering for the head, and to have descended over the back of the neck and shoulders, somewhat like the Indian pugaree. His feet were probably shod with *sandals*. The *Chaluq*, or more probably the *Kittuna*, which formed his inner garment, must have been close-fitting, and descended to His feet, since it was not only so worn by teachers, but was regarded as absolutely necessary for any one who would publicly read or ‘Targum’ the Scriptures, or exercise any function in the Synagogue. {Tos. Megill. 4:p. 45 *b*, lines 17 and 16 from bottom.} As we know, it ‘was without seam, woven from the top throughout;’ {St. ¹⁴¹²³John 19:23.} and this closely accords with the texture of these garments. Round the middle it would be fastened with a girdle. ^{f1379} Over this inner, He would most probably wear the square outer

garment, or *Tallith*, with the customary fringes of four long white threads with one of hyacinth knotted together on each of the four corners. There is reason to believe, that three square garments were made with these ‘fringes,’ although, by way of ostentation, the Pharisees made them particularly wide so as to attract attention, just as they made their phylacteries broad. {St. ^{
}Matthew 18:5.} Although Christ only denounced the latter practice, not the phylacteries themselves, it is impossible to believe that Himself ever wore them, either on the forehead or the arm. ^{f1380} There was certainly no warrant for them in Holy Scripture, and only Pharisee externalism could represent their use as fulfilling the import of ^{
}Exodus 13:9, 16, ^{
}Deuteronomy 6:8; 11:18. The admission that neither the officiating priests, nor the representatives of the people, wore them in the Temple, {Zebhach. 19 *a, b.*} seems to imply that this practice was not quite universal. For our part, we refuse to believe that Jesus, like the Pharisees, appeared wearing phylacteries every day and all day long, or at least a great part of the day. For such was the ancient custom, and not merely; as the modern practice, to wear them only at prayer. ^{f1381}

One further remark may be allowed before dismissing this subject. Our inquiries enable us in this matter also to confirm the accuracy of the Fourth Gospel. We read {St. ^{
}John 19:23.} that the quaternion of soldiers who crucified Christ made division of the riches of His poverty, taking each one part of His dress, while for the fifth, which, if divided, would have had to be rent in pieces, they cast lots. This incidental remark carries evidence of the Judæan authorship of the Gospel in the accurate knowledge which it displays. The four pieces of dress to be divided would be the head-gear, the more expensive sandals or shoes, the long girdle, and the coarse *Tallith* — all about equal in value. ^{f1382} And the fifth undivided and, comparatively, most expensive garment. ‘without seam, woven from the top throughout,’ probably of wool, as befitted the season of the year, was the *Kittuna*, or inner garment. How strange, that, what would have been of such priceless value to Christendom, should have been divided as the poor booty of a rough, unappreciative soldiery! Yet how well for us, since not even the sternest warning could have kept within the bounds of mere reverence the veneration with which we should have viewed and handled that which He wore, Who died for us on the Cross.

Can we, then, wonder that this Jewish woman, ‘having heard the things concerning Jesus,’ with her imperfect knowledge, in the weakness of her

strong faith, thought that, if she might but touch His garment, she would be made whole? It is but what we ourselves might think, if He were still walking on earth among men: it is but what, in some form or other, we still feel when in the weakness — the rebound or diastole — of our faith it seems to us, as if the want of this touch in not outwardly-perceived help or Presence left us miserable and sick, while even one real touch, if it were only of His garment, one real act of contact, however mediate, would bring us perfect healing. And in some sense it really is so. For, assuredly, the Lord cannot be touched by disease and misery, without healing coming from Him, for He is the God-Man. And He is also the loving, pitying Savior. Who disdains not, nor turns from our weakness in the manifestation of our faith, even as He turned not from hers who touched His garment for her healing.

We can picture her to our minds as, mingling with those who thronged and pressed upon the Lord, she put forth her hand and ‘touched the border of His garment,’ most probably ^{f1383} the long *Tsitsith* of one of the corners of the *Tallith*. We can understand how, with a disease which not only rendered her Levitically defiling, but where womanly shamefacedness would make public speech so difficult, she, thinking of Him Whose Word, spoken at a distance, had brought healing, might thus seek to have her heart’s desire. What strong faith to expect help where all human help, so long and earnestly sought, had so signally failed! And what strong faith to expect, that even contact with Him, the bare touch of His garment, would carry such Divine Power as to make her ‘whole.’ Yet in this very strength lay also its weakness. She believed so much in Him, that she felt as if it needed not personal appeal to Him; she felt so deeply the hindrances to her making request of Himself, that, believing so strongly in Him, she deemed it sufficient to touch, not even Himself, but that which in itself had no power nor value, except as it was in contact with His Divine Person. But it is here that her faith was beset by two-fold danger. In its excess it might degenerate into superstition, as trees in their vigor put forth shoots, which, unless they be cut off, will prevent the fruit-bearing, and even exhaust the life of the tree. Not the garments in which He appeared among men, and which touched His Sacred Body, nor even that Body, but Himself brings healing. Again, there was the danger of losing sight of that which, as the moral element, is necessary in faith: personal application to, and personal contact with, Christ.

And so it is to us also. As we realize the Mystery of the Incarnation, His love towards, and His Presence with, His own, and the Divine Power of the Christ, we cannot think too highly of all that is, or brings, in contact with Him. The Church, the Sacraments, the Apostolic Ministry of His Institution — in a word, the grand historic Church, which is alike His Dwelling-place, His Witness, and His Representative on earth, ever since He instituted it, endowed it with the gift of the Holy Spirit, and hallowed it by the fulfilled promise of His Eternal Presence, is to us what the garment He wore was to her who touched Him. We shall think highly of all this in measure as we consciously think highly of Him. His Bride the Church; the Sacraments which are the fellowship of His Body and Blood, of His Crucifixion and Resurrection; the Ministry and Embassy of Him, committed to the Apostles, and ever since continued with such direction and promise, cannot be of secondary importance — must be very real and full of power, since they are so connected, and bring us into such connection with Him: the spirituo-physical points of contact between Him, Who is the God-man, and those who, being men, are also the children of God. Yet in this strength of our faith may also lie its danger if not its weakness. Through excess it may pass into superstition, which is the attachment of power to anything other than the Living God; or else, in the consciousness of our great disease, want of courage might deprive faith of its moral element in personal dealing and personal contact with Christ.

Very significantly to us who, in our foolish judging and merciless condemning of one another, ever re-enacted the Parable of the Two Debtors, the Lord did not, as Pseudo-orthodoxy would prescribe it, disappoint her faith for the weakness of its manifestation. To have disappointed her faith, which was born of such high thoughts of Him, would have been to deny Himself, and he cannot deny Himself. But very significantly, also, while He disappointed not her faith, He corrected the error of its direction and manifestation. And to this His subsequent bearing toward her was directed. No sooner had she so touched the border of His garment than ‘she knew in the body that she was healed of the scourge.’

^{f1384} No sooner, also, had she so touched the border of His garment than *He* knew, ‘perceived in Himself,’ what had taken place: the forthgoing of the Power that is from out of Him. ^{f1385}

Taking this narrative in its true literality, there is no reason to overweight and mar it by adding what is not conveyed in the text. There is nothing in the language of St. Mark ^{f1386} (as correctly rendered), nor of St. Luke, to

oblige us to conclude that this forthgoing of Power, which He perceived in Himself, had been through an act, of the full meaning of which Christ was unconscious — in other words, that He was ignorant of the person who, and the reason why, she Had touched Him. In short, ‘the forthgoing of the Power that is out of Him’ was neither unconscious nor unwilling on His part. It was caused by her faith, not by her touch. ‘Thy faith hath made thee whole.’ And the question of Jesus could not have been misleading, when ‘straightway’ ^{f1387} He ‘turned Him about in the crowd and said, Who touched My garments?’ That He knew who had done it, and only wished, through self-confession, to bring her to clearness in the exercise of her faith, appears from what is immediately added: ‘And He looked round about,’ not to see who had done it, but ‘to see her that had done this thing.’ And as His look of unspoken appeal was at last fixed on her alone in all that crowd, which, as Peter rightly said, was thronging and pressing Him, ‘the woman saw that she was not hid,’ {St. ~~<BM>~~ Luke 8:47.} and came forward to make full confession. Thus, while in His mercy He had borne with her weakness, and in His faithfulness not disappointed her faith, its twofold error was also corrected. She learned that it was not from the garment, but from the Savior, that the Power proceeded; she learned also, that it was not the touch of it, but the faith in Him, that made whole, and such faith must ever be of personal dealing with Him. And so He spoke to her the Word of twofold help and assurance: ‘Thy faith hath made thee whole, go forth into peace,’ ^{f1388} and be healed of thy scourge.’

Brief as is the record of this occurrence, it must have caused considerable delay in the progress of our Lord to the house of Jairus. For in the interval the maiden, who had been at the last gasp when her father went to entreat the help of Jesus, had not only died, but the house of mourning was already filled with relatives, hired mourners, wailing women, and musicians, in preparation for the funeral. The intentional delay of Jesus when summoned to Lazarus {St. ~~<BM>~~ John 11:6.} leads us to ask, whether similar purpose may not have influenced His conduct in the present instance. But even were it otherwise, no outcome of God’s Providence is of chance, but each is designed. The circumstances, which in their concurrence make up an event, may all be of natural occurrence, but their conjunction is of Divine ordering and to a higher purpose, and this constitutes Divine Providence. It was in the interval of this delay that the messengers came, who informed Jairus of the actual death of his child. Jesus overheard ^{f1389} it, as they whispered to the Ruler not to trouble the Rabbi any further, ^{f1390} but He

heeded it not, save so far as it affected the father. The emphatic admonition, not to fear, only to believe, gives us an insight into the threatening failure of the Ruler's faith; perhaps, also, into the motive which prompted the delay of Christ. The utmost need, which would henceforth require the utmost faith on the part of Jairus had now come. But into that, which was to pass within the house, no stranger must intrude. Even of the Apostles only those, who now for the first time became, and henceforth continued, the innermost circle, ^{f1391} might witness, without present danger to themselves or others, what was about to take place. How Jesus dismissed the multitude, or else kept them at bay, or where He parted from all his disciples except Peter, James, and John, does not clearly appear, and, indeed, is of no importance. He may have left the nine Apostles with the people, or outside the house, or parted from them in the courtyard of Jairus' house before he entered the inner apartments. ^{f1392}

Within, 'the tumult' and weeping, the wail of the mourners, real or hired, and the melancholy sound of the mourning flutes ^{f1393} — sad preparation for, and pageantry of, an Eastern funeral — broke with dismal discord on the majestic calm of assured victory over death, with which Jesus had entered the house of mourning. But even so He would tell it them, as so often in like circumstances He tells it to us, that the damsel was not dead, but only sleeping. The Rabbis also frequently have the expression 'to sleep' (*demakh dmr*, or *dwmr*, when the sleep is overpowering and oppressive), instead of 'to die.' It may well have been that Jesus made us of this word of double meaning in some such manner as this: *Talyetha dimkath*, 'the maiden sleepeth.' And they understood Him well in their own way, yet understood Him not at all.

As so many of those who now hear this word, they to whom it was then spoken, in their coarse realism, laughed Him to scorn. For did they not verily know that she had actually died, even before the messengers had been despatched to prevent the needless trouble of His coming? Yet even this their scorn served a higher purpose. For it showed these two things: that to the certain belief of those in the house the maiden was really dead, and that the Gospel-writers regarded the raising of the dead as not only beyond the ordinary range of Messianic activity, but as something miraculous even among the miracles of Christ. And this also is evidential, at least so far as to prove that the writers recorded the event not lightly, but with full knowledge of the demand which it makes on our faith.

The first thing to be done by Christ was to ‘put out’ the mourners, whose proper place this house no longer was, and who by their conduct had proved themselves unfit to be witnesses of Christ’s great manifestation. The impression which the narrative leaves on the mind is, that all this while the father of the maiden was stupefied, passive, rather than active in the matter. The great fear, which had come upon him when the messengers apprized him of his only child’s death, seemed still to numb his faith. He followed Christ without taking any part in what happened; he witnessed the pageantry of the approaching obsequies in his house without interfering; he heard the scorn which Christ’s majestic declaration of the victory over death provoked, without checking it. The fire of his faith was that of ‘dimly burning flax.’ { ~~39B~~ Isaiah 42:3. } But ‘He will not quench’ it.

He now led the father and the mother into the chamber where the dead maiden lay, followed by the three Apostles, witnesses of His chiefest working and of His utmost earthly glory, but also of His inmost sufferings. Without doubt or hesitation He took her by the hand and spoke only these two words: *Talyetha Qum* [*Kum*] (*myq atyl f* ^{f1394}), Maiden, arise! ‘And straightway the damsel arose.’ But the great astonishment which came upon them, as well as the ‘strait charge’ that no man should know it, are further evidence, if such were required, how little their faith had been prepared for that which in its weakness was granted to it. And thus Jesus, as He had formerly corrected in the woman that weakness of faith which came through very excess, so now in the Ruler of the Synagogue the weakness which was by failure. And so ‘He hath done all things well: He maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.’ { St. ~~4075~~ Mark 7:37. }

How Jesus conveyed Himself away, whether through another entrance into the house, or by ‘the road of the roofs,’ we are not told. But assuredly, He must have avoided the multitude. Presently we find Him far from Capernaum. Probably He had left it immediately on quitting the house of Jairus. But what of that multitude? The tidings must have speedily reached them, that the daughter of the Synagogue-Ruler was not dead. Yet it had been straightly charged that none of them should be informed, how it had come to pass that she lived. They were then with this intended mystery before them. *She was not dead*: thus much was certain. The Christ had, ere leaving that chamber, given command that meat should be brought her; and, as that direction must have been carried out by one of the attendants, this would become immediately known to all that household. Had she then not really died, but only been sleeping? Did Christ’s words of double

meaning refer to literal sleep? Here then was another Parable of twofold different bearing: to them that had hearts to understand, and to them who understood not. In any case, their former scorn had been misplaced; in any case, the Teacher of Nazareth was far other than all the Rabbis. In what Name, and by what Power, did He come and act? Who was He really? Had they but known of the '*Talyetha Qum*,' and how these two words had burst open the two-leaved doors of death and Hades! Nay, but it would have only ended in utter excitement and complete misunderstanding, to the final impossibility of the carrying out of Christ's Mission. For, the full as well as the true knowledge, that He was the Son of God, could only come after His contest and suffering. And our faith also in Him is first of the suffering Savior, and then of the Son of God. Thus was it also from the first. It was through what He did for them that they learned Who He was. Had it been otherwise, the full blaze of the Sun's glory would have so dazzled them, that they could not have seen the Cross.

Yet to all time has this question engaged the minds of men: Was the maiden really dead, or did she only sleep? With it this other and kindred one is connected: Was the healing of the woman miraculous, or only caused by the influence of mind over body, such as is not unfrequently witnessed, and such as explains modern so-called miraculous cures, where only superstition perceives supernatural agency? But these very words 'Influence of mind over body,' with which we are so familiar, are they not, so to speak, symbolic and typical? Do they not point to the possibility, and, beyond it, to the fact of such influence of the God-Man, of the command which he wielded over the body? May not command of soul over body be part of unfallen Man's original inheritance; all most fully realized in the Perfect Man, the God-Man, to Whom has been given the absolute rule of all things, and Who has it in virtue of His Nature? These are only dim feelings after possible higher truths.

No one who carefully reads this history can doubt, that the Evangelists, at least, viewed this healing as a real miracle, and intended to tell it as such. Even the statement of Christ, that by the forthgoing of Power He knew the moment when the woman touched the hem of His garment, would render impossible the view of certain critics (*Keim* and others), that the cure was the effect of natural causes: expectation acting through the imagination on the nervous system, and so producing the physical results. But even so, and while these writers reiterate certain old cavils ^{f1395} propounded by *Strauss*, and by him often derived from the ancient armory of our own Deists (such

as *Woolston*), they admit being so impressed with the ‘simple,’ ‘natural,’ and ‘life-like’ cast of the narrative, that they contend for its historic truth. But the great leader of negativism, *Strauss*, has shown that any natural explanation of the event is opposed to the whole tenor of the narrative, indeed of the Gospel-history; so that the alternative is its simple acceptance or its rejection. *Strauss* boldly decides for the latter, but in so doing is met by the obvious objection, that his denial does not rest on any historical foundation. We can understand, how a legend could gather around historical facts and embellish them, but not how a narrative so entirely without precedent in the Old Testament, and so opposed, not only to the common Messianic expectation, but to Jewish thought, could have been invented to glorify a Jewish Messiah. ^{f1396}

As regards the restoration to life of *Jairus’* daughter, there is a like difference in the negative school (between *Keim* and *Strauss*). One party insists that the maiden only seemed, but was not really dead, a view open also to this objection, that it is manifestly impossible by such devices to account for the raising of the young man at *Nain*, or that of *Lazarus*. On the other hand, *Strauss* treats the whole as a myth. It is well, that in this case, he should have condescended to argument in support of his view, appealing to the expectancy created by like miracles of *Elijah* and *Elisha*, and to the general belief at that time, that the Messiah would raise the dead. For, the admitted differences between the recorded circumstances of the miracles of *Elijah* and *Elisha* and those of Christ are so great, that another negative critic (*Keim*) finds proof of imitation in their contrasts! {*Jesu* 5 *Nazar.* 2:2 p. 475.} But the appeal to Jewish belief at that time tells, if possible, even more strongly against the hypothesis in question (of *Keim* and *Strauss*). It is, to say the least, doubtful whether Jewish theology generally ascribed to the Messiah the raising of the dead. ^{f1397} There are isolated statements to that effect, but the majority of opinions is, that God would Himself raise the dead. But even those passages in which this is attributed to the Messiah tell against the assertions of *Strauss*. For, the resurrection to which they refer is that of *all the dead* (whether at the end of the present age, or of the world), and not of single individuals. To the latter there is not the faintest allusion in Jewish writings, and it may be safely asserted that such a dogma would have been foreign, even incongruous, to Jewish theology.

The unpleasant task of stating and refuting these objections seemed necessary, if only to show that, as of old so now, this history cannot be

either explained or accounted for. It must be accepted or rejected, accordingly as we think of Christ. Admittedly, it formed part of the original tradition and belief of the Church. And it is recorded with such details of names, circumstances, time and place, as almost to court inquiry, and to render fraud well-nigh impossible. And it is so recorded by all the three Evangelists, with such variations, or rather, additions, of details as only to confirm the credibility of the narrators, by showing their independence of each other. Lastly, it fits into the whole history of the Christ, and into this special period of it; and it sets before us the Christ and His bearing in a manner, which we instinctively feel to be accordant with what we know and expect. Assuredly, it implies determined rejection of the claims of the Christ, and that on grounds, not of history, but of preconceived opinions hostile to the Gospel, not to see and adore in it the full manifestation of the Divine Savior of the world, ‘Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.’ {~~5010~~2 Timothy 1:10} And with this belief our highest thoughts of the potential for humanity, and our dearest hopes for ourselves and those we love, are inseparably connected.

CHAPTER 27

SECOND VISIT TO NAZARETH — THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE.

(St. ~~<005>~~ Matthew 13:54-58; ~~<000>~~ 10:1, 5-42; 11:1;
St. ~~<000>~~ Mark 6:1-13; St. ~~<000>~~ Luke 9:1-6.)

IT almost seems, as if the departure of Jesus from Capernaum marked a crisis in the history of that town. From henceforth it ceases to be the center of His activity, and is only occasionally, and in passing, visited. Indeed, the concentration and growing power of Pharisaic opposition, and the proximity of Herod's residence at Tiberias ^{f1398} would have rendered a permanent stay there impossible at this stage in our Lord's history. Henceforth, His Life is, indeed, not purely missionary, but He has no certain dwelling-place: in the sublime pathos of His own language, 'He hath not where to lay His Head.'

The notice in St. Mark's Gospel, {St. ~~<000>~~ Mark 6:1.} that His disciples followed Him, seems to connect the arrival of Jesus in 'His own country' (at Nazareth) with the departure from the house of Jairus, into which He had allowed only three of His Apostles to accompany Him. The circumstances of the present visit, as well as the tone of His countrymen at this time, are entirely different from what is recorded of His former sojourn at Nazareth. {St. ~~<006>~~ Luke 4:16-31.} ^{f1399} The tenacious narrowness, and the prejudices, so characteristic of such a town, with its cliques and petty family-pride, all the more self-asserting that the gradation would be almost imperceptible to an outsider, are, of course, the same as on the former visit of Jesus. Nazareth would have ceased to be Nazareth, had its people felt or spoken otherwise than nine or ten months before. That His fame had so grown in the interval, would only stimulate the conceit of the village-town to try, as it were, to construct the great Prophet out of its own building materials, with this additional gratification that He was thoroughly their own, and that they possessed even better materials in their Nazareth. All this is so quite according to life, that the substantial repetition of the former scene in the Synagogue, so far from surprising us, seems only natural. What surprises us is, what He marvelled at: the unbelief of Nazareth, which lay at the foundation of its estimate and treatment of Jesus.

Upon their own showing their unbelief was most unwarrantable. If ever men had the means of testing the claims of Jesus, the Nazarenes possessed them. True, they were ignorant of the miraculous event of His Incarnation; and we can now perceive at least one of the reasons for the mystery, which was allowed to enwrap it, as well as the higher purpose in Divine Providence of His being born, not in Nazareth, but in Bethlehem of Judaea, and of the interval of time between that Birth and the return of His parents from Egypt to Nazareth. Apart from prophecy, it was needful for Nazareth that Christ should have been born in Bethlehem, otherwise the 'mystery of His Incarnation' must have become known. And yet it could not have been made known, alike for the sake of those most nearly concerned, and for that of those who, at that period of His History, could not have understood it; to whom, indeed, it would have been an absolute hindrance to belief in Him. And He could not have returned to Bethlehem, where He was born, to be brought up there, without calling attention to the miracle of His Birth. If, therefore, for reasons easily comprehended, the mystery of His Incarnation was not to be divulged, it was needful that the Incarnate of Nazareth should be born at Bethlehem, and the Infant of Bethlehem be brought up at Nazareth.

By thus withdrawing Him successively from one and the other place, there was really none on earth who knew of His miraculous Birth, except the Virgin-Mother, Joseph, Elizabeth, and probably Zacharias. The vision and guidance vouchsafed to the shepherds on that December night did not really disclose the mystery of His Incarnation. Remembering their religious nations, it would not leave on them quite the same impression as on us. It might mean much, or it might mean little, in the present: time would tell. In those lands the sand buries quickly and buries deep — preserving, indeed, but also hiding what it covers. And the sands of thirty years had buried the tale which the shepherds had brought; the wise men from the East had returned another way; the excitement which their arrival in Jerusalem and its object had caused, was long forgotten. Messianic expectations and movements were of constant recurrence: the religious atmosphere seemed charged with such elements; and the political changes and events of the day were too engrossing to allow of much attention to an isolated report, which, after all, might mean little, and which certainly was of the long past. To keep up attention, there must be communication; and that was precisely what was wanting in this instance. The reign of Herod was tarnished by many suspicious and murders such as those of Bethlehem. Then intervened

the death of Herod — while the carrying of Jesus into Egypt and His non-return to Bethlehem formed a complete break in the continuity of His History. Between obscure Bethlehem in the far south, and obscure Nazareth in the far north, there was no communication such as between towns in our own land, and they who had sought the Child's life, as well as they who might have worshipped Him, must have been dead. The aged parents of the Baptist cannot have survived the thirty years which lay between the Birth of Christ and the commencement of His Ministry. We have already seen reason for supposing that *Joseph* had died before. None, therefore, knew all except the Virgin-Mother; and she would hide it the deeper in her heart, the more years passed, and she increasingly felt, as they passed, that, both in His early obscurity and in His later manifestation, she could not penetrate into the real meaning of that mystery, with which she was so closely connected. She could not understand it; how dared she speak of it? She could not understand; nay, we can almost perceive, how she might even misunderstand — not the fact, but the meaning and the purport of what had passed.

But in Nazareth they knew nothing of all this; and of Him only as that Infant Whom His parents, Joseph the carpenter and Mary, had brought with them months after they had first left Nazareth. Jewish law and custom made it possible, that they might have been married long before. And now they only knew of this humble family, that they lived in retirement, and that sons and daughters had grown around their humble board. Of Jesus, indeed, they must have heard that He was not like others around — so quite different in all ways, as He grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man. Then came that strange tarrying behind on His first visit to Jerusalem, when His parents had to return to seek, and at last found Him in the temple. This, also was only strange, though perhaps not strange in a child such as Jesus; and of His own explanation of it, so full of deepest meaning, they might not have heard. If we may draw probable, though not certain, inferences, after that only these three outward circumstances in the history of the family might have been generally noticed: that Jesus followed the occupation of His adoptive father; {St. ~~408~~ Mark 6:3.} that Joseph had died; and that the mother and 'brethren' of Jesus had left Nazareth, ^{f1400} while His 'sisters' apparently continued there, being probably married to Nazarenes. {St. ~~408~~ Mark 6:3.}

When Jesus had first left Nazareth to seek Baptism at the hands of John) it could scarcely have attracted much attention. Not only did 'the whole

world' go after the Baptist, but, considering what was known of Jesus, His absence from, not His presence at the banks of Jordan, would have surprised the Nazarenes. Then came vague reports of His early doings, and, what probably His countrymen would much more appreciate, the accounts which the Galileans brought back from the Feast of what Jesus had done at Jerusalem. His fame had preceded Him on that memorable Sabbath, when all Nazareth had thronged the Synagogue, curious to hear what the Child of Nazareth would have to say, and still more eager to see what He could do. Of the charm of His words there could be no question. Both what He said and how He said it, was quite other than what they had ever listened to. The difference was not in degree, but in kind: He spoke to them of the Kingdom; yet not as for Israel's glory, but for unspeakable comfort in the soul's deepest need. It was truly wonderful, and that not abstractly, but as on the part of 'Joseph's Son.' That was all they perceived. Of that which they had most come to see there was, and could be, no manifestation, so long as they measured the Prophet by His outward antecedents, forgetful that it was inward kinship of faith, which connected Him that brought the blessing with those who received it.

But this seeming assumption of superiority on the part of Joseph's Son was quite too much for the better classes of Nazareth. It was intolerable, that He should not only claim equality with an Elijah or an Elisha, but place them, the burghers of Nazareth, as it were, outside the pale of Israel, below a heathen man or woman. And so, if He had not, without the show of it, proved the authority and power He possessed, they would have cast Him headlong over the ledge of the hill of their insulted town. And now He had come back to them, after nine or ten months, in totally different circumstances. No one could any longer question His claims, whether for good or for evil. As on the Sabbath He stood up once more in that Synagogue to teach, they were astonished. The rumor must have spread that, notwithstanding all, His own kin — probably His 'sisters,' whom He might have been supposed by many to have come to visit, did not own and honor Him as a Prophet. Or else, had they of His own house purposely spread it, so as not to be involved in His Fate? But the astonishment with which they heard Him on that Sabbath was that of unbelief. The cause was so apparently inadequate to the effect! They knew His supposed parentage and His brothers; His sisters were still with them; and for these many years had they known Him as the carpenter, the son of the carpenter. Whence, then, had 'this One,' 'these things,' 'and what the wisdom which' was

‘given to this One’ — and these mighty works done by His Hands?’ {St. ~~AMP~~ Mark 6:2.}

It was, indeed, more than a difficulty — an impossibility — to account for it on their principles. There could be no delusion, no collusion, no deception. In our modern cant-phraseology, theirs might have been designated Agnosticism and philosophic doubt. But philosophic it certainly was not, any more than much that now passes, because it bears that name; at least, if, according to modern negative criticism, the inexplicable is also the unthinkable. Nor was it really doubt or Agnosticism, any more than much that now covers itself with that garb. It was, what Christ designated it, unbelief, since the questions would have been easily answered — indeed, never have arisen — had they believed that He was the Christ. And the same alternative still holds true. If ‘this One’ is what negative criticism declares Him, which is all that it can know of Him by the outside: the Son of Mary, the Carpenter and Son of the carpenter of Nazareth, Whose family occupied the humblest position among Galileans — then whence this wisdom which, say of it what you will, underlies all modern thinking, and these mighty works, which have molded all modern history? Whence — if He be only what you can see by the outside, and yet His be such wisdom, and such mighty deeds have been wrought by His Hands? Is He only what you say and see, seeing that such results are nowise explicable on such principles; or is He not much more than this — even the Christ of God?

‘And He marvelled because of their unbelief.’ In view of their own reasoning it was most unreasonable. And equally unreasonable is modern unbelief. For, the more strongly negative criticism asserts its position as to the Person of Jesus, the more unaccountable are His Teaching and the results of His Work.

In such circumstances as at Nazareth, nothing could be done by a Christ, in contradistinction to a miracle-monger. It would have been impossible to have finally given up His own town of Nazareth without one further appeal and one further opportunity of repentance. As He had begun, so He closed this part of His Galilean Ministry, by preaching in His own Synagogue of Nazareth. Save in the case of a few who were receptive, on whom He laid His Hands for healing, His visit passed away without such ‘mighty works’ as the Nazarenes had heard of. He will not return again to Nazareth. Henceforth He will make commencement of sending forth His disciples,

partly to disarm prejudices of a personal character, partly to spread the Gospel-tiding farther and wider than he alone could have carried them. For His Heart compassionated the many who were ignorant and out of the way. And the harvest was near, and the harvesting was great, and it was His Harvest, into which He would send forth laborers.

For, although, in all likelihood, the words, from which quotation has just been made, {St. ^{<1086>}Matthew 9:36-38.} were spoken at a later time, {St. ^{<200>}Luke 10:2.} they are so entirely in the spirit of the present Mission of the Twelve, that they, or words to a similar effect, may also have been uttered on the present occasion. Of such seeming repetitions, when the circumstances were analogous, although sometimes with different application of the same many-sided words, there are not a few instances, of which one will presently come under notice. {Comp. St. ^{<1005>}Matthew 10:26 with St. ^{<271>}Luke 12:1, 2.} Truly those to whom the Twelve were sent forth were ‘troubled’ ^{f1401} as well as ‘scattered,’ like sheep that have not a Shepherd, and it was to deliver them from the ‘distress’ caused by ‘grievous wolves,’ and to gather into His fold those that had been scattered abroad, that Jesus sent forth the Twelve with the special commission to which attention will now be directed. Viewing it in its fullest form, {St. ^{<1005>}Matthew 10:5 to the end.} it is to be noted: —

First: That this Discourse of Christ consists of *five* parts: vv. 5 to 15; vv. 16 to 23; vv. 24 to 33; vv. 34 to 39; vv. 40 to the end.

Secondly: That many passages in it occur in different connections in the other two Synoptic Gospels, specially in St. Mark 13 and in St. Luke 12 and 21. From this it may be inferred, either that Jesus spake the same or similar words on more than one occasion (when the circumstances were analogous), or else that St. Matthew grouped together into one Discourse, as being internally connected, sayings that may have been spoken on different occasions. Or else, and this seems to us the most likely, both these inferences may in part be correct. For,

Thirdly: It is evident, that the Discourse reported by St. Matthew goes far beyond that Mission of the Twelve, beyond even that of the Early Church, indeed, sketches the history of the Church’s Mission in a hostile world, up ‘to the end.’ At the same time it is equally evident, that the predictions, warnings, and promises applicable to a later period in the Church’s history, hold equally true in principle in reference to the first Mission of the Twelve; and, conversely, that what specially applied

to it, also holds true in principle of the whole subsequent history of the Church in its relation to a hostile world. Thus, what was specially spoken at this time to the Twelve, has ever since, and rightly, been applied to the Church; while that in it, which specially refers to the Church of the future, would in principle apply also to the Twelve.

Fourthly: This distinction of primary and secondary application in the different parts of the Discourse, and their union in the general principles underlying them, has to be kept in view, if we are to understand this Discourse of Christ. Hence, also, the present and the future seem in it so often to run into each other. The horizon is gradually enlarging throughout the Discourse, but there is no change in the standpoint originally occupied; and so the present merges into the future, and the future mingles with the present. And this, indeed, is also the characteristic of much of Old Testament prophecy, and which made the prophet ever a preacher of the present, even while he was a foreteller of the future.

Lastly: It is evidential of its authenticity, and deserves special notice, that this Discourse, while so un-Jewish in spirit, is more than any other, even more than that on the Mount, Jewish in its forms of thought and modes of expression.

With the help of these principles, it will be more easy to mark the general outline of this Discourse. Its first part {St. ~~4005~~ Matthew 10:5-15.} applies entirely to this first Mission of the Twelve, although the closing words point forward to ‘the judgment.’ {ver. 15.} Accordingly it has its parallels, although in briefer form, in the other two Gospels. {St. ~~4007~~ Mark 6:7-11; St. ~~4001~~ Luke 9:1-5.}

1. The Twelve were to go forth two and two, {St. ~~4007~~ Mark 6:7.} furnished with authority ^{f1402} — or, as St. Luke more fully expresses it, with ‘power and authority’ — alike over all demons and to heal all manner of diseases. It is of secondary importance, whether this was conveyed to them by word only, or with some sacramental sign, such as breathing on them or the laying on of hands. The special commission, for which they received such power, was to proclaim the near advent of the Kingdom, and, in manifestation as well as in evidence of it, to heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, and cast out demons. ^{f1403} They were to speak good and to do good in the highest sense, and that in a manner which all would feel good: freely, even as they had received it. Again, they were not to make any special

provision ^{f1404} for their journey, beyond the absolute immediate present.
^{f1405} They were but laborers, yet as such they had claim to support. Their Employer would provide, and the field in which they worked might well be expected to supply it. {Comp. for this latter aspect ~~<51518>~~ 1 Timothy 5:18.}
^{f1406}

In accordance with this, singleness of purpose and an entire self-denial, which should lead them not to make provision ‘for the flesh,’ but as laborers to be content with daily food, were the further injunctions laid on them. Before entering into a city, they were to make inquiry, literally to ‘search out,’ who in it was ‘worthy,’ and of them to ask hospitality; not seeking during their stay a change for the gratification of vanity or for self-indulgence. If the report on which they had made choice of a host proved true, then the ‘Peace with thee!’ with which they had entered their temporary home, would become a reality. Christ would make it such. As He had given them ‘power and authority,’ so He would ‘honor’ the draft on Him, in acknowledgment of hospitable reception, which the Apostles’ ‘Peace with thee!’ implied.

But even if the house should prove unworthy, the Lord would none the less own the words of His messengers and make them real; only, in such case the peace would return to them who had spoken it. Yet another case was possible. The house to which their inquiries had led them, or the city into which they had entered, might refuse to receive them, because they came as Christ’s ambassadors. Greater, indeed, would be their guilt than that of the cities of the plain, since these had not known the character of the heavenly guests to whom they refused reception; and more terrible would be their future punishment. So Christ would vindicate their authority as well as His own, and show the reality of their commission: on the one hand, by making their Word of Peace a reality to those who had proved ‘worthy;’ and, on the other, by punishment if their message was refused. Lastly, in their present Mission they were not to touch either Gentile or Samaritan territory. The direction — so different in spirit from what Jesus Himself had previously said and done, and from their own later commission — was, of course, only ‘for the present necessity.’ ^{f1407} For the present they were neither prepared nor fitted to go beyond the circuit indicated. It would have been a fatal anticipation of their inner and outer history to have attempted this, and it would have defeated the object of our Lord of disarming prejudices when making a final appeal to the Jews of Galilee.

Even these considerations lead us to expect a strictly Jewish cast in this Discourse to the Disciples. The command to abstain from any religious fellowship with Gentiles and Samaritans was in temporary accommodation to the prejudices of His disciples and of the Jews. And the distinction between ‘the way of the Gentiles’ and ‘any city of the Samaritans’ is the more significant, when we bear in mind that even the dust of a heathen road was regarded as defiling, {Sanh. 15 *b*; Ned. 53 *b*.} while the houses, springs, roads, and certain food of the Samaritans were declared clean. {Jer. Abhod. Z 44 *d*.} At the same time, religiously and as regarded fellowship, the Samaritans were placed on the same footing with Gentiles. {Jer. Sheq. 1:5, p. 46 *b*.} Nor would the injunction, to impart their message freely, sound strange in Jewish ears. It was, in fact, what the Rabbis themselves most earnestly enjoined in regard to the teaching of the Law and traditions, however different their practice may have been. {Ab. i. 13.} Indeed, the very argument, that they were to impart freely, because they had received freely, is employed by the Rabbis, and derived from the language and example of Moses in ^{<1845>}Deuteronomy 4:5. {Ab. 4:5; Bekhor. 29 *a*.} ^{f1408} Again, the directions about not taking staff, shoes, nor money-purse, exactly correspond to the Rabbinic injunction not to enter the Temple-precincts with staff, shoes ^{f1409} (mark, not sandals), and a money-girdle. {Ber. 9:5} The symbolic ^{f1410} The symbolic reasons underlying this command would, in both cases, be probably the same: to avoid even the appearance of being engaged on other business, when the whole being should be absorbed in the service of the Lord. At any rate, it would convey to the disciples the idea, that they were to consider themselves as if entering the Temple-precincts, thus carrying out the principle of Christ’s first thought in the Temple: ‘Wist ye not that I must be about My Father’s business?’ {St. ^{<1849>}Luke 2:49.} Nor could they be in doubt what severity of final punishment a doom heavier than that of Sodom and Gomorrah would imply, since, according to early tradition, their inhabitants were to have no part in the world to come. {Sanh. 10:3.} And most impressive to a Jewish mind would be the symbolic injunction, to shake off the dust of their feet for a testimony against such a house or city. The expression, no doubt, indicated that the ban of the Lord was resting on it, and the symbolic act would, as it were, be the solemn pronouncing that ‘nought of the cursed thing’ clave to them. {^{<1837>}Deuteronomy 13:17.} ^{f1411} In this sense, anything that clave to a person was metaphorically called ‘the dust,’ as for example, ‘the dust of an evil tongue,’ {Jer. Peah 16 *a*.} ‘the dust of usury,’ as, on the other hand, to ‘dust to idolatry’ meant to cleave

to it. {Sanh. 64 *a.*} Even the injunction not to change the dwelling, where one had been received, was in accordance with Jewish views, the example of Abraham being quoted, who {According to ~~Q138~~Genesis 13:3.} ‘returned to the place where his tent had been at the beginning.’ {Arach. 16 b, lines 12 and 11 from bottom.} ^{f1412}

These remarks show how closely the Lord followed, in this first part of His charge to the disciples, {St. ~~Q100~~Matthew 10:1-15.} Jewish forms of thinking and modes of expression. It is not otherwise in the second, {St. ~~Q106~~Matthew 10:16-23.} although the difference is here very marked. We have no longer merely the original commission, as it is given in almost the same terms by St. Mark and St. Luke. But the horizon is now enlarged, and St. Matthew reports that which the other Evangelists record at a later stage of the Lord’s Ministry. Whether or not when the Lord charged His disciples on their first mission, He was led gradually to enlarge the scope of His teaching so as to adapt it to all times, need not be discussed. For St. Matthew himself could not have intended to confine the words of Christ to this first journey of the Apostles, since they contain references to division in families, persecutions, and conflict with the civil power, {vv. 16-18.} such as belong to a much later period in the history of the Church; and, besides, contain also that prediction which could not have applied to this first Mission of the Apostles, ‘Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come.’ {ver. 23.}

Without here anticipating the full inquiry into the promise of His immediate Coming, it is important to avoid, even at this stage, any possible misunderstanding on the point. The expectation of the Coming of ‘the Son of Man’ was grounded on a prophecy of Daniel, {~~Q173~~Daniel 7:13.} in which that Advent, or rather manifestation, was associated with judgment. The same is the case in this Charge of our Lord. The disciples in their work are described ‘as sheep in the midst of wolves,’ a phrase which the Midrash {On ~~Q182~~Esther 8:2, ed. Warsh. p. 120 *b.*} applies to the position of Israel amidst a hostile world, adding: How great is that Shepherd, Who delivers them, and vanquishes the wolves! Similarly, the admonition to ‘be wise as serpents and harmless as doves’ is reproduced in the Midrash, {On ~~Q124~~Song of Solomon 2:14.} where Israel is described as harmless as the dove towards God, and wise as serpents towards the hostile Gentile nations. Such and even greater would be the enmity which the disciples, as the true Israel, would have to encounter from Israel after the flesh. They would be handed over to the various Sanhedrin, ^{f1413} and visited with such

punishments as these tribunals had power to inflict. {St. ~~<1017>~~ Matthew 10:17.} More than this, they would be brought before governors and kings, primarily, the Roman governors and the Herodian princes. {ver. 18.} And so determined would be this persecution, as to break the ties of the closest kinship, and to bring on them the hatred of all men. {vv. 21, 22.} The only, but the all-sufficient, support in those terrible circumstances was the assurance of such help from above, that, although unlearned and humble, they need have no care, nor make preparation in their defense, which would be given them from above. And with this they had the promise, that he who endured to the end would be saved, and the prudential direction, so far as possible, to avoid persecution by timely withdrawal, which could be the more readily achieved, since they would not have completed their circuit of the cities of Israel before the ‘Son of Man be come.’

It is of the greatest importance to keep in view that, at whatever period of Christ’s Ministry this prediction and promise were spoken, and whether only once or oftener, they refer exclusively to a Jewish state of things. The persecutions are exclusively Jewish. This appears from verse 18, where the answer of the disciples is promised to be ‘for a testimony against them,’ who had delivered them up, that is, here evidently the Jews, as also against ‘the Gentiles.’ And the Evangelistic circuit of the disciples in their preaching was to be primarily Jewish; and not only so, but in the time when there were still ‘cities of Israel,’ that is, previous to the final destruction of the Jewish commonwealth. The reference, then, is to that period of Jewish persecution and of Apostolic preaching in the cities of Israel, which is bounded by the destruction of Jerusalem. Accordingly, the ‘coming of the Son of Man,’ and the ‘end’ here spoken of, must also have the same application. It was, as we have seen, according to ~~<2073>~~ Daniel 7:13, a coming in judgment. To the Jewish persecuting authorities, who had rejected the Christ, in order, as they imagined, to save their City and Temple from the Romans, {St. ~~<8148>~~ John 11:48.} and to whom Christ had testified that He would come again, this judgment on their city and state, this destruction of their polity, *was* ‘the Coming of the Son of Man’ in judgment, and the only coming which the Jews, as a state, could expect, the only one meet for them, even as, to them who look for Him, He will appear a second time, without sin unto salvation.

That this is the only natural meaning attaching to this prediction, especially when compared with the parallel utterances recorded in St. ~~<8139>~~ Mark 13:9-13, appears to us indubitable. It is another question how, or how far, those

to whom these words were in the first place addressed would understand their full bearing, at least at that time. Even supposing, that the disciples who first heard did not distinguish between the Coming to Israel in judgment, and that to the world in mingled judgment and mercy, as it was afterwards conveyed to them in the Parable of the Forthshooting of the Fig-tree, {St. ⁴²⁷³Luke 21:29-31.} yet the early Christians must soon have become aware of it. For, the distinction is sharply marked. As regards its manner, the 'second' Coming of Christ may be said to correspond to the state of those to whom He cometh. To the Jews His first Coming was visible, and as claiming to be their King. They had asked for a sign; and no sign was given them at the time. They rejected Him, and placed the Jewish polity and nation in rebellion against 'the King.' To the Jews, who so rejected the first visible appearance of Christ as their King, the second appearance would be invisible but real; the sign which they had asked would be given them, but as a sign of judgment, and His Coming would be in judgment. Thus would His authority be vindicated, and He appear, not, indeed, visibly but really, as what He had claimed to be. That this was to be the manner and object of His Coming to Israel, was clearly set forth to the disciples in the Parable of the Unthankful Husbandmen. {St. ⁴²⁷³Matthew 21:33-46, and the parallels.} The coming of the Lord of the vineyard would be the destruction of the wicked husbandmen. And to render misunderstanding impossible, the explanation is immediately added, that the Kingdom of God was to be taken from them, and given to those who would bring forth the fruits thereof. Assuredly, this could not, even in the view of the disciples, which may have been formed on the Jewish model, have applied to the Coming of Christ at the end of the present AEon dispensation.

We bear in mind that this second, outwardly invisible but very real, Coming of the Son of Man to the Jews, as a state, could only be in judgment on their polity, in that 'Sign' which was once refused, but which, when it appeared, would only too clearly vindicate His claims and authority. Thus viewed, the passages, in which that second Coming is referred to, will yield their natural meaning. Neither the mission of the disciples, nor their journeying through the cities of Israel, was finished, before the Son of Man came. Nay, there were those standing there who would not taste death, till they had seen in the destruction of the city and state the vindication of the Kingship of Jesus, which Israel had disowned. {St. ⁴¹⁶⁸Matthew 16:28, and parallels.} And even in those last Discourses in which the horizon gradually

enlarges, and this Coming in judgment to Israel merges in the greater judgment on an unbelieving world, {St. Matthew 24 and parallels.} this earlier Coming to the Jewish nation is clearly marked. The three Evangelists equally record it, that ‘this generation’ should not pass away, till all things were fulfilled. {St. ^{<1234>}Matthew 24:34; St. ^{<1130>}Mark 13:30; St. ^{<213>}Luke 21:32.} To take the lowest view, it is scarcely conceivable that these sayings would have been allowed to stand in all the three Gospels, if the disciples and the early Church had understood the Coming of the Son of Man in any other sense than as to the Jews in the destruction of their polity. And it is most significant, that the final utterances of the Lord as to His Coming were elicited by questions arising from the predicted destruction of the Temple. This the early disciples associated with the final Coming of Christ. To explain more fully the distinction between them would have been impossible, in consistency with the Lord’s general purpose about the doctrine of His Coming. Yet the Parables which in the Gospels (especially in that by St. Matthew) follow on these predictions, {St. ^{<1231>}Matthew 25:1-30.} and the teaching about the final Advent of ‘the Son of Man,’ point clearly to a difference and an interval between the one and the other.

The disciples must have the more readily applied this prediction of His Coming to Palestine, since ‘the woes’ connected with it so closely corresponded to those expected by the Jews before the Advent of Messiah. {Sot. 9:15; comp. Sanh. 97 *a* to 99 *a*, passim.} Even the direction to flee from persecution is repeated by the Rabbis in similar circumstances and established by the example of Jacob, {^{<212>}Hosea 12:12.} of Moses, {^{<1215>}Exodus 2:15.} and of David. {^{<1912>}1 Samuel 19:12; comp. Bemidb. R. 23, ed. Warsh. p. 86 *b*, and Tanch.}

In the next section of this Discourse of our Lord, as reported by St. Matthew, {St. Matthew g. 24-34.} the horizon is enlarged. The statements are still primarily applicable to the early disciples, and their preaching among the Jews and in Palestine. But their ultimate bearing is already wider, and includes predictions and principles true to all time. In view of the treatment which their Master received, the disciples must expect misrepresentation and evil-speaking. Nor could it seem strange to them, since even the common Rabbinic proverb had it: ^{f1414} ‘It is enough for a servant to be as his lord’ (*wbrk ahyc rb[l wyd.*) As we hear it from the lips of Christ, we remember that this saying afterwards comforted those, who mourned the downfall of wealthy and liberal homes in Israel, by

thoughts of the greater calamity which had overthrown Jerusalem and the Temple. And very significant is its application by Christ: ‘If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebul,’ ^{f1415} how much more them of His household.’ This charge, brought of course by the Pharisaic party of Jerusalem, had a double significance. We believe, that the expression ‘Master of the house’ looked back to the claims which Jesus had made on His first purification of the Temple. We almost seem to hear the coarse Rabbinic witticism in its play on the word *Beelzebul*. For, *Zebhul*, (*l w bz*) means in Rabbinic language, not any ordinary dwelling, but specifically the Temple, ^{f1416} {Jer. Ber. 13 *b*.} and *Beel-Zebul* would be the Master of the Temple.’ On the other hand, *Zibbul* (*l w bz*) means ^{f1417} sacrificing to idols; {Abod. Z. 18 *b*, and often.} and hence *Beel-zebul* would, in that sense, be equivalent to ‘lord’ or ‘chief of idolatrous sacrificing’ ^{f1418} — the worst and chiefest of demons, who presided over, and incited to, idolatry. ‘The Lord of the Temple’ (which truly was His Church) was to them ‘the chief of idolatrous worship,’ the Representative of God that of the worst of demons: Beelzebul was Beelzibbul! ^{f1419} What then might ‘His Household’ expect at their hands?

But they were not to fear such misrepresentations. In due time the Lord would make manifest both His and their true character. {St. ^{<4005} Matthew 10:26.} ^{f1420} Nor were they to be deterred from announcing in the clearest and most public manner, in broad daylight, and from the flat roofs of houses, that which had been first told them in the darkness, as Jewish teachers communicated the deepest and highest doctrines in secret to their disciples, or as the preacher would whisper his discourse into the ear of the interpreter. The deepest truths concerning His Person, and the announcement of His Kingdom and Work, were to be fully revealed, and loudly proclaimed. But, from a much higher point of view, how different was the teaching of Christ from that of the Rabbis! The latter laid it down as a principle, which they tried to prove from Scripture, {^{<6885} Leviticus 18:5.} that, in order to save one’s life, it was not only lawful, but even duty — if necessary, to commit any kind of sin, except idolatry, incest, or murder. {Sanh. 74 *a* comp. Yoma 82 *a*.} Nay, even idolatry was allowed, if only it were done in secret, so as not to profane the Name of the Lord — than which death was infinitely preferable. ^{f1421} Christ, on the other hand, not only ignored this vicious Jewish distinction of public and private as regarded morality, but bade His followers set aside all regard for personal safety, even in reference to the duty of preaching the Gospel. There was a

higher fear than of men: that of God — and it should drive out the fear of those who could only kill the body. Besides, why fear? God's Providence extended even over the meanest of His creatures. Two sparrows cost only an assarion (*rsya*.) about the third of a penny. ^{f1422} Yet even one of them would not perish without the knowledge of God. No illustration was more familiar to the Jewish mind than that of His watchful care even over the sparrows. The beautiful allusion in ~~<3086>~~ Amos 3:5 was somewhat realistically carried out in a legend which occurs in more than one Rabbinic passage. We are told that, after that great miracle-worker of Jewish legend, R. Simeon ben Jochai, had been for thirteen years in hiding from his persecutors in a cave, where he was miraculously fed, he observed that, when the bird-catcher laid his snare, the bird escaped, or was caught, according as a voice from heaven proclaimed, 'Mercy,' or else, 'Destruction.' Arguing, that if even a sparrow could not be caught without heaven's bidding, how much more safe was the life of a 'son of man' (*Cn rbd cpn*), he came forth. {Ber. R. 79, ed. Warsh. p. 142 *b*; Jer. Shebh. 9:1; Midr. on ~~<2008>~~ Ecclesiastes 10:8; on ~~<17009>~~ Esther 1:9; on ~~<9174>~~ Psalm 17:14. }

Nor could even the additional promise of Christ: 'But of you even the hairs of the head are all numbered,' ^{f1423} surprise His disciples. But it would convey to them the gladsome assurance that, in doing His Work, they were performing the Will of God, and were specially in His keeping. And it would carry home to them, with the comfort of a very different application, while engaged in doing the Work and Will of God, what Rabbinism expressed in a realistic manner by the common sayings, that whither a man was to go, thither his feet would carry him; and, that a man could not injure his finger on earth, unless it had been so decreed of him in heaven. {Chull. 7 *b*; comp. also the even more realistic expression, Shabb. 107 *b*. } And in later Rabbinic writings {Pesiqta 18 *a*. } we read, in almost the words of Christ: 'Do I not number all the hairs of every creature?' And yet an even higher outlook was opened to the disciples. All preaching was confessing, and all confessing a preaching of Christ; and our confession or denial would, almost by a law of nature, meet with similar confession or denial on the part of Christ before His Father in heaven. ^{f1424} This, also, was an application of that fundamental principle, that 'nothing is covered that shall not be revealed,' which, indeed, extendeth to the inmost secrets of heart and life.

What follows in our Lord's Discourse {St. ~~<0084>~~Matthew 10:34.} still further widens the horizon. It describes the condition and laws of His Kingdom, until the final revelation of that which is now covered and hidden. So long as His claims were set before a hostile world they could only provoke war ^{f1425} On the other hand, so long as such decision was necessary, in the choice of either those nearest and dearest, of ease, nay, of life itself, or else of Christ, there could be no compromise. Not that, as is sometimes erroneously supposed, a very great degree of love to the dearest on earth amounts to loving them more than Christ. No degree of proper affection can ever make affection wrongful, even as no diminution of it could make wrongful affection right. The love which Christ condemneth differs not in degree, but in kind, from rightful affection. It is one which takes the place of love to Christ, not which is placed by the side of that of Christ. For, rightly viewed, the two occupy different provinces. Wherever and whenever the two affections come into comparison, they also come into collision. And so the questions of not being worthy of Him (and who can be positively worthy?), and of the true finding or losing of our life, have their bearing on our daily life and profession. ^{f1426}

But even in this respect the disciples must, to some extent, have been prepared to receive the teaching of Christ. It was generally expected, that a time of great tribulation would precede the Advent of the Messiah. Again, it was a Rabbinic axiom, that the cause of the Teacher, to whom a man owed eternal life, was to be taken in hand before that of his father, to whom he owed only the life of this world. {B. Mets 33 a.} ^{f1427} Even the statement about taking up the cross in following Christ, although prophetic, could not sound quite strange. Crucifixion was, indeed, not a Jewish punishment, but the Jews must have become sadly familiar with it. The Targum {On ~~<0017>~~Ruth 1:17.} speaks of it as one of the four modes of execution of which Naomi described to Ruth as those in custom in Palestine, the other three being — stoning, burning, and beheading. Indeed, the expression 'bearing the cross,' as indicative of sorrow and suffering, is so common, that we read, Abraham carried the wood for the sacrifice of Issac, 'like who bears his cross on his shoulder.' {Ber. R. 56, on ~~<0206>~~Genesis 22:6.}

Nor could the disciples be in doubt as to the meaning of the last part of Christ's address. {St. ~~<0000>~~Matthew 10:40-42.} They were old Jewish forms of thought, only filled with the new wine of the Gospel. The Rabbis taught, only in extravagant terms, the merit attaching to the reception and

entertainment of sages. {Comp. for example the long discussion in Ber. 63 *b.*} The very expression ‘in the name of’ a prophet, or a righteous man, is strictly Jewish (**mcl** ,) and means for the sake of, or with intention, in regard to. It appears to us, that Christ introduced His own distinctive teaching by the admitted Jewish principle, that hospitable reception for the sake of, or with the intention of doing it to, a prophet or a righteous man, would procure a share in the prophet’s righteous man’s reward. Thus, tradition had it, that a Obadiah of King Ahab’s court {~~11806~~ 1 Kings 18:4.} had become the prophet of that name, because he had provided for the hundred prophets. {Sanh. 39 *b.*} And we are repeatedly assured, that to receive a sage, or even an elder, was like receiving the Shekhinah itself. But the concluding promise of Christ, concerning the reward of even ‘a cup of cold water’ to ‘one of these little ones’ ‘in the name of a disciple,’ goes far beyond the farthest conceptions of His contemporaries. Yet even so, the expression would, so far as its form is concerned, perhaps bear a fuller meaning to them than to us. These ‘little ones’ (**mynmq**) were ‘the children,’ who were still learning the elements of knowledge, and who would by-and-by grow into ‘disciples.’ For, as the Midrash has it: ‘Where there are no little ones, there are no disciples; and where no disciples, no sages: where no sages, there no elders; where no elders, there no prophets; and where no prophets, there {According to ~~23816~~ Isaiah 8:16.} does God not cause His Shekhinah to rest.’ {Ber. R. 42, on ~~01101~~ Genesis 14:1. }

We have been so particular in marking the Jewish parallelisms in this Discourse, first, because it seemed important to show, that the words of the Lord were not beyond the comprehension of the disciples. Starting from forms of thought and expressions with which they were familiar, He carried them far beyond Jewish ideas and hopes. But, secondly, it is just in this similarity of form, which proves that it was of the time, and to the time, as well as to us and to all times, that we best see, how far the teaching of Christ transcended all contemporary conception.

But the reality, the genuineness, the depth and fervor of self-surrender, which Christ expects, is met by equal fulness of acknowledgment on His part, alike in heaven and on earth. In fact, there is absolute identification with His ambassadors on the part of Christ. As He is the Ambassador of the Father, so are they His, and as such also the ambassadors of the Father. To receive them was, therefore, not only to receive Christ, but the Father, Who would own the humblest, even the meanest service of love to one of

the learners, 'the little ones.' All the more painful is the contrast of Jewish pride and self-righteousness, which attributes supreme merit to ministering, not as to God, but as to man; not for God's sake, but for that of the man; a pride which could give utterance to such a saying, 'All the prophets have announced salvation only to the like of those who give their daughters in marriage to sages, or cause them to make gain, or give of their goods to them. But what the bliss of the sages themselves is, no mortal eye has seen.' {Sanh. 99 *a.*}

It was not with such sayings that Christ sent forth His disciples; nor in such spirit, that the world has been subdued to Him. The relinquishing of all that is nearest and dearest, cross-bearing, loss of life itself — such were the terms of His discipleship. Yet acknowledgment there would surely, be first, in the felt and assured sense of His Presence; then, in the reward of a prophet, a righteous man, or, it might be, a disciple. But all was to be in Him, and for Him, even the gift of 'a cup of cold water' to 'a little one.' Nay, neither the 'little ones,' the learners, nor the cup of cold water given them, would be overlooked or forgotten. But over all did the 'Meek and Lowly One' cast the loftiness of His Humility.

CHAPTER 28

THE STORY OF THE BAPTIST, FROM HIS LAST TESTIMONY TO JESUS TO HIS BEHEADING IN PRISON

(1. St. ^{<495>}John 3:25-30. 2 St. ^{<494>}Matthew 9:14-17; St. ^{<408>}Mark 2:18-22; St. ^{<453>}Luke 5:33-39. 3. St. ^{<402>}Matthew 11:2-14; St. ^{<478>}Luke 7:18-35. 4. St. ^{<441>}Matthew 14:1-12; St. ^{<464>}Mark 6:14-29; St. ^{<497>}Luke 9:7-9.)

WHILE the Apostles went forth by two and two on their first Mission, ^{f1428} Jesus Himself taught and preached in the towns around Capernaum. {St. ^{<401>}Matthew 11:1.} This period of undisturbed activity seems, however, to have been of brief duration. ^{f1429} That it was eminently successful, we infer not only from direct notices, {St. ^{<462>}Mark 6:12, 13; St. ^{<496>}Luke 9:6.} but also from the circumstance that, for the first time, the attention of Herod Antipas was now called to the Person of Jesus. We suppose that, during the nine or ten months of Christ's Galilean Ministry, the Tetrarch had resided in his Paræan dominions (east of the Jordan), either at Julias or at Machærus, in which latter fortress the Baptist was beheaded. We infer, that the labors of the Apostles had also extended thus far, since they attracted the notice of Herod. In the popular excitement caused by the execution of the Baptist, the miraculous activity of the messengers of the Christ, Whom John had announced, would naturally attract wider interest, while Antipas would, under the influence of fear and superstition, give greater heed to them. We can scarcely be mistaken in supposing, that this accounts for the abrupt termination of the labors of the Apostles, and their return to Jesus. At any rate, the arrival of the disciples of John, with tidings of their master's death, and the return of the Apostles, seem to have been contemporaneous. {St. ^{<442>}Matthew 14:12, 13; St. ^{<463>}Mark 6:30.} Finally, we conjecture, that it was among the motives which influenced the removal of Christ and His Apostles from Capernaum. Temporarily to withdraw Himself and His disciples from Herod, to give them a season of rest and further preparation after the excitement of the last few weeks, and to avoid being involved in the popular movements consequent on the murder of the Baptist — such we may venture to indicated as among the reasons of the departure of Jesus and His disciples, first into the dominions of the Tetrarch Philip, on the eastern side of the Lake, {St. ^{<401>}John 6:1.} and after that 'into the borders of Tyre and Sidon.' {St. ^{<4074>}Mark 7:24.} Thus

the fate of the Baptist was, as might have been expected, decisive in its influence on the History of the Christ and of His Kingdom. But we have yet to trace the incidents in the life of John, so far as recorded in the Gospels, from the time of His last contact with Jesus to his execution.

1. It was {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 3:22 to 4:3.} in the late spring, or rather early summer of the year 27 of our era, that John was baptizing in AEnon, near to Salim. In the neighborhood, Jesus and His disciples were similarly engaged. ^{f1430} The Presence and activity of Jesus in Jerusalem at the Passover {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 2:13 to 3:21.} had determined the Pharisaic party to take active measures against Him and His Forerunner. John. As to the first outcome of this plan we notice the discussions on the question of ‘purification,’ and the attempt to separate between Christ and the Baptist by exciting the jealousy of the latter. {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 3:25 etc.} But the result was far different. His disciples might have been influenced, but John himself was too true a man, and too deeply convinced of the reality of Christ’s Mission, to yield even for a moment to such temptation. Nothing more noble can be conceived than the self-abnegation of the Baptist in circumstances which would not only have turned aside an impostor or an enthusiast, but must have severely tried the constancy of the truest man. At the end of a most trying career of constant self-denial its scanty fruits seemed, as it were, snatched from Him, and the multitude, which he had hitherto swayed, turned after Another, to Whom himself had first given testimony, but Who ever since had apparently neglected him. And now he had seemingly appropriated the one distinctive badge of his preaching! Not to rebel, nor to murmur, but even to rejoice in this as the right and proper thing, for which he had longed as the end of his own work — this implies a purity, simplicity, and grandeur of purpose, and a strength of conviction unsurpassed among men. The moral height of this testimony of John, and the evidential force of the introduction of this narrative — utterly unaccountable, nay unintelligible on the hypothesis that it is not true — seem to us among the strongest evidences in favor of the Gospel-history.

It was not the greatness of the Christ, to his own seeming loss, which could cloud the noonday of the Baptist’s convictions. In simple Judæan illustration, he was only ‘the friend of the Bridegroom’ (the ‘*Shoshebhayna*’), with all that popular association or higher Jewish allegory connected with that relationship. ^{f1431} He claimed not the bride. His was another joy — that of hearing the Voice of her rightful Bridegroom, Whose ‘groomsman’ he was. In the sound of that Voice lay

the fulfilment of his office. And St. John, looking back upon the relation between the Baptist and Jesus — on the reception of the testimony of the former and the unique position of ‘the Bridegroom’ — points out the lessons of the answer of the Baptist to his disciples (St. ~~RRB~~ John 3:31 to 36 ^{f1432}) as formerly those of the conversation with Nicodemus. {St. ~~RRB~~ John 3:16 to 21.}

This hour of the seeming abasement of the Baptist was, in truth, that of the highest exaltation, as marking the fulfilment of his office, and, therefore, of his joy. Hours of cloud and darkness were to follow.

2. The scene has changed, and the Baptist has become the prisoner of Herod Antipas. The dominions of the latter embraced, in the north: Galilee, *west* of the Jordan and of the Lake of Galilee; and in the south: Peraea, *east* of the Jordan. To realize events we must bear in mind that, crossing the Lake eastwards, we should pass from the possessions of Herod to those of the Tetrarch Philip, or else come upon the territory of the ‘Ten Cities,’ or Decapolis, a kind of confederation of townships, with constitution and liberties, such as those of the Grecian cities. ^{f1433} By a narrow strip northwards, Peraea just slipped in between the Decapolis and Samaria. It is impossible with certainty to localize the AEnon, near Salim, where John baptized. Ancient tradition placed the latter a few miles south of Scythopolis or Bethshean, on the borders of Galilee, or rather, the Decapolis, and Samaria. But as the eastern part of Samaria towards the Jordan was very narrow, one may well believe that the place was close to, perhaps actually in, the north-eastern angle of the province of Judaea, where it borders on Samaria. We are now on the western bank of Jordan. The other, or eastern, bank of the river would be that narrow northern strip of Peraea which formed part of the territory of Antipas. Thus a few miles, or the mere crossing of the river, would have brought the Baptist into Peraea. There can be no doubt but that the Baptist must either have crossed into, or else that AEnon, near Salim, was actually within the dominions of Herod. ^{f1434} It was on that occasion that Herod seized on his person, {St. ~~RRB~~ John 3:24.} and that Jesus, Who was still within Judæan territory, withdrew from the intrigues of the Pharisees and the proximity of Herod, through Samaria, into Galilee. {St. ~~RRB~~ John 6:1 }

For, although Galilee belonged to Herod Antipas, it was sufficiently far from the present residence of the Tetrarch in Peraea. Tiberias, his Galilean residence, with its splendid royal palace, had only been built a year or two

before; ^{f1435} and it is impossible to suppose, that Herod would not have sooner heard of the fame of Jesus, {St. ~~4041~~ Matthew 14:1.} if his court had been in Tiberias, in the immediate neighborhood of Capernaum. We are, therefore, shut up to the conclusion, that during the nine or ten months of Christ's Ministry in Galilee, the Tetrarch resided in Peraea. Here he had two palaces, one at Julias, or Livias, the other at Machaerus. The latter will be immediately described as the place of the Baptist's imprisonment and martyrdom. The Julias, or Livias, of Peraea must be distinguished from another city of that name (also called Bethsaida) in the North (east of the Jordan), and within the dominions of the Tetrarch Philip. The Julias of Peraea represented the ancient *Beth Haram* in the tribe of Gad, {~~4026~~ Numbers 32:36; ~~4037~~ Joshua 13:27.} a name for which Josephus gives {Ant. 18:2. 1.} *Betharamphtha*, and the Rabbis *Beth Ramthah*. {Jerus. Shev. 38 d.} ^{f1436} It still survives in the modern *Beit-haran*. But of the fortress and palace which Herod had built, and named after the Empress, 'all that remains' are 'a few traces of walls and foundations.' ^{f1437}

Supposing Antipas to have been at the Peraean Julias, he would have been in the closest proximity to the scene of the Baptist's last recorded labors at AEnon. We can now understand, not only how John was imprisoned by Antipas, but also the threefold motives which influenced it. According to Josephus, {Ant. 18:5, 2.} the Tetrarch was afraid that his absolute influence over the people, who seemed disposed to carry out whatever he advised, might lead to a rebellion. This circumstance is also indicated in the remark of St. Matthew, {St. ~~4045~~ Matthew 14:5.} that Herod was afraid to put the Baptist to death on account of the people's opinion of him. On the other hand, the Evangelic statement, {St. ~~4048~~ Matthew 14:3, 4; St. Mark vi 17, 18.} that Herod had imprisoned John on account of his declaring his marriage with Herodias unlawful, is in no way inconsistent with the reason assigned by Josephus. Not only might both motives have influenced Herod, but there is an obvious connection between them. For, John's open declaration of the unlawfulness of Herod's marriage, as unlike incestuous and adulterous, might, in view of the influence which the Baptist exercised, have easily led to a rebellion. In our view, the sacred text gives indication of yet a third cause which led to John's imprisonment, and which indeed, may have given final weight to the other two grounds of enmity against him. It has been suggested, that Herod must have been attached to the Sadducees, if to any religious party, because such a man would not have connected himself with the Pharisees. The reasoning is singularly

inconclusive. On political grounds, a Herod would scarcely have lent his weight to the Sadducean or aristocratic priest-party in Jerusalem; while, religiously, only too many instances are on record of what the Talmud itself calls ‘painted ones, who are like the Pharisees, and who act like Zimri, but expect the reward of Phinehas.’ {Sot. 22 *b.*} Besides, the Pharisees may have used Antipas as their tool, and worked upon his wretched superstition to effect their own purposes. And this is what we suppose to have been the case. The reference to the Pharisaic spying and to their comparisons between the influence of Jesus and John, {St. ~~John~~ John 4:1, 2.} which led to the withdrawal of Christ into Galilee, seems to imply that the Pharisees had something to do with the imprisonment of John. Their connection with Herod appears even more clearly in the attempt to induce Christ’s departure from Galilee, on pretext of Herod’s machinations. It will be remembered that the Lord unmasked their hypocrisy by bidding them go back to Herod, showing that He fully knew that real danger threatened Him, not from the Tetrarch, but from the leaders of the party in Jerusalem. {St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 13:31-33.} Our inference therefore is, that Pharisaic intrigue had a very large share in giving effect to Herod’s fear of the Baptist and of his reproofs.

3. We suppose, then, that Herod Antipas was at Julias, in the immediate neighborhood of AEnon, at the time of John’s imprisonment. But, according to Josephus, whose testimony there is no reason to question, the Baptist was committed to the strong fortress of Machaerus. {Ant. 18:5, 2.} ^{f1438} If Julias lay where the Wady of the Heshban debouches into the Jordan, east of that river, and a little north of the Dead Sea, Machaerus is straight south of it, about two and a half hours north-west of the ancient *Kiriathaim* (the modern *Kureiyat*), the site of Chedorlaomer’s victory. {~~Gen~~ Genesis 14:5.} Machaerus (the modern *M’Khaur*) marked the extreme point south, as Pella that north, in Peraea. As the boundary fortress in the south-east (towards Arabia), its safety was of the greatest importance, and everything was done to make a place, exceedingly strongly by nature, impregnable. It had been built by Alexander Jannaeus, but destroyed by Gabinius in the wars of Pompey. {Jewish War 1:8.5.} It was not only restored, but greatly enlarged, by Herod the Great, who surrounded it with the best defenses known at that time. In fact, Herod the Great built a town along the shoulder of the hill, and surrounded it by walls, fortified by towers. From this town a farther height had to be climbed, on which the castle stood, surrounded by walls, and flanked by towers one hundred and sixty cubits

high. Within the enclosure of the castle Herod had built a magnificent palace. A large number of cisterns, storehouses, and arsenals, containing every weapon of attack or defense, had been provided to enable the garrison to stand a prolonged siege. *Josephus* describes even its natural position as unassailable. The highest point of the fort was on the west, where it looked sheer down into a valley. North and south the fort was equally cut off by valleys, which could not be filled up for siege purposes. On the east there was, indeed, a valley one hundred cubits deep, but it terminated in a mountain opposite to Machaerus. This was evidently the weak point of the situation. ^{f1439}

A late and very trustworthy traveller ^{f1440} has pronounced the description of *Josephus* { War 7:6 1,2. } as sufficiently accurate, although exaggerated, and as probably not derived from personal observation. He has also furnished such pictorial details, that we can transport ourselves to that rocky keep of the Baptist, perhaps the more vividly that, as we wander over the vast field of stones, upturned foundations, and broken walls around, we seem to view the scene in the lurid sunset of judgment. ‘A rugged line of upturned squared stones’ shows the old Roman paved road to Machaerus. Ruins covering quite a square mile, on a group of undulating hills, mark the site of the ancient town of Machaerus. Although surrounded by a wall and towers, its position is supposed not to have been strategically defensible. Only a mass of ruins here, with traces of a temple to the Syrian Sun-God, broken cisterns, and desolateness all around. Crossing a narrow deep valley, about a mile wide, we climb up to the ancient fortress on a conical hill. Altogether it covered a ridge of more than a mile. The key of the position was a citadel to the extreme east of the fortress. It occupied the summit of the cone, was isolated, and almost impregnable, but very small. We shall return to examine it. Meanwhile, descending a steep slope about 150 yards towards the west, we reach the oblong flat plateau that formed the fortress, containing Herod’s magnificent palace. Here, carefully collected, are piled up the stones of which the citadel was built. These immense heaps look like a terrible monument of judgment.

We pass on among the ruins. No traces of the royal palace are left, save foundations and enormous stones upturned. Quite at the end of this long fortress in the west, and looking southwards, is a square fort. We return, through what we regard as the ruins of the magnificent castle-palace of Herod, to the highest and strongest part of the defenses — the eastern

keep or the citadel, on the steep slope 150 yards up. The foundations of the walls all around, to the height of a yard or two above the ground, are still standing. As we clamber over them to examine the interior, we notice how small this keep is: exactly 100 yards in diameter. There are scarcely any remains of it left. A well of great depth, and a deep cemented cistern with the vaulting of the roof still complete, and — of most terrible interest to us — two dungeons, one of them deep down, its sides scarcely broken in, ‘with small holes still visible in the masonry where staples of wood and iron had once been fixed’! As we look down into its hot darkness, we shudder in realizing that this terrible keep had for nigh ten months been the prison of that son of the free ‘wilderness,’ the bold herald of the coming Kingdom, the humble, earnest, self-denying John the Baptist. Is this the man whose testimony about the Christ may be treated as a falsehood?

We withdraw our gaze from trying to pierce this gloom and to call up in it the figure of the camel-hair-clad and leather-girt preacher, and look over the ruins at the scene around. We are standing on a height not less than 3,800 feet above the Dead Sea. In a straight line it seems not more than four or five miles; and the road down to it leads, as it were, by a series of ledges and steps. We can see the whole extent of this Sea of Judgment, and its western shores from north to south. We can almost imagine the Baptist, as he stands surveying this noble prospect. Far to the south stretches the rugged wilderness of Judaea, bounded by the hills of Hebron. Here nestles Bethlehem, there is Jerusalem. Or, turning another way, and looking into the deep cleft of the Jordan valley: this oasis of beauty is Jericho; beyond it, like a silver thread, Jordan winds through a burnt, desolate-looking country, till it is lost to view in the haze which lies upon the edge of the horizon. As the eye of the Baptist travelled over it, he could follow all the scenes of His life and labors, from the home of his childhood in the hill-country of Judaea, to those many years of solitude and communing with God in the wilderness, and then to the first place of his preaching and Baptism, and onwards to that where he had last spoken of the Christ, just before his own captivity. And now the deep dungeon in the citadel on the one side, and, on the other, down that slope, the luxurious palace of Herod and his adulterous, murderous wife, while the shouts of wild revelry and drunken merriment rise around! Was this the Kingdom he had come to announce as near at hand; for which he had longed, prayed, toiled, suffered, utterly denied himself and all that made life pleasant, and the rosy morning of which he had hailed with hymns of praise? Where was the

Christ? Was He the Christ? What was He doing? Was he eating and drinking all this while with publicans and sinners, when he, the Baptist, was suffering for Him? Was He in His Person and Work so quite different from himself? and why was He so? And did the hot haze and mist gather also over this silver thread in the deep cleft of Israel's barren burnt-up desolateness?

4. In these circumstances we scarcely wonder at the feelings of John's disciples, as months of this weary captivity passed. Uncertain what to expect, they seem to have oscillated between Machaerus and Capernaum. Any hope in their Master's vindication and deliverance lay in the possibilities involved in the announcement he had made of Jesus as the Christ. And it was to Him that their Master's finger had pointed them. Indeed, some of Jesus' earliest and most intimate disciples had come from their ranks; and, as themselves had remarked, the multitude had turned to Jesus even before the Baptist's imprisonment. {St. ~~413~~ John 3:26.} And yet, could He be the Christ? How many things about Him that were strange and seemed inexplicable! In their view, there must have been a terrible contrast between him who lay in the dungeon of Machaerus, and Him Who sat down to eat and drink at a feast of the publicans.

His reception of publicans and sinners they could understand; their own Master had not rejected them. But why eat and drink with them? Why feasting, and this in a time when fasting and prayer would have seemed specially appropriate? And, indeed, was not fasting always appropriate? And yet this new Messiah had not taught his disciples either to fast or what to pray! The Pharisees, in their anxiety to separate between Jesus and His Forerunner, must have told them all this again and again, and pointed to the contrast.

At any rate, it was at the instigation of the Pharisees, and in company with them, ^{f1441} that the disciples of John propounded to Jesus this question about fasting and prayer, immediately after the feast in the house of the converted Levi-Matthew. {St. ~~414~~ Matthew 9:14-17 and parallels.} We must bear in mind that fasting and prayer, or else fasting and alms, or all the three, were always combined. Fasting represented the negative, prayer and alms the positive element, in the forgiveness of sins. Fasting, as self-punishment and mortification, would avert the anger of God and calamities. Most extraordinary instances of the purposes in view in fasting, and of the results obtained are told in Jewish legend, which (as will be

remembered) went so far as to relate how a Jewish saint was thereby rendered proof against the fire of Gehenna, of which a realistic demonstration was given when his body was rendered proof against ordinary fire. {B. Mez. 85 a, ^{f1442} towards the end.}

Even apart from such extravagances, Rabbinism gave an altogether external aspect to fasting. In this it only developed to its utmost consequences a theology against which the Prophets of old had already protested. Perhaps, however, the Jews are not solitary in their misconception and perversion of fasting. In their view, it was the readiest means of turning aside any threatening calamity, such as drought, pestilence, or national danger. This, *ex opere operato*: because fasting was self-punishment and mortification, not because a fast meant mourning (for sin, not for its punishment), and hence indicated humiliation, acknowledgment of sin, and repentance. The second and fifth days of the week (Monday and Thursday) ^{f1443} were those appointed for public fasts, because Moses was supposed to have gone up the Mount for the second Tables of the Law on a Thursday, and to have returned on a Monday. The self-introspection of Pharisaism led many to fast on these two days all the year round, {Taan. 12 a; St. ~~<1812>~~ Luke 18:12.} just as in Temple-times not a few would offer daily trespass-offering for sins of which they were ignorant. Then there were such painful minutiae of externalism, as those which ruled how, on a less strict fast, a person might wash and anoint; while on the strictest fast, it was prohibited even to salute one another. {Taan 1:4-7.} ^{f1444}

It may well have been, that it was on one of these weekly fasts that the feast of Levi-Matthew had taken place, and that this explains the expression: 'And John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting.' {St. ~~<1018>~~ Mark 2:18.} ^{f1445} This would give point to their complaint, 'Thy disciples fast not.' Looking back upon the standpoint from which they viewed fasting, it is easy to perceive why Jesus could not have sanctioned, not even tolerated, the practice among His disciples, as little as St. Paul could tolerate among Judaizing christians the, in itself indifferent, practice of circumcision. But it was not so easy to explain this at the time of the disciples of John. For, to understand it, implied already entire transformation from the old to the new spirit. Still more difficult must it have been to do it in such manner, as at the same time to lay down principles that would rule all similar questions to all ages. But our Lord did both, and even thus proved His Divine Mission.

The last recorded testimony of the Baptist had pointed to Christ as the ‘Bridegroom.’ {St. ^{<RB2>}John 3:29.} As explained in a previous chapter, John applied this in a manner which appealed to popular custom. As he had pointed out, the Presence of Jesus marked the marriage-week. By universal consent and according to Rabbinic law, this was to be a time of unmixed festivity. {Ber. 6 *b.*} Even in the Day of Atonement a bride was allowed to relax one of the ordinances of that strictest fast. {Yoma 8:1.} During the marriage-week all mourning was to be suspended — even the obligation of the prescribed daily prayers ceased. It was regarded as a religious duty to gladden the bride and bridegroom. Was it not, then, inconsistent on the part of John’s disciples to expect ‘the sons of the bride-chamber’ to fast, so long as the Bridegroom was with them?

This appeal of Christ is still further illustrated by the Talmudic ordinance {Jer. Sukk. 53 *a*, near the middle.} which absolved ‘the friends of the bridegroom,’ and all ‘the sons of the bride-chamber,’ even from the duty of dwelling in booths (at the Feast of Tabernacles). The expression, ‘sons of the bride-chamber’ hpwj ynb, which means all invited guests, has the more significance, when we remember that the Covenant-union between God and Israel was not only compared to a marriage, but the Tabernacle and Temple designated as ‘the bridal chambers.’ {Jer. Megill. 72 d 1.} ^{f1446} And, as the institution of ‘friends of the bridegroom’ prevailed in Judaea, but *not* in Galilee, this marked distinction of the ‘friends of the bridegroom,’ ^{f1447} in the mouth of the Judæan John and ‘sons of the bride-chamber’ in that of the Galilean Jesus, is itself evidential of historic accuracy, as well as of the Judæan authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

But let it not be thought that it was to be a time of unbroken joy to the disciples of Jesus. Nay, the ideas of the disciples of John concerning the Messianic Kingdom, as one of resistless outward victory and assertion of power, were altogether wrong. The Bridegroom would be violently taken from them, and then would be the time for mourning and fasting. Not that this necessarily implies literal fasting, any more than it excludes it, provided the great principles, more fully indicated immediately afterwards, are contrary to the spirit of the joyous liberty of the children of God. It is only a sense of sin, and the felt absence of the Christ, which should lead to mourning and fasting, though not in order thereby to avert either the anger of God or outward calamity. Besides the evidential force of this highly spiritual, and thoroughly un-Jewish view of fasting, we notice some other points in confirmation of his, and of the Gospel-history generally. On the

hypothesis of a Jewish invention of the Gospel-history, or of its Jewish embellishment, the introduction of this narrative would be incomprehensible. Again, on the theory of a fundamental difference in the Apostolic teaching, St. Matthew and St. Mark representing the original Judaic, St. Luke the freer Pauline development, the existence of this narrative in the first two Gospels would seem unaccountable. Or, to take another view — on the hypothesis of the much later and non-Judaean (Ephesian) authorship of the Fourth Gospel, the minute archaeological touches, and the general fitting of the words of the Baptist {St. ⁴¹⁹⁶John 3:29.} into the present narrative would be inexplicable. Lastly, as against all deniers and detractors of the Divine Mission of Jesus, this early anticipation of His violent removal by death, and of the consequent mourning of the Church, proves that it came not to him from without, as by the accident of events, but that from the beginning He anticipated the end, and pursued it of set, steadfast purpose.

Yet another point in evidence comes to us from the eternal and un-Jewish principles implied in the two illustrations, of which Christ here made use. {St. ⁴¹⁹⁶Matthew 9:16, 17.} In truth, the Lord's teaching is now carried down to its ultimate principles. The slight variations which here occur in the Gospel of St. Luke, as, indeed, such exist in so many of the narratives of the same events by different Evangelists, should not be 'explained away' For, the sound critic should never devise an explanation for the sake of a supposed difficulty, but truthfully study the text — as an interpreter, not an apologist. Such variations of detail present no difficulty. As against a merely mechanical unspiritual accord, they afford evidence of truthful, independent witness, and irrefragable proof that, contrary to modern negative criticism, and three narratives are not merely different recensions of one and the same original document.

In general, the two illustrations employed — that of the piece of undressed cloth (or, according to St. Luke, a piece torn from a new garment) sewed upon the rent of an old garment, and that of the new wine put into a old wine-skins, must not be too closely pressed in regard to their language. ^{f1448} They seem chiefly to imply this: You ask, why do we fast often, but Thy disciples fast not? You are mistaken in supposing that the old garment can be retained, and merely its rents made good by patching it with a piece of new cloth. Not to speak of the incongruity, the effect would only be to make the rent ultimately worse. The old garment will not bear mending with the 'undressed cloth Christ's was not merely a reformation: all things

must become new. Or, again, take the other view of it — as the old garment cannot be patched from the new, so, on the other hand, can the new wine of the Kingdom not be confined in the old forms. It would burst those wine-skins. The spirit must, indeed, have its corresponding form of expression; but that form must be adapted, and correspond to it. Not the old with a little of the new to hold it together where it is rent; but the new, and that not in the old wine-skins, but in a form corresponding to the substance. Such are the two final principles ^{f1449} — the one primary addressed to the Pharisees, the other to the disciples of John, by which the illustrative teaching concerning the marriage-feast, with its bridal garment and wine of banquet, is carried far beyond the original question of the disciples of John, and receives an application to all time.

5. We are in spirit by the mount of God, and about to witness the breaking of a terrible storm. {St. ~~LUKE~~ Luke 7:18-35; St. ~~MATTHEW~~ Matthew 11:2-19.} It is one that uproots the great trees and rends the rocks; and all we shall watch it solemnly, earnestly, as with bared head — or, like Elijah, with face wrapt in mantle. Weeks had passed, and the disciples of John had come back and showed their Master of all these things. He still lay in the dungeon of Machaerus; his circumstances unchanged — perhaps, more hopeless than before. For, Herod was in that spiritually most desperate state: he had heard the Baptist, and was much perplexed. And still he heard — but only heard — him gladly. {St. ~~MARK~~ Mark 6:20.} ^{f1450} It was a case by no means singular, and of which Felix, often sending for St. Paul, at whose preaching of righteousness, temperance, and the judgement to come, he had trembled, offers only one of many parallels. That, when hearing him, Herod was ‘much perplexed,’ we can understand, since he ‘feared him, knowing that he was a righteous man and holy,’ and thus fearing ‘heard him.’ But that being ‘much perplexed,’ he still ‘heard him gladly,’ constituted the hopelessness of his case. But was the Baptist right? Did it constitute part of his Divine calling to have not only denounced, but apparently directly confronted Herod on his adulterous marriage? Had he not attempted to lift himself the axe which seemed to have slipped from the grasp of Him, of Whom the Baptist had hoped and said that He would lay it to the root of the tree?

Such thoughts may have been with him, as he passed from his dungeon to the audience of Herod, and from such bootless interviews back to his deep keep. Strange as it may seem, it was, perhaps, better for the Baptist when he was alone. Much as his disciples honored and loved him, and truly

zealous and jealous for him as they were, it was best when they were absent. There are times when affection only pains, by forcing on our notice inability to understand, and adding to our sorrow that of feeling our inmost being a stranger to those nearest, and who love us must. Then, indeed, is a man alone. It is so with the Baptist. The state of mind and experience of his disciples had already appeared, even in the slight notices of his disciples has already appeared, even in the slight notices concerning them. Indeed, had they fully understood him, and not ended where he began — which, truly, is the characteristic of all sects, in their crystallization, or, rather, ossification of truth, they would not have remained his disciples; and this consciousness must also have brought exquisite pain. Their very affection for him, and their zeal for his credit (as shown in the almost coarse language of their inquiry: ‘John the Baptist hath sent us unto Thee, saying, Art Thou He that cometh, or look we for another?’), as well as their tenacity of unprogressiveness — were all, so to speak, marks of his failure. And, if he had failed with them, had he succeeded in anything?

And yet further and more terrible questions rose in that dark dungeon. Like serpents that crept out of its walls, they would uncoil and raise their heads with horrible hissing. What if, after all, there had been some terrible mistake on his part? At any rate the logic of events was against him. He was now the fast prisoner of that Herod, to whom he had spoken with authority; in the power of that bold adulteress, Herodias. If he were Elijah, the great Tishbite had never been in the hands of Ahab and Jezebel. And the Messiah, Whose Elijah he was, moved not; could not, or would not, move, but feasted with publicans and sinners! Was it all a reality? or — oh, thought too horrible for utterance — could it have been a dream, bright but fleeting, uncaused by any reality, only the reflection of his own imagination? It must have been a terrible hour, and the power of darkness. At the end of one’s life, and that of such self-denial and suffering, and with a conscience so alive to God, which had — when a youth — driven him burning with holy zeal into the wilderness, to have such a question meeting him as: Art Thou He, or do we wait for another? Am I right, or in error and leading others into error? must have been truly awful. Not Paul, when forsaken of all he lay in the dungeon, the aged prisoner of Christ; not Huss, when alone at Constance he encountered the whole Catholic Council and the flames; only He, the God-Man, over Whose soul crept the death-coldness of great agony when, one by one, all light of God and man seemed to fade out, and only that one remained burning — His own faith in

the Father, could have experienced bitterness like this. Let no one dare to say that the faith of John failed, at least till the dark waters have rolled up to his own soul. For mostly all and each of us must pass through some like experience; and only our own hearts and God know, how death-bitter are the doubts, whether of head or of heart, when question after question raises, as with devilish hissing, its head, and earth and heaven seem alike silent to us.

But here we must for a moment pause to ask ourselves this, which touches the question of all questions: Surely, such a man as this Baptist, so thoroughly disillusioned in that hour, could not have been an impostor, and his testimony to Christ a falsehood? Nor yet could the record, which gives us this insight into the weakness of the strong man and the doubts of the great Testimony-bearer, be a cunningly-invented fable. We cannot imagine the record of such a failure, if the narrative were an invention. And if this record be true, it is not only of present failure, but also of the previous testimony of John. To us, at least, the evidential force of this narrative seems irresistible. The testimony of the Baptist to Jesus offers the same kind of evidence as does that of the human soul to God: in both cases the one points to the other, and cannot be understood without it.

In that terrible conflict John overcame, as we all must overcome. His very despair opened the door of hope. The helpless doubt, which none could solve but One, he brought to Him around Whom it had gathered. Even in this there is evidence for Christ, as the unalterably True One. When John asked the question: Do we wait for another? light was already struggling through darkness. It was incipient victory even in defeat. When he sent his disciples with this question straight to Christ, he had already conquered; for such a question addressed to a possibly false Messiah has no meaning. And so must it ever be with us. Doubt is the offspring of our disease, diseased as is its paternity. And yet it cannot be cast aside. It may be the outcome of the worst, or the problems of the best souls. The twilight may fade into outer night, or it may usher in the day. The answer lies in this: whether doubt will lead us to Christ, or *from* Christ.

Thus viewed, the question: 'Art Thou the Coming One, or do we wait for another?' indicated faith both in the great promise and in Him to Whom it was addressed. The designation 'The Coming One' (*habba*), though a most truthful expression of Jewish expectancy, was not one ordinarily used of the Messiah. But it was invariably used in reference to the Messianic age,

as the *Athid labho*, or coming future (literally, the prepared for to come), and the *Olam habba*, the coming world or AEon. ^{f1451} But then it implied the setting right of all things by the Messiah, the assumption and vindication of His Power. In the mouth of John it might therefore mean chiefly this: Art Thou He that is to establish the Messianic Kingdom in its outward power, or have we to wait for another? In that case, the manner in which the Lord answered it would be all the more significant. The messengers came just as He was engaged in healing body and soul. {St. ^{<072>}Luke 7:21.} ^{f1452} Without interrupting His work, or otherwise noticing their inquiry, He bade them tell John for answer what they had seen and heard, and that ‘the poor, {St. ^{<016>}Matthew 11:5.} are evangelized.’ To this, as the inmost characteristic of the Messianic Kingdom, He only added, not by way of reproof nor even of warning, but as a fresh ‘Beatitude:’ ‘Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be scandalized in Me.’ To faith, but only to faith, this was the most satisfactory and complete answer to John’s inquiry. And such a sight of Christ’s distinctive Work and Word, with believing submission to the humbleness of the Gospel, is the only true answer to our questions, whether of head or heart.

But a harder saying than this did the Lord speak amidst the forthpouring of His testimony to John, when his messengers had left. It pointed the hearers beyond their present horizon. Several facts here stand out prominently. First, He to Whom John had formerly borne testimony, now bore testimony to him; and that, not in the hour when John had testified for Him, but when his testimony had wavered and almost failed. This is the opposite of what one would have expected, if the narrative had been a fiction, while it is exactly what we might expect if the narrative be true. Next, we mark that the testimony of Christ is as from a higher standpoint. And it is a full vindication as well as unstinted praise, spoken, not as in his hearing, but after his messengers — who had met a seemingly cold reception — had left. The people were not coarsely to misunderstand the deep soul-agony, which had issued in John’s inquiry. It was not the outcome of a fickleness which, like the reed shaken by every wind, was moved by popular opinion. Nor was it the result of fear of bodily consequences, such as one that pampered the flesh might entertain. Let them look back to the time when, in thousands, they had gone into the wilderness to hear his preaching. What had attracted them thither? Surely it was, that he was the opposite of one swayed by popular opinion, ‘a reed shaken by the wind.’ And when they had come to him, what had they

witnessed? ^{f1453} Surely, his dress and food betokened the opposite of pampering or care of the body, such as they saw in the courtiers of a Herod. But what they did expect, that they really did see: a prophet, and much more than a mere prophet, the very Herald of God and Preparer of Messiah's Way. ^{f1454} And yet, and this truly was a hard saying and utterly un-Judaic — it was neither self-denial nor position, no, not even that of the New Testament Elijah, which constituted real greatness, as Jesus viewed it, just as nearest relationship constituted not true kinship to Him. To those who sought the honor which is not of man's bestowing, but of God, to be a little one in the Kingdom of God was greater greatness than even the Baptist's.

But, even so, let there be no mistake. As afterwards St. Paul argued with the Jews, that their boast in the Law only increased their guilt as breakers of the Law, so here our Lord. The popular concourse to, and esteem of, the Baptist, {St. ^{ⲁⲓⲧⲓ} Luke 7:29, 30.} ^{f1455} did not imply that spiritual reception which was due to his Mission. {St. ^{ⲁⲓⲓⲏ} Matthew 11:14-19.} It only brought out, in more marked contrast, the wide inward difference between the expectancy of the people as a whole, and the spiritual reality presented to them in the Forerunner of the Messiah and in the Messiah Himself. {St. ^{ⲁⲓⲓⲏ} Matthew 11:14-19.} Let them not be deceived by the crowds that had submitted to the Baptism of John. From the time that John began to preach the Kingdom, hindrances of every kind had been raised. To overcome them and enter the Kingdom, it required, as it were, violence like that to enter a city which was surrounded by a hostile army. ^{f1456} Even by Jewish admission, ^{f1457} the Law 'and all the prophets prophesied only of the days of Messiah.' {Sanh. 99 *a*; Ber. 34 *b*; Shabb. 63 *a*.} John, then, was the last link; and, if they would but have received it, he would have been to them the Elijah, the Restorer of all things. Selah, 'he that hath ears, let him hear.'

Nay, but it was not so. The children of that generation expected quite another Elijah and quite another Christ, and disbelieved and complained, because the real Elijah and Christ did not meet their foolish thoughts. They were like children in a market-place, who expected their fellows to adapt themselves to the tunes they played. It was as if they said: We have expected great Messianic glory and national exaltation, and ye have not responded ('we have piped ^{f1458} unto you, and ye have not danced'); we have looked for deliverance from our national sufferings, and they stirred not your sympathies nor brought your help ('we have mourned to you, and

ye have not lamented'). But you thought of the Messianic time as children, and of us, as if we were your fellows, and shared your thoughts and purposes! And so when John came with his stern asceticism, you felt he was not one of you. He was in one direction outside your boundary-line, and I, as the Friend of sinners, in the other direction. The axe which he wielded you would have laid to the tree of the Gentile world, not to that of Israel and of sin; the welcome and fellowship which I extended, you would have had to 'the wise' and 'the righteous,' not to sinners. Such was Israel as a whole. And yet there was an election according to grace: the violent, who had to fight their way through all this, and who took the Kingdom by violence — and so Heaven's Wisdom (in opposition to the children's folly) is vindicated ^{f1459} by all her children. ^{f1460} If anything were needed to show the internal harmony between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel, it would be this final appeal, which recalls those other words: 'He came unto His own (things or property), and his own (people, they who were His own) received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power (right, authority) to become children of God, which were born (begotten,) not... of the will of man, but of God.' {St. ~~ROM~~ John 1:11-13.}

6. The scene once more changes, and we are again at Machaerus. ^{f1461} Weeks have passed since the return of John's messengers. We cannot doubt that the sunlight of faith has again fallen into the dark dungeon, nor yet that the peace of restful conviction has filled the martyr of Christ. He must have known that his end was at hand, and been ready to be offered up. Those not unfrequent conversations, in which the weak, superstitious, wicked tyrant was 'perplexed' and yet 'heard him gladly,' could no longer have inspired even passing hopes of freedom. Nor would he any longer except from the Messiah assertions of power on his behalf. He now understood that for which He had come; he knew the better liberty, triumph, and victory which He brought. And what mattered it? His life-work had been done, and there was nothing further that fell to him or that he could do, and the weary servant of the Lord must have longed for his rest.

It was early spring, shortly before the Passover, the anniversary of the death of Herod the Great and of the accession of (his son) Herod Antipas to the Tetrarchy. ^{f1462} A fit time this for a Belshazzar-feast, when such an one as Herod would gather to a grand banquet 'his lords,' and the military authorities, and the chief men of Galilee. It is evening, and the castle-palace is brilliantly lit up. The noise of music and the shouts of revelry come

across the slope into the citadel, and fall into the deep dungeon where waits the prisoner of Christ. And now the merriment in the great banqueting-hall has reached its utmost height. The king has nothing further to offer his satiated guests, no fresh excitement. So let it be the sensuous stimulus of dubious dances, and, to complete it, let the dancer be the fair young daughter of the king's wife, the very descendant of the Asmonaeon priest-princes! To viler depth of coarse familiarity even a Herod could not have descended.

She has come, and she has danced, this princely maiden, out of whom all maidenhood and all princeliness have been brazed by a degenerate mother, wretched offspring of the once noble Maccabees. And she has done her best in that wretched exhibition, and pleased Herod and them that sat at meat with him. And now, amidst the general plaudits, she shall have her reward — and the king swears it to her with loud voice, that all around hear it — even to the half of his kingdom. The maiden steals out of the banquet-hall to ask her mother what it shall be. Can there be doubt or hesitation in the mind of Herodias? If there was one object she had at heart, which these ten months she had in vain sought to attain: it was the death of John the Baptist. She remembered it all only too well — her stormy, reckless past. The daughter of Aristobulus, the ill-fated son of the ill-fated Asmonaeon princess Mariamme (I.), she had been married to her half-uncle, Herod Philip, ^{f1463} the son of Herod the Great and of Mariamme (II.), the daughter of the High-Priest (Boethos). At one time it seemed as if Herod Philip would have been sole heir of his father's dominions. But the old tyrant had changed his testament, and Philip was left with great wealth, but as a private person living in Jerusalem. This little suited the woman's ambition. It was when his half-brother, Herod Antipas, came on a visit to him at Jerusalem, that an intrigue began between the Tetrarch and his brother's wife. It was agreed that, after the return of Antipas from his impending journey to Rome, he would repudiate his wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia, and wed Herodias. But Aretas' daughter heard of the plot, and having obtained her husband's consent to go to Machaerus, she fled thence to her father. This, of course, led to enmity between Antipas and Aretas. Nevertheless, the adulterous marriage with Herodias followed. In a few sentences the story may be carried to its termination. The woman proved the curse and ruin of Antipas. First came the murder of the Baptist, which sent a thrill of horror through the people, and to which all the later misfortunes of Herod were attributed. Then followed a war

with Aretas, in which the Tetrarch was worsted. And, last of all, his wife's ambition led him to Rome to solicit the title of King, lately given to Agrippa, the brother of Herodias. Antipas not only failed, but was deprived of his dominions, and banished to Lyons in Gaul. The pride of the woman in refusing favors from the Emperor, and her faithfulness to her husband in his fallen fortunes, are the only redeeming points in her history. {*Jos. Ant.* 18:7. 1, 2; *War* 2:9. 6.} As for Salome, she was first married to her uncle, Philip the Tetrarch. Legend has it, that her death was retributive, being in consequence of a fall on the ice.

Such was the woman who had these many months sought with the vengefulness and determination of a Jezebel, to rid herself of the hated person, who alone had dared publicly denounce her sin, and whose words held her weak husband in awe. The opportunity had now come for obtaining from the vacillating monarch what her entreaties could never have secured. As the Gospel puts it, {*St.* ^{f1468} *Matthew* 14:8.} 'instigated' by her mother, the damsel hesitated not. We can readily fill in the outlined picture of what followed. It only needed the mother's whispered suggestion, and still flushed from her dance, Salome reentered the banqueting-hall. 'With haste,' as if no time were to be lost, she went up to king: 'I would that thou forthwith give me in a charger, the head of John the Baptist!' Silence must have fallen on the assembly. Even into their hearts such a demand from the lips of little more than a child must have struck horror. They all knew John to be a righteous and holy man. Wicked as they were, in their superstition, if not religiousness, few, if any of them, would have willingly lent himself to such work. And they all knew, also, why Salome, or rather Herodias, had made this demand. What would Herod do? 'The king was exceeding sorry.' For months he had striven against this. His conscience, fear of the people, inward horror at the deed, all would have kept him from it. But he had sworn to the maiden, who now stood before him, claiming that the pledge be redeemed, and every eye in the assembly was now fixed upon him. Unfaithful to his God, to his conscience, to truth and righteousness; not ashamed of any crime or sin, he would yet be faithful to his half-drunken oath, and appear honorable and true before such companions!

It has been but the contest of a moment. 'Straightway' the king gives the order to one of the body-guard. ^{f1464} The maiden hath withdrawn to await the result with her mother. The guardsman has left the banqueting-hall. Out into the cold spring night, up that slope, and into the deep dungeon. As its

door opens, the noise of the revelry comes with the light of the torch which the man bears. No time for preparation is given, nor needed. A few minutes more, and the gory head of the Baptist is brought to the maiden in a charger, and she gives the ghastly dish to her mother.

It is all over! As the pale morning light streams into the keep, the faithful disciples, who had been told of it, come reverently to bear the headless body to the burying. They go forth for ever from that accursed place, which is so soon to become a mass of shapeless ruins. They go to tell it to Jesus, and henceforth to remain with Him. We can imagine what welcome awaited them. But the people ever afterwards cursed the tyrant, and looked for those judgments of God to follow, which were so soon to descend on him. And he himself was ever afterwards restless, wretched, and full of apprehensions. He could scarcely believe that the Baptist was really dead, and when the fame of Jesus reached him, and those around suggested that this was Elijah, a prophet, or as one of them, Herod's mind, amidst its strange perplexities, still reverted to the man whom he had murdered. It was a new anxiety, perhaps, even so, a new hope; and as formerly he had often and gladly heard the Baptist, so now he would fain have seen Jesus. { St. ~~499~~ Luke 9:9. } He would see Him; but not now. In that dark night of betrayal, he, who at the bidding of the child of an adulteress, had murdered the Forerunner, might, with the probation of a Pilate, have rescued Him whose faithful witness John had been. But night was to merge into yet darker night. For it was the time and the power of the Evil One. And yet: Jehovah reigneth.'

CHAPTER 29

THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

(St. ~~<0143>~~ Matthew 14:13-21; St. ~~<1063>~~ Mark 6:30-44;
St. ~~<0910>~~ Luke 9:10-17; St. ~~<0001>~~ John 6:1-14).

In the circumstances described in the previous chapter, Jesus resolved at once to leave Capernaum; and this probably alike for the sake of His disciples, who needed rest; for that of the people, who might have attempted a rising after the murder of the Baptist; and temporarily to withdraw Himself and His followers from the power of Herod. For this purpose He chose the place outside the dominions of Antipas, nearest to Capernaum. This was Beth-Saida ('the house of fishing,' 'Fisher-town,' ^{f1465} just within the territory of the Tetrarch Philip. Originally a small village, Philip had converted it into a town, and named it Julias, after Caesar's daughter. It lay on the eastern bank of Jordan, just before that stream enters the Lake of Galilee. {*Jos. Ant.* 18:2. 1.} It must, however, not be confounded with the other 'Fisher-town,' or Bethsaida, on the western shore of the Lake, ^{f1466} which the Fourth Gospel, evidencing by this local knowledge its Judæan, or rather Galilean, authorship, distinguishes from the eastern as Bethsaida of Galilee.' {St. ~~<0121>~~ John 12:21; comp. 1:44; St. ~~<1065>~~ Mark 6:45.} ^{f1467}

Other minute points of deep interest in the same direction will present themselves in the course of this narrative. Meantime we note, that this is the only history, previous to Christ's last visit to Jerusalem, which is recorded by all the four Evangelists; the only series of events also in the whole course of that Galilean Ministry, which commenced after His return from the 'Unknown Feast,' {St. John 5.} which is referred to in the Fourth Gospel; ^{f1468} and that it contains to distinct notices as to time, which enable us to fit it exactly into the frame-work of this history. For, the statement of the Fourth Gospel, {St. ~~<0101>~~ John 6:4.} that the 'Passover was nigh,' ^{f1469} is confirmed by the independent notice of St. Mark, {St. ~~<1063>~~ Mark 6:39.} that those whom the Lord miraculously fed were ranged 'on the green grass.' In that climate there would have been no 'green grass' soon after the Passover. We must look upon the coincidence of these two notices as one of the undesigned confirmations of this narrative.

For, miraculous it certainly is, and the attempts rationalistically to explain it, to sublimate it into a parable, to give it the spiritualistic meaning of spiritual feeding, or to account for its mythical origin by the precedent of the descent of the manna, or of the miracle of Elisha,^{f1470} are even more palpable failures than those made to account for the miracle at Cana. The only alternative is to accept — or entirely to reject it. In view of the exceptional record of this history in all the four Gospels, no unbiased historical student would treat it as a simple invention, for which there was no ground in reality. Nor can its origin be accounted for by previous Jewish expectancy, or Old Testament precedent. The only rational mode of explaining it is on the supposition of its truth. This miracle, and what follows, mark the climax in our Lord's doing, as the healing of the Syro-Phoenician maiden the utmost sweep of His activity, and the Transfiguration the highest point in regard to the miraculous about His Person. The only reason which can be assigned for the miracle of His feeding the five thousand was that of all His working: Man's need, and, in view of it, the stirring of the Pity and Power that were King Herod, and the banquet that ended with the murder of the Baptist, and King Jesus, and the banquet that ended with His lonely prayer on the mountain-side, the calming of the storm on the lake, and the deliverance from death of His disciples.

Only a few hours' sail from Capernaum, and even a shorter distance by land (round the head of the Lake) lay the district of the Bethsaida-Julias. It was natural that Christ, wishing to avoid public attention, should have gone 'by ship,' and equally so that the many 'seeing them departing, and knowing' — viz., what direction the boat was taking, should have followed on foot, and been joined by others from the neighboring villages,^{f1471} as those from Capernaum passed through them, perhaps, also, as they recognized on the Lake the now well-known sail,^{f1472} speeding towards the other shore. It is an incidental but interesting confirmation of the narrative, that the same notice about this journey occurs, evidently undesignedly, in St. ~~4062~~John 6:22. Yet another we find in the fact, that some of those who 'ran there on foot' had reached the place before Jesus and His Apostles. {St. ~~4063~~Mark 6:33.} Only some, as we judge. The largest proportion arrived later, and soon swelled to the immense number of 'about 5,000 men,' 'besides women and children.' The circumstances that the Passover was nigh at hand, so that many must have been starting on their journey to Jerusalem, round the Lake and through Peraea, partly

accounts for the concourse of such multitudes. And this, perhaps in conjunction with the effect on the people of John's murder, may also explain their ready and eager gathering to Christ, thus affording yet another confirmation of the narrative.

It was a well-known spot where Jesus and His Apostles touched the shore. Not many miles south of it was the Gerasa or Gergesa, where the great miracle of healing the demonished had been wrought. {St. ~~AMB~~ Mark 5:1-16.} Just beyond Gerasa the mountains and hills recede, and the plain along the shore enlarges, till it attains wide proportions on the northern bank of the Lake. The few ruins which mark the site of Bethsaida-Julias — most of the basalt-stones having been removed for building purposes — lie on the edge of a hill, three or four miles north of the Lake. The ford, by which those who came from Capernaum crossed the Jordan, was, no doubt, that still used, about two miles from where the river enters the Lake. About a mile further, on that wide expanse of grass, would be the scene of the great miracle. In short, the locality thoroughly accords with the requirements of the Gospel-narrative.

As we picture it to ourselves, our Lord with His disciples, and perhaps followed by those who had outrun the rest, first retired to the top of a height, and there rested in teaching converse with them. {St. ~~AMB~~ John 6:3.} Presently, as He saw the great multitudes gathering, He was 'moved with compassion towards them.' {St. ~~AMB~~ Matthew 14:14.} ^{f1473} There could be no question of retirement or rest in view of this. Surely, it was the opportunity which God had given, a call which came to Him from His Father. Every such opportunity was unspeakably precious to Him, Who longed to gather the lost under His wings. It might be, that even now they would learn what belonged to their peace. Oh, that they would learn it! At least, He must work while it was called to-day, ere the night of judgment came; work with that unending patience and intense compassion which made Him weep, when He could no longer work. It was this depth of longing and intenseness of pity which now ended the Savior's rest, and brought Him down from the hill to meet the gathering multitude in the 'desert' plain beneath.

And what a sight to meet His gaze — these thousands of strong men, besides women and children; and what thoughts of the past, the present, and the future, would be called up by the scene! 'The Passover was nigh,' {St. ~~AMB~~ John 6:4.} with its remembrances of the Paschal night, the Paschal

Lamb, the Paschal Supper, the Paschal deliverance — and most of them were Passover-pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem. These Passover-pilgrims and God's guests, now streaming out into this desert after Him; with a murdered John just buried, and no earthly teacher, guide, or help left! Truly they were 'as sheep having no shepherd. {St. ~~4054~~ Mark 6:34.} The very surroundings seemed to give to the thought the vividness of a picture: this wandering, straying multitude, the desert sweep of country, the very want of provisions. A Passover, indeed, but of which He would be the Paschal Lamb, the Bread which He gave, the Supper, and around which He would gather those scattered, shepherdless sheep into one flock of many 'companies,' to which His Apostles would bring the bread He had blessed and broken, to their sufficient and more than sufficient nourishment; from which, indeed, they would carry the remnant-baskets full, after the flock had been fed, to the poor in the outlying places of far-off heathendom. And so thoughts of the past, the present, and the future must have mingled — thoughts of the Passover in the past, of the Last, the Holy Supper in the future, and of the deeper inward meaning and bearing of both the one and the other; thoughts also of this flock, and of that other flock which was yet to gather, and of the far-off places, and of the Apostles and their service, and of the provision which they were to carry from His Hands, a provision never exhausted by present need, and which always leaves enough to carry thence and far away.

There is, at least in our view, no doubt that thoughts of the Passover and of the Holy Supper, of their commingling and mystic meaning, were present to the Savior, and that it is in this light the miraculous feeding of the multitude must be considered, if we are in any measure to understand it. Meantime the Savior was moving among them — 'beginning to teach them many things,' {St. ~~4054~~ Mark 6:34.} and 'healing them that had need of healing.' {St. ~~4011~~ Luke 9:11.} Yet, as He so moved and thought of it all, from the first, 'He Himself knew what He was about to do. {St. ~~4006~~ John 6:6.} And now the sun had passed its meridian, and the shadows fell longer on the surging crowd. Full of the thoughts of the great Supper, which was symbolically to link the Passover of the past with that of the future, and its Sacramental continuation to all time, He turned to Philip with this question: 'Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?' It was to 'try him,' and show how he would view and meet what, alike spiritually and temporally, has so often been the great problem. Perhaps there was something in Philip which made it specially desirable, that the question

should be put to him. {Comp. St. ^{f1474}John 14:8, 9.} At any rate, the answer of Philip showed that there had been a ‘need be’ for it. This, ‘two hundred denarii — (between six and seven pounds) worth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little,’ is the course realism, not of unbelief, but of an absence of faith which, entirely ignoring any higher possibility, has not even its hope left in a ‘Thou knowest, Lord.’

But there is evidence, also, that the question of Christ worked deeper thinking and higher good. As we understand it, Philip told it to Andrew, and they to the others. While Jesus taught and healed, they must have spoken together of this strange question of the Master. They knew Him sufficiently to judge, that it implied some purpose on His part. Did He intend to provide for all that multitude? They counted them roughly — going along the edge and through the crowd — and reckoned them by thousands, besides women and children. They thought of all the means for feeding such a multitude. How much had they of their own? As we judge by combining the various statements, there was a lad there who carried the scant, humble provisions of the party — perhaps a fisher-lad brought for the purpose from the boat. {Comp. St. ^{f1475}John 6:9 with St. ^{f1476}Matthew 14:17; St. ^{f1477}Mark 6:38; St. ^{f1478}Luke 9:13.} It would take quite what Philip had reckoned — about two hundred denarii — if the Master meant them to go and buy victuals for all that multitude. Probably the common stock — at any rate as computed by Judas, who carried the bag — did not contain that amount. In any case, the right and the wise thing was to dismiss the multitude, that they might go into the towns and villages and buy for themselves victuals, and find lodgment. For already the bright spring-day was declining, and what was called ‘the first evening’ had set in. ^{f1479}For the Jews reckoned two evenings, although it is not easy to determine the exact hour when each began and ended. But, in general, the first evening may be said to have begun when the sun declined, and it was probably reckoned as lasting to about the ninth hour, or three o’clock of the afternoon. {Comp. *Jos. Ant.* 16:6. 2.} Then began the period known as ‘between the evenings,’ which would be longer or shorter according to the season of the year, and which terminated with ‘the second evening’ — the time from when the first star appeared to that when the third star was visible. {Orach-Chajim 261.} With the night began the reckoning of the following day.

It was the ‘first evening’ when the disciples, whose anxiety must have been growing with the progress of time, asked the Lord to dismiss the people.

But it was as they had thought. He would have them give the people to eat! Were they, then, to go and buy two hundred denarii worth of loaves? No, they were not to buy, but to give of their own store! How many loaves had they! Let them go and see. {St. ~~4068~~ Mark 6:38.} And when Andrew went to see what store the fisher-lad carried for them, he brought back the tidings, ‘He hath five barley loaves and two small fishes,’ to which he added, half in disbelief, half in faith’s rising expectancy of impossible possibility: ‘But what are they among so many?’ {St. ~~4119~~ John 6:9.} It is to the fourth Evangelist alone that we owe the record of this remark, which we instinctively feel gives to the whole the touch of truth and life. It is to him also that we owe other two minute traits of deepest interest, and of far greater importance than at first sight appears.

When we read that these five were *barley-loaves*, we learn that, no doubt from voluntary choice, the fare of the Lord and of His followers was the poorest. Indeed, barley-bread was, almost proverbially, the meanest. Hence, as the Mishnah puts it, while all other meat-offerings were of wheat, that brought by the woman accused of adultery was to be of barley, because (so R. Gamaliel puts it), ‘as her deed is that of animals, so her offering is also of the food of animals.’ {Sotah. 2:1.} The other minute trait in St. John’s Gospel consists in the use of a peculiar word for ‘fish’ (ὀψάριον), ‘opsarion, which properly means what was eaten along with the bread, and specially refers to the small, and generally dried or pickled fish eaten with bread, like our ‘sardines,’ or the ‘caviar’ of Russia, the pickled herrings of Holland and Germany, or a peculiar kind of small dried fish, eaten with the bones, in the North of Scotland. Now just as any one who would name that fish as eaten with bread, would display such minute knowledge of the habits of the North-east of Scotland as only personal residence could give, so in regard to the use of this term, which, be it marked, *is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel*, Dr. Westcott suggests, that ‘it may have been a familiar Galilean word,’ and his conjecture is correct, for *Ophsonin* ὤψωσπιν from the same Greek word ὀψων, of which that used by St. John is the diminutive, means a ‘savory dish,’ while *Aphyan* ἁψῆα or *Aphits* ἁψῆ, is the term for a kind of small fish, such as sardines. The importance of tracing accurate local knowledge in the Fourth Gospel warrants our pursuing the subject further. The Talmud, declares that of all kinds of meat, fish only becomes more savory by salting, {Babha. B. 740 b.} and names certain kinds, specially designated as ‘small fishes,’ {μῦγρ

μυνηφ Beza 16 a. } which might be eaten without being cooked. Small fishes were recommended for health; {Ber. 40 a, near the middle.} and a kind of pickle or savory was also made of them. Now the Lake of Galilee was particularly rich in these fishes, and we know that both the salting and pickling of them was a special industry among its fishermen. For this purpose a small kind of them were specially selected, which bear the name Terith (tyrf). ^{f1475} Now the diminutive used by St. John (ὀψάριον) of which our Authorized Version no doubt gives the meaning fairly by rendering it ‘small fishes,’ refers, no doubt, to those small fishes (probably a kind of sardine) of which millions were caught in the Lake, and which, dried and salted, would form the most common ‘savory’ with bread for the fisher-population along the shores.

If the Fourth Gospel in the use of this diminutive displays such special Lake-knowledge as evidences its Galilean origin, another touching trait connected with its use may here be mentioned. It has already been said that the term is used only by St. John, as if to mark the Lake of Galilee origin of the Fourth Gospel. But only once again does the expression occur in the Fourth Gospel. On that morning, when the Risen One manifested Himself by the Lake of Galilee to them who had all the night toiled in vain, He had Provided for them miraculously the meal, when on the ‘fire of charcoal’ they saw the well-remembered ‘little fish’ (the *opsarion*), and, as He bade them bring of the ‘little fish’ (the *Opsaria*) which they had miraculously caught, Peter drew to shore the net full, not of *opsaria*, but ‘of great fishes’ ἰχθύων μεγάλων. And yet it was not of those ‘great fishes’ that He gave them, but ‘He took the bread and gave them, and the *opsarion* likewise.’ {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 21:9, 10, 13.} Thus, in infinite humility, the meal at which the Risen Savior sat down with His disciples was still of ‘bread and small fishes’ — even though He gave them, the draught of large fishes; and so at that last meal He recalled that first miraculous feeding by the Lake of Galilee. And this also is one of those undesigned, too often unobserved traits in the narrative, which yet carry almost irresistible evidence.

There is one proof at least of the implicit faith or rather trust of the disciples in their Master. They had given Him account of their own scanty provision, and yet, as He bade them make the people sit down to the meal, they hesitated not to obey. We can picture it to ourselves, what is so exquisitely sketched: the expanse of ‘grass.’ {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Matthew 14:9} ‘green,’ and fresh, {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Mark 6:39.} ‘much grass,’ {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 6:10 .}

then the people in their ‘companies’ { **συμπόσια** St. ~~4059~~ Mark 6:39.} of fifties and hundreds, reclining, { **κλισίας** St. ~~4094~~ Luke 9:14} and looking in their regular divisions, and with their bright many-colored dresses, like ‘garden-beds’ ^{f1476} {St. ~~4060~~ Mark 6:40.} on the turf. But One Figure must every eye have been bent. Around Him stood His Apostles. They had laid before Him the scant provision made for their own wants, and which was now to feed their great multitude. As was wont at meals, on the part of the head of the household, Jesus took the bread, ‘blessed’ {Ber. 46 *a*.} or, as St. John puts it, ‘gave thanks,’ ^{f1477} there is also reference to the Lord’s Supper. As of comparatively secondary importance, yet helping us better to realize the scene, we recall the Jewish ordinance, that the Head of the meal, yet if they who sat down to it were not merely guests, but his children, or his household, then might he speak it, even if he himself did not partake of the bread which he had broken. {Rosh haSh 29 *b*.}

We can scarcely be mistaken as to the words which Jesus spake when ‘He gave thanks.’ The Jewish Law {Sot. 7:1.} allows the grace at meat to be said, not only in Hebrew, but in any language, the Jerusalem Talmud aptly remarking, that it was proper a person should understand to Whom he was giving thanks **drbm yml** . {Jer. Sot. p. 21 *b* .} Similarly, we have very distinct information as regards a case like the present. We gather, that the use of ‘savory’ with bread was specially common around the Lake of Galilee, and the Mishnah lays down the principle, that if bread and ‘savory’ were eaten, it would depend which of the two was the main article of diet, to determine whether thanks-giving should be said for one or the other. In any case only one benediction was to be used. {In this case, of course, it would be spoken over the bread, the ‘savory’ being merely an addition. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the words which Jesus spake, whether in Aramaean, Greek, or Hebrew, were those so well known: ‘Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the world, Who causes to come forth **ayxwmh** bread from the earth.’ Assuredly it was this threefold thought: the upward thought (*sursum corda*), the recognition of the creative act as regards every piece of bread we eat, and the thanksgiving, which was realized anew in all its fulness, when, as He distributed to the disciples, the provision miraculously multiplied in His Hands. And still they bore it from His Hands from company to company, laying before each a store. When they were all filled, He that had provided the meal bade them gather up the fragments before each company. So doing, each of the twelve had his basket filled. Here also we have another life-touch. Those

‘baskets’ **κόφινοι**, known in Jewish writings by a similar name (*kephiphah*), made of wicker or willows ^{f1478} **tyrxm hpypk** were in common use, but considered of the poorest kind. {Comp. Sotah. 2:1.} There is a sublimeness of contrast that passes description between this feast to the five thousand, besides women and children and the poor’s provision of barley bread and the two small fishes; and, again, between the quantity left and the coarse wicker baskets in which it was stored. Nor do we forget to draw mentally the parallel between this Messianic feast and that banquet of ‘the latter days ‘ which Rabbinism pictured so realistically. But as the wondering multitude watched, as the disciples gathered from company to company the fragments into their baskets, the murmur ran through the ranks: ‘This is truly the Prophet, “This is truly the Prophet, “the coming One” (*habba*, **abh**) into the world. ‘ And so the Baptist’s last inquiry, ‘Art Thou the Coming One?’ ^{f1479} was fully and publicly answered, and that by the Jews themselves.

CHAPTER 30

THE NIGHT OF MIRACLES ON THE LAKE OF GENNESARET.

(St. ~~4142~~ Matthew 14:22-36; St. John 15-21.)

THE last question of the Baptist, spoken in public, had been: ‘Art Thou the Coming One, or look we for another?’ It had, in part, been answered, as the murmur had passed through the ranks: ‘This One is truly the Prophet, the Coming One!’ So, then, they had no longer to wait, nor to look for another! And this ‘Prophet’ was Israel’s long expected Messiah. What this would imply to the people, in the intensity and longing of the great hope which, for centuries, nay, far beyond the time of Ezra, had swayed their hearts, it is impossible fully to conceive. Here, then, was the Great Reality at last before them. He, on Whose teaching they had hung entranced, was ‘the Prophet,’ nay, more, ‘the Coming One.’ He Who was coming all those many centuries, and yet had not come till now. Then, also, was He more than a Prophet — a King: Israel’s King, the King of the world. An irresistible impulse seized the people. They would proclaim Him King, then and there; and as they knew, probably from previous utterances, perhaps when similar movements had to be checked, that He would resist, they would constrain Him to declare Himself, or at least to be proclaimed by them. Can we wonder at this; or that thoughts of a Messianic worldly kingdom should have filled, moved, and influenced to discipleship a Judas; or that, with such a representative of their own thoughts among the disciples, the rising waves of popular excitement should have swollen into the mighty billows?

‘Jesus therefore, perceiving that they were about to come, and to take Him by force, that they might make Him King, ^{f1480} withdrew again into the mountain, Himself alone,’ or, as it might be rendered, though not quite in the modern usage of the expression, ‘became an anchorite again... Himself alone.’ {St. ~~4165~~ John 6:15.} This is another of those sublime contrasts, which render it well-nigh inconceivable to regard this history otherwise than as true and Divine. Yet another is the manner in which He stilled the multitude, and the purpose for which He became the lonely Anchorite on the mountain-top. He withdrew to pray; and He stilled the people, and sent them, no doubt solemnized, to their homes, by telling them that He

withdrew to pray. And He did pray till far on, ‘when the (second) evening had come,’ {St. ^{f1423}Matthew 14:23.} and the first stars shone out in the deep blue sky over the Lake of Galilee, with the far lights twinkling and trembling on the other side. And yet another sublime contrast — as He constrained the disciples to enter the ship, and that ship, which bore those who had been sharers in the miracle, could not make way against storm and waves, and was at last driven out of its course. And yet another contrast — as He walked on the storm-tossed waves and subdued them. And yet another, and another — for is not all this history one sublime contrast to the seen and the thought of by men, but withal most true and Divine in the sublimeness of these contrasts?

For whom and for what He prayed, alone on that mountain, we dare not, even in deepest reverence, inquire. Yet we think, in connection with it, of the Passover, the Manna, the Wilderness, the Lost Sheep, the Holy Supper, the Bread which is His Flesh, and the remnant in the Baskets to be carried to those afar off, and then also of the attempt to make Him a King, in all its spiritual unreality, ending in His View with the betrayal, the denial, and the cry: ‘We have no King but Caesar.’ And as He prayed, the faithful stars in the heavens shone out. But there on the Lake, where the bark which bore His disciples made for the other shore, ‘a great wind’ ‘contrary to them’ was rising. And still He was ‘alone on the land,’ but looking out into the evening after them, as the ship was ‘in the midst of the sea,’ and they toiling and ‘distressed in rowing.’

Thus far, to the utmost verge of their need, but not farther. The Lake is altogether about forty furlongs or stadia (about six miles) wide, and they had as yet reached little more than half the distance (twenty-five or thirty furlongs). Already it was ‘the fourth watch of the night.’ There was some difference of opinion among the Jews, whether the night should be divided into three, or (as among the Romans) into four watches. The latter (which would count the night at twelve instead of nine hours) was adopted by many. {Ber. 3 b.} In any case it would be what might be termed the morning-watch, ^{f1481} when the well-known Form seemed to be passing them, ‘walking upon the sea.’ There can, at least, be no question that such was the impression, not only of one or another, but that all saw Him. Nor yet can there be here question of any natural explanation. Once more the truth of the event must be either absolutely admitted, or absolutely rejected. ^{f1482} The difficulties of the latter hypothesis, which truly cuts the knot, would be very formidable. Not only would the origination of this

narrative, as given by two of the Synoptists and by St. John, be utterly unaccountable — neither meeting Jewish expectancy, nor yet supposed Old Testament precedent, but, if legend it be, it seems purposeless and irrational. Moreover, there is this noticeable about it, as about so many of the records of the miraculous in the New Testament, that the writers by no means disguise from themselves or their readers the obvious difficulties involved. In the present instance they tell us, that they regarded His Form moving on the water as ‘a spirit,’ and cried out for fear; and again, that the impression produced by the whole scene, even on them that had witnessed the miracle of the previous evening, was one of overwhelming astonishment. This walking on the water, then, was even to them within the domain of the truly miraculous, and it affected their minds equally, perhaps even more than ours, from the fact that in their view so much, which to us seems miraculous, lay within the sphere of what might be expected in the course of such a history.

On the other hand, this miracle stands not isolated, but forms one of a series of similar manifestations. It is closely connected both with what had passed on the previous evening, and what was to follow; it is told with a minuteness of detail, and with such marked absence of any attempt at gloss, adornment, apology, or self-glorification, as to give the narrative (considered simply as such) the stamp of truth; while, lastly, it contains much that lifts the story from the merely miraculous into the domain of the sublime and deeply spiritual. As regards what may be termed its credibility, this at least may again be stated, that this and similar instances of ‘dominion over the creature,’ are not beyond the range of what God had originally assigned to man, when He made him a little lower than the angels, and crowned him with glory and honor, made him to have dominion over the works of His Hands, and all things were put under his feet. {^{<1085}Psalm 8:5, 6; comp. ^{<1086}Hebrews 2:6-9.} Indeed, this ‘dominion over the sea’ seems to exhibit the Divinely human rather than the humanly Divine aspect of His Person,^{f1483} if such distinction may be lawfully made. Of the physical possibility of such a miracle, not to speak of the contradiction in terms which this implies — no explanation can be attempted, if it were only on the ground that we are utterly ignorant of the conditions under which it took place.

This much, however, deserves special notice, that there is one marked point of difference between the account of this miracle and what will be found a general characteristic in legendary narratives. In the latter, the

miraculous, however extraordinary, is the expected; it creates no surprise, and it is never mistaken for something that might have occurred in the ordinary course of events. For, it is characteristic of the mythical that the miraculous is not only introduced in the most realistic manner, but forms the essential element in the conception of things. This is the very *raison d'être* of the myth or legend, when it attaches itself to the real and historically true. Now the opposite is the case in the present narrative. Had it been mythical or legendary, we should have expected that the disciples would have been described as immediately recognizing the Master as He walked on the sea, and worshipping Him. Instead of this, they 'are troubled' and 'afraid.' 'They supposed it was an apparition,' ^{f1484} (this in accordance with popular Jewish notions), and 'cried out for fear.' Even afterwards, when they had received Him into the ship, 'they were sore amazed in themselves,' and 'understood not,' while those in the ship (in contradistinction to the disciples), burst forth into an act of worship. This much then is evident, that the disciples expected not the miraculous; that they were unprepared for it; that they had explained it on what to them seemed natural grounds; and that, even when convinced of its reality, the impression of wonder, which it made, was of the deepest. And this also follows is a corollary, that, when they recorded it, it was not in ignorance that they were writing that which sounded strangest, and which would affect those who should read it with even much greater wonderment — we had almost written — unbelief, than those who themselves had witnessed it.

Nor let it be forgotten, that what had just been remarked about this narrative holds equally true in regard to other miracles recorded in the New Testament. Thus, even so fundamental an article of the faith as the resurrection of Christ is described as having come upon the disciples themselves as a surprise, not only wholly unexpected, but so incredible, that it required repeated and indisputable evidence to command their acknowledgment. And nothing can be more plain, than that St. Paul himself was not only aware of the general resistance which the announcement of such an event would raise, {<4018>Acts 26:8.} but that he felt to the full the difficulties of what he so firmly believed, {<4352>1 Corinthians 15:12-19.} and made the foundation of all his preaching. {<4473>Acts 17:31, 32.} Indeed, the elaborate exposition of the historical grounds, on which he had arrived at the conviction of reality, {<4350>1 Corinthians 15:1-8.} affords an insight into the mental difficulties which it must at first have presented to him. And a

similar inference may be drawn from the reference of St. Peter to the difficulties connected with the Biblical predictions about the end of the world. {~~<6004>~~ 2 Peter 3:4.} ^{f1485}

It is not necessary to pursue this subject further. Its bearing on the miracle of Christ's walking on the Sea of Galilee will be sufficiently manifest. Yet other confirmatory evidence may be gathered from a closer study of the details of the narrative. When Jesus 'constrained the disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before Him unto the other side, {St. ~~<6042>~~ Matthew 14:22.} they must have thought, that His purpose was to join them by land, since there was no other boat there, save that in which they crossed the Lake. {St. ~~<6162>~~ John 6:22.} And possibly such had been his intention, till He saw their difficulty, if not danger, from the contrary wind. ^{f1486} This must have determined Him to come to their help. And so this miracle also was not a mere display of power, but, being caused by their need, had a moral object. And when it is asked, how from the mountain-height by the Lake He could have seen at night where the ship was laboring so far on the Lake, ^{f1487} it must surely have been forgotten that the scene is laid quite shortly before the Passover (the 15th of Nisan), when, of course, the moon would shine on an unclouded sky, all the more brightly on a windy spring-night, and light up the waters far across.

We can almost picture to ourselves the weird scene. The Christ is on that hill-top in solitary converse with His Father — praying after that miraculous breaking of bread: fully realizing all that it implied to Him of self-surrender, of suffering, and of giving Himself as the Food of the World, and all that it implied to us of blessing and nourishment; praying also — with that scene fresh on His mind, of their seeking to make Him, even by force, their King — that the carnal might become spiritual reality (as in symbol it would be with the Breaking of Bread). Then, as He rises from His knees, knowing that, alas, it could not and would not be so to the many, He looks out over the Lake after that little company, which embodied and represented all there yet was of His Church, all that would really feed on the Bread from Heaven, and own Him their true King. Without presumption, we may venture to say, that there must have been indescribable sorrow and longing in His Heart, as His gaze was bent across the track which the little boat would follow. As we view it, it seems all symbolical: the night, the moonlight, the little boat, the contrary wind, and then also the lonely Savior after prayer looking across to where the boatmen vainly labor to gain the other shore. As in the clear moonlight just

that piece of water stands out, almost like burnished silver, with all else in shadows around, the sail-less mast is now rocking to and fro, without moving forward. They are in difficulty, in danger: and the Savior cannot pursue His journey on foot by land; He must come to their help, though it be across the water. It is needful, and therefore it shall be upon the water; and so the storm and unsuccessful toil shall not prevent their reaching the shore, but shall also be to them for teaching concerning Him and His great power, and concerning His great deliverance; such teaching as, in another aspect of it, had been given them in symbol in the miraculous supply of food, with all that it implied (and not to them only, but to us also) of precious comfort and assurance, and as will for ever keep the Church from being overwhelmed by fear in the stormy night on the Lake of Galilee, when the labor of our oars cannot make way for us.

And they also who were in the boat must have been agitated by peculiar feelings. Against their will they had been ‘constrained’ by the Lord to embark and quit the scene; just as the multitude, under the influence of the great miracle, were surrounding their Master, with violent insistence to proclaim him the Messianic King of Israel. Not only a Judas Iscariot, but all of them, must have been under the strongest excitement: first of the great miracle, and then of the popular movement. It was the crisis in the history of the Messiah and of His Kingdom. Can we wonder, that, when the Lord in very mercy bade them quit a scene which could only have misled them, they were reluctant, nay that it almost needed violence of His part? And yet — the more we consider it — was it not most truly needful for them, that they should leave? But, on the other hand, in this respect also, does there seem a ‘need be’ for His walking upon the sea, that they might learn not only His Almighty Power, and (symbolically) that He ruled the rising waves; but that, in their disappointment at His not being a King, they might learn that He *was* a King — only in a far higher, truer sense than the excited multitude would have proclaimed Him.

Thus we can imagine the feelings with which they had pushed the boat from the shore, and then eagerly looked back to descry what passed there. But soon the shadows of night were enwrapping all objects at a distance, and only the bright moon overhead shone on the track behind and before. And now the breeze from the other side of the Lake, of which they may have been unaware when they embarked on the eastern shore, had freshened into violent, contrary wind. All energies must have been engaged to keep the boat’s head towards the shore. ^{f1488} Even so it seemed as if they

could make no progress, when all at once, in the track that lay behind them, a Figure appeared. As it passed onwards over the water, seemingly upborne by the waves as they rose, not disappearing as they fell, but carried on as they rolled, the silvery moon laid upon the trembling waters the shadows of that Form as it moved, long and dark, on their track. St. John uses an expression, ^{f1489} which shows us in the pale light, those in the boat, intently, fixedly, fearfully, gazing at the Apparition as It neared still closer and closer. We must remember their previous excitement, as also the presence, and, no doubt, the superstitious suggestions of the boatman, when we think how they cried out for fear, and deemed It an Apparition. And ‘He would have passed by them,’ {St. ~~Mark~~ ^{f1488} Mark 6:48.} as He so often does in our case — bringing them, indeed, deliverance, pointing and smoothing their way, but not giving them His known Presence, if they had not cried out. But their fear, which made them almost hesitate to receive Him into the boat, ^{f1490} even though the outcome of error and superstition, brought His ready sympathy and comfort, in language which has so often, and in all ages, converted foolish fears of misapprehension into gladsome, thankful assurance: ‘It is I, be not afraid!’

And they were no longer afraid, though truly His walking upon the waters might seem more awesome than any ‘apparition.’ The storm in their hearts, like that on the Lake, was commanded by His Presence. We must still bear in mind their former excitement, now greatly intensified by what they had just witnessed, in order to understand the request of Peter: ‘Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come to Thee on the water.’ They are the words of a man, whom the excitement of the moment has carried beyond all reflection. And yet this combination of doubt (‘if it be Thou’), with presumption (‘bid me come on the water’), is peculiarly characteristic of Peter. He is the Apostle of Hope — and hope is a combination of doubt and presumption, but also their transformation. With reverence be it said, Christ could not have left the request ungranted, even though it was the outcome of yet unreconciled and untransformed doubt and presumption. He would not have done so, or doubt would have remained doubt untransformed; and He could not have done so, without also correcting it, or presumption would have remained presumption untransformed, which is only upward growth, without deeper rooting in inward spiritual experience. And so He bade him come upon the water, ^{f1491} to transform his doubt, but left him, unassured from without, to his own feelings as he saw the wind, ^{f1492} to transform his presumption; while by stretching out His Hand to save him from sinking, and by the

words of correction which He spake, He did actually so point to their transformation in that hope, of which St. Peter is the special representative, and the preacher in the Church.

And presently, as they two came into the boat, ^{f1493} the wind ceased, and immediately the ship was at the land. But ‘they that were in the boat’ — apparently in contradistinction to the disciples, ^{f1494} though the latter must have stood around in sympathetic reverence — ‘worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God.’ The first full public confession this of the fact, and made not by the disciples, but by others. With the disciples it would have meant something far deeper. But as from the lips of these men it seems, like the echo of what had passed between them on that memorable passage across the Lake. They also must have mingled in the conversation, as the boat had pushed off from the shore on the previous evening, when they spake of the miracle of the feeding, and then of the popular attempt to proclaim Him Messianic King, of which they knew not yet the final issue, since they had been ‘constrained to get into the boat,’ while the Master remained behind. They would speak of all that He was and had done, and how the very devils had proclaimed Him to be the ‘Son of God,’ on that other shore, close by where the miracle of feeding had taken place. Perhaps, having been somewhat driven out of their course, they may have passed close to the very spot, and, as they pointed to it recalled the incident. And this designation of ‘Son of God,’ with the worship which followed, would come much more readily, because with much more superficial meaning, to the boatmen than to the disciples. But in them, also, the thought was striking deep root; and presently, by the Mount of Transfiguration, would it be spoken in the name of all by Peter, not as demon- nor as man-taught, but as taught of Christ’s Father Who is in Heaven.

Yet another question suggests itself. The events of the night are not recorded by St. Luke — perhaps because they did not come within his general view-plan of that Life; perhaps from reverence, because neither he, nor his teacher St. Paul, were within that inner circle, with which the events of that night were connected rather in the way of reproof than otherwise. At any rate, even negative criticism cannot legitimately draw any adverse inference from it, in view of its record not only by two of the Synoptists, but in the Fourth Gospel. St. Mark also does not mention the incident concerning St. Peter; and this we can readily understand from his connection with that Apostle. Of the two eyewitnesses, St. John and St.

Matthew, the former also is silent on that incident. On any view of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, it could not have been from ignorance, either of its occurrence, or else of its record by St. Matthew. Was it among those 'many other things which Jesus did,' which were not written by him, since their complete chronicle would have rendered a Gospel-sketch impossible? Or did it lie outside that special conception of his Gospel, which as regards its details, determined the insertion or else the omission of certain incidents? Or was there some reason for this omission connected with the special relation of John to Peter? And, lastly, why was St. Matthew in this instance more detailed than the others, and alone told it with such circumstantiality? Was it that it had made such deep impression on his own mind; had he somehow any personal connection with it; or did he feel, as if this bidding of Peter to come to Christ out of the ship and on the water had some close inner analogy with his own call to leave the custom-house and follow Christ? Such, and other suggestions which may arise can only be put in the form of questions. Their answer awaits the morning and the other shore.

CHAPTER 31

THE CAVILS OF THE PHARISEES CONCERNING PURIFICATION, AND THE TEACHING OF THE LORD CONCERNING PURITY, — THE TRADITIONS CONCERNING ‘HAND-WASHING’ AND ‘VOWS.’

(St. ^{<151>}Matthew 15:1-20; St. ^{<1070>}Mark 7:1-23.)

AS we follow the narrative, confirmatory evidence of what had preceded springs up at almost every step. It is quite in accordance with the abrupt departure of Jesus from Capernaum, and its motives, that when, so far from finding rest and privacy at Bethsaida (east of the Jordan), a greater multitude than ever had there gathered around Him, which would fain have proclaimed Him King, He resolved on immediate return to the western shore, with the view of seeking a quieter retreat, even though it were in ‘the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.’ {St. ^{<152>}Matthew 15:21.} According to St. Mark, {St. ^{<1065>}Mark 6:45.} the Master had directed the disciples to make for the other Bethsaida, or ‘Fisherton,’ on the western shore of the Lake. {St. ^{<121>}John 12:21.} Remembering how common the corresponding name is in our own country, ^{f1495} and that fishing was the main industry along the shores of the Lake, we need not wonder at the existence of more than one Beth-Saida, or ‘Fisherton.’ ^{f1496} Nor yet does it seem strange, that the site should be lost of what, probably, except for the fishing, was quite an unimportant place. By the testimony both of Josephus and the Rabbis, the shores of Gennesaret were thickly studded with little towns, villages, and hamlets, which have all perished without leaving a trace, while even of the largest the ruins are few and inconsiderable. We would, however, hazard a geographical conjecture. From the fact that St. Mark {St. ^{<1065>}Mark 6:45.} names Bethsaida, and St. John {St. ^{<107>}John 6:17.} Capernaum, as the original destination of the boat, we would infer that Bethsaida was the fishing quarter of, or rather close to, Capernaum, even as we so often find in our own country a ‘Fisherton’ adjacent to larger towns. With this would agree the circumstance, that no traces of an ancient harbor have been discovered at Tell Hum, the site of Capernaum. ^{f1497} Further, it would explain, how Peter and Andrew, who, according to St. John, {St. ^{<1044>}John 1:44; ^{<121>}12:21.} were of Bethsaida, are described by St. Mark {St. ^{<1029>}Mark 1:29.} as having their home in Capernaum. It also deserves notice, that, as regards the house of St. Peter, St. Mark, who was so

intimately connected with him, names Capernaum, while St. John, who was his fellow-townsmen. names Bethsaida, and that the reverse difference obtains between the two Evangelists in regard to the direction of the ship. This also suggests, that in a sense — as regarded the fishermen, — he names were interchangeable, or rather, that Bethsaida was the ‘Fisherton’ of Capernaum. ^{f1498}

A superficial reader might object that, in the circumstances, we would scarcely have expected Christ and His disciples to have returned at once to the immediate neighborhood of Capernaum, if not to that city itself. But a fuller knowledge of the circumstances will not only, as so often, convert the supposed difficulty into most important confirmatory evidence, but supply some deeply interesting details. The apparently trivial notice, that (at least) the concluding part of the Discourses, immediately on the return to Capernaum, was spoken by Christ ‘in Synagogue,’ {St. ~~Mat~~ John 6:59.} ^{f1499} enables us not only to localize this address, but to fix the exact succession of events. If this Discourse was spoken ‘in Synagogue,’ it must have been (as will be shown) on the Jewish Sabbath. Reckoning backwards, we arrive at the conclusion, that Jesus with His disciples left Capernaum for Bethsaida-Julias on a Thursday; that the miraculous feeding of the multitude took place on Thursday evening; the passage of the disciples to the other side, and the walking of Christ on the sea, as well as the failure of Peter’s faith, in the night of Thursday to Friday; the passage of the people to Capernaum in search of Jesus, {St. ~~Mat~~ John 6:22-24.} with all that followed, on the Friday; and, lastly, the final Discourses of Christ on the Saturday in Capernaum and in the Synagogue.

Two inferences will appear from this chronological arrangement. First, when our Lord had retraced His steps from the eastern shore in search of rest and retirement, it was so close on the Jewish Sabbath (Friday), that He was almost obliged to return to Capernaum to spend the holy day there, before undertaking the further journey to ‘the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.’ And on the Sabbath no actual danger, either from Herod Antipas or the Pharisees, need have been apprehended. Thus (as before indicated), the sudden return to apprehend. Thus (as before indicated), the sudden return to Capernaum, so far from constituting a difficulty, serves as confirmation of the previous narrative. Again, we cannot but perceive a peculiar correspondence of dates. Mark here: The miraculous breaking of Bread at Bethsaida on a Thursday evening; the breaking of Bread at the Last Supper on a Thursday evening; the attempt to proclaim Him King, and the

betrayal; Peter's bold assertion, and the failure of his faith, each in the night from Thursday to Friday; and, lastly, Christ's walking on the angry, storm-tossed waves, and commanding them, and bringing the boat that bore His disciples safe to land, and His victory and triumph over Death and him that had the power of Death.

These, surely, are more than coincidences; and in this respect also may this history be regarded as symbolic. As we read it, Christ directed the disciples to steer for Bethsaida, the 'Fisherton' of Capernaum, But, apart from the latter suggestion, we gather from the expressions used, {St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 6:53.} that the boat which bore the disciples had drifted out of its course — probably owing to the wind, — and touched land, not where they had intended, but at Gennesaret, where they moored it. There can be no question, that by this term is meant 'the plain of Gennesaret,' the richness and beauty of which *Josephus* {Jewish War 3:10.7, 8.} and the Rabbis {Pes. 8 b; Meg. 6 a; Ber. R. 98.} describe in such glowing language. To this day it bears marks of having been the most favored spot in this favored region. Traveling northwards from Tiberias along the Lake, we follow, for about five or six miles, a narrow ledge of land shut in by mountains, when we reach the home of the Magdalene, the ancient Magdala (the modern *Mejdel*). Right over against us, on the other side, is *Kersa* (Gerasa), the scene of the great miracle. On leaving Magdala the mountains recede, and form a plain, more than a mile wide, and four or five miles long. This is 'the land of Gennesaret' (*el Ghuweir*). We pass across the 'Valley of Doves,' which intersects it about one mile to the north of Magdala, and pursue our journey over the well-watered plain, till, after somewhat more than an hour, we reach its northern boundary, a little beyond *Khan Minyeh*. The latter has, in accordance with tradition, been regarded by some as representing Bethsaida, ^{f1500} but seems both too far from the Lake, and too much south of Capernaum, to answer the requirements.

No sooner had the well-known boat, which bore Jesus and His disciples, been run up the gravel-beach in the early morning of that Friday, than His Presence must have become known throughout the district, all the more that the boatmen would soon spread the story of the miraculous occurrences of the preceding evening and night. With Eastern rapidity the tidings would pass along, and from all the country around the sick were brought on their pallets, if they might but touch the border of His garment. Nor could such touch, even though the outcome of an imperfect faith, be in vain — for He, Whose garment they sought leave to touch, was the God-

Man, the Conqueror of Death, the Source and Spring of all Life. And so it was where He landed, and all the way up to Bethsaida and Capernaum. {St. ~~414b~~ Matthew 14:34-36; St. ~~406b~~ Mark 6:53-56.} ^{f1501}

In what followed, we can still trace the succession of events, though there are considerable difficulties as to their precise order. Thus we are expressly told, {St. ~~4162~~ John 6:22-25.} that those from ‘the other side’ came to Capernaum’ on ‘the day following’ the miraculous feeding, and that one of the subsequent Discourses, of which the outline is preserved, was delivered ‘in Synagogue.’ {Pes. 55 *a*.} As this could only have been done either on a Sabbath or Feast-Day (in this instance, the Passover {St. ~~4004~~ John 6:4.}), it follows, that in any case a day must have intervened between their arrival at Capernaum and the Discourse in Synagogue. Again, it is almost impossible to believe that it could have been on the Passover-day (15th Nisan). ^{f1502} For we cannot imagine, that any large number would have left their homes and festive preparations on the Eve of the Pascha (14th Nisan), not to speak of the circumstance that in Galilee, differently from Judaea, all labor, including, of course, that of a journey across the Lake, was intermitted on the Eve of the Passover. {ver. 59.} Similarly, it is almost impossible to believe, that so many festive pilgrims would have been assembled till late in the evening preceding the 14th Nisan so far from Jerusalem as Bethsaida-Julias, since it would have been impossible after that to reach the city and Temple in time for the feast. It, therefore, only remains to regard the Synagogue-service at which Christ preached as that of an ordinary Sabbath, and the arrival of the multitude as having taken place on Friday in the forenoon.

Again, from the place which the narrative occupies in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, as well as from certain internal evidence, it seems difficult to doubt, that the reproof of the Pharisees and Scribes on the subject of ‘the unwashed hands,’ {St. ~~4050~~ Matthew 15:1; St. ~~4006~~ Mark 7:1.} was not administered immediately after the miraculous feeding and the night of miracles. We cannot, however, feel equally sure, which of the two preceded the other: the Discourse in Capernaum, {St. ~~4163~~ John 6:59} or the Reproof of the Pharisees. {St. ~~4050~~ Matthew 15:1 etc.} Several reasons have determined us to regard the Reproof as having preceded the Discourse. Without entering on a detailed discussion, the simple reading of the two sections will lead to the instinctive conclusion, that such a Discourse could not have been followed by such cavil and such Reproof, while it seems in the right order of things, that the Reproof which led to the ‘offense’ of the

Pharisees, and apparently the withdrawal of some in the outer circle of discipleship, {St. ^{<0152>}Matthew 15:12-14.} should have been followed by the positive teaching of the Discourse, which in turn resulted in the going back of many who had been in the inner circle of disciples.

In these circumstances, we venture to suggest the following as the succession of events. Early on the Friday morning the boat which bore Jesus and His disciples grated on the sandy beach of the plain of Gennesaret. As the tidings spread of His arrival and of the miracles which had so lately been witnessed, the people from the neighboring villages and towns flocked around Him, and brought their sick for the healing touch. So the greater part of the forenoon passed. Meantime, while they moved, as the concourse of the people by the way would allow, the first tidings of all this must have reached the neighboring Capernaum. This brought immediately on the scene those Pharisees and Scribes 'who had come from Jerusalem' on purpose to watch, and, if possible, to compass the destruction on Jesus. As we conceive it, they met the Lord and His disciples on their way to Capernaum. Possibly they overtook them, as they rested by the way, and the disciples, or some of them, were partaking of some food — perhaps, some of the consecrated Bread of the previous evening. The Reproof of Christ would be administered there; then the Lord would, not only for their teaching, but for the purposes immediately to be indicated, turn to the multitude; {St. ^{<0150>}Matthew 15:10; St. ^{<0174>}Mark 7:14, 15.} next would follow the remark of the disciples and the reply of the Lord, spoken, probably, when they were again on the way; {St. ^{<0152>}Matthew 15:12-14.} and, lastly, the final explanation of Christ, after they had entered the house at Capernaum. {St. ^{<0155>}Matthew 15:15-20; St. ^{<0177>}Mark 7:17-23.} In all probability a part of what is recorded in St. ^{<0124>}John 6:24, etc. occurred also about the same time; the rest on the Sabbath which followed.

Although the cavil of the Jerusalem Scribes may have been occasioned by seeing some of the disciples eating without first having washed their hands, we cannot banish the impression that it reflected on the miraculously provided meal of the previous evening, when thousands had sat down to food without the previous observance of the Rabbinic ordinance. Neither in that case, nor in the present, had the Master interposed. He was, therefore, guilty of participation in their offense. So this was all which these Pharisees and Scribes could see in the miracle of Christ's feeding the Multitude — that it had not been done according to Law! Most strange as it may seem,

yet in the past history of the Church, and, perhaps, sometimes also in the present, this has been the only thing which some men have seen in the miraculous working of the Christ! Perhaps we should not wonder that the miracle itself made no deeper impression, since even the disciples ‘understood not’ (by reasoning) ‘about the loaves’ — however they may have accounted for it in a manner which might seem to them reasonable. But, in another aspect, the objection of the Scribes was not a mere cavil. In truth, it represented one of the great charges which the Pharisees brought against Jesus, and which determined them to seek His destruction.

It has already been shown, that they accounted for the miracles of Christ as wrought by the power of Satan, whose special representative — almost incarnation — they declared Jesus to be. This would not only turn the evidential force of these signs into an argument against Christ, but vindicate the resistance of the Pharisees to His claims. The second charge against Jesus was, that He was ‘not of God;’ that He was ‘a sinner.’ {St. ~~John~~ 9:16, 24.} If this could be established, it would, of course, prove that He was not the Messiah, but a deceiver who misled the people, and whom it was the duty of the Sanhedrin to unmask and arrest. The way in which they attempted to establish this, perhaps persuaded themselves that it was so, was by proving that He sanctioned in others, and Himself committed, breaches of the traditional law; which, according to their fundamental principles, involved heavier guilt than sins against the revealed Law of Moses. The third and last charge against Jesus, which finally decided the action of the Council, could only be fully made at the close of His career. It might be formulated so as to meet the views of either the Pharisees or Sadducees. To the former it might be presented as a blasphemous claim to equality with God — the Very Son of the Living God. To the Sadducees it would appear as a movement on the part of a most dangerous enthusiast — if honest and self-deceived, all the more dangerous; one of those pseudo-Messiahs who led away the ignorant, superstitious, and excitable people; and which, if unchecked, would result in persecutions and terrible vengeance by the Romans, and in loss of the last remnants of their national independence. To each of these three charges, of which we are now watching the opening or development, there was (from the then standpoint) only one answer: Faith in His Person. And in our time, also, this is the final answer to all difficulties and objections. To this faith Jesus was now leading His disciples, till, fully realized in the great confession of Peter, it became, and has ever since proved, the Rock

on which that Church is built, against which the very gates of Hades cannot prevail.

It was in support of the second of these charges, that the Scribes now blamed the Master for allowing His disciples to eat without having previously washed, or, as St. Mark — indicating, as we shall see, in the word the origin of the custom — expresses it with graphic accuracy: ‘with common hands.’ ^{f1503} Once more we have to mark, how minutely conversant the Gospel narratives are with Jewish Law and practice. This will best appear from a brief account of this ‘tradition of the elders,’ ^{f1504} the more needful that important differences prevail even among learned Jewish authorities, due probably to the circumstance that the brief Mishnic Tractate devoted to the subject ^{f1505} has no Gemara attached to it, and also largely treats of other matters. At the outset we have this confirmation of the Gospel language, that this practice is expressly admitted to have been, not a Law of Moses, but ‘a tradition of the elders.’ ^{f1506} Still, and perhaps on this very account, it was so strictly enjoined, that to neglect it was like being guilty of gross carnal defilement. Its omission would lead to temporal destruction, {Sot. 4 *b*} or, at least, to poverty. {Shabb. 62 *b*.} Bread eaten with unwashed hands was as if it had been filth. {Sot. 4 *b*.} Indeed, a Rabbi who had held this command in contempt was actually buried in excommunication. {Eduy. 5:6; Ber. 19 *a*.} Thus, from their point of view, the charge of the Scribes against the disciples, so far from being exaggerated, is most moderately worded by the Evangelists. In fact, although at one time it had only been one of the marks of a Pharisee, yet at a later period to wash before eating was regarded as affording the ready means of recognizing a Jew. {Chull. 106 *a*; Bemidb. R. 20, ed. Warsh. p. 81 *b*.} ^{f1507}

It is somewhat more difficult to account for the origin of the ordinance. So far as indicated, it seems to have been first enjoined in order to ensure that sacred offerings should not be eaten in defilement. When once it became an ordinance of the elders, this was, of course, regarded as sufficient ground for obedience. {Chull. 106 *a*.} Presently, Scriptural support was sought for it. Some based it on the original ordinance of purification in ^{<B151>}Leviticus 15:11; {Chull. 106 *a*.} while others saw in the words {^{<B144>}Leviticus 11:44.} ‘Sanctify yourselves,’ the command to wash before meat; in the command, ‘Be ye holy,’ that of washing after meat; while the final clause, ‘for I am the Lord your God,’ was regarded as enjoining ‘the grace at meat.’ {Ber. 53 *b*, end.} For, soon it was not merely a washing before, but

also after meals. The former alone was, however, regarded as ‘a commandment’ (*Mitsvah*), the other only as ‘a duty’ (*Chobhah*), which some, indeed, explained on sanitary grounds, as there might be left about the hands what might prove injurious to the eyes. {Erub. 17 b; Chull. 105 b.} ^{f1508} Accordingly, soldiers might, in the urgency of campaigning, neglect the washing before, but they ought to be careful about that after meat. By-and-by, the more rigorous actually washed between the courses, although this was declared to be purely voluntary. {Chull. 105 a, b.} This washing before meals is regarded by some as referred to in Talmudic writings by the expression ‘the first waters’ (*Mayim rishonim*), while what is called ‘the second’ (*sheniym*), or ‘the other,’ ‘later,’ or ‘after-waters’ (*Mayim acharonim*), is supposed to represent the washing after meals.

But there is another and more important aspect of the expression, which leads us to describe the rite itself. The distinctive designation for it is *Netilath Yadayim*, ^{f1509} literally, the lifting of the hands; while for the washing before meat the term *Meshi* or *Mesha* {avm (Chull. 107 a and b).} is also used, which literally means ‘to rub.’ Both these terms point to the manner of the rite. The first question here was, whether ‘second tithe,’ prepared first-fruits (*Terumah*), or even common food (*Chullin*), or else, ‘holy’ i.e. sacrificial food, was to be partaken of. In the latter case a complete immersion of the hands (‘baptism,’ *Tebhilath Yadayim*), and not merely a *Netilath*, or ‘uplifting,’ was purifications were so frequent, and care had to be taken that the water had not been used for other purposes, or something fallen into it that might discolor or defile it, large vessels or jars were generally kept for the purpose. These might be of any material, although stone is specially mentioned. ^{f1510} It was the practice to draw water out of these with what was called a *natla*, *antila*, or *antelaya*, {ἀντήλιον} very often of glass, which must hold (at least) a quarter of a log {Chull. 107 a; Baba B. 58 b, and often.} — a measure equal to one and a half ‘egg-shells.’ For, no less quantity than this might be used for affusion. The water was poured on both hands, which must be free of anything covering them, such as gravel, mortar, etc. The hands were lifted up, so as to make the water run to the wrist, in order to ensure that the whole hand was washed, and that the water polluted by the hand did not again run down the fingers. Similarly, each hand was rubbed with the other (the first), provided the hand that rubbed had been affused: otherwise, the rubbing might be done against the head, or even against a wall. But there was one point on which special stress was laid. In the ‘first affusion,’ which

was all that originally was required when the hands were Levitically ‘defiled,’ the water had to run down to the wrist ^{f1511} *qrpl* or *qrph d[lappereq*, or *ad happereq*). If the water remained short of the wrist (*chuts lappereq*), the hands were not clean. {Comp. Yad. 2:3; Chull. 106 *a* and *b*.} Accordingly, the words of St. Mark {St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 7:3.} can only mean that the Pharisees eat not ‘except they wash their hands to the wrist.’ ^{f1512}

Allusion has already been made to what are called ‘the first’ and ‘the second,’ or ‘other’ ‘waters.’ But, in their original meaning, these terms referred to something else than washing before and after meals. The hands were deemed capable of contracting Levitical defilement, which, in certain cases, might even render the whole body ‘unclean.’ If the hands were ‘defiled,’ two affusions were required: the first, or ‘first waters’ (*mayim rishonim*) to remove the defilement, and the ‘second,’ or ‘after waters’ (*mayim sheniyim* or *acharonim*) to wash away the waters that had contracted the defilement of the hands. Accordingly, on the affusion of the first waters the hands were elevated, and the water made to run down at the wrist, while at the second waters the hands were depressed, so that the water might run off by the finger points and tips. By-and-by, it became the practice to have two affusions, whenever *Terumah* (prepared first-fruits) was to be eaten, and at last even when ordinary food (*Chullin*) was partaken of. The modern Jews have three affusions, and accompany the rite with a special benediction.

This idea of the ‘defilement of the hands’ received a very curious application. According to one of the eighteen decrees, which, as we shall presently show, date before the time of Christ, the Roll of the Pentateuch in the Temple defiled all kinds of meat that touched it. The alleged reason for this decree was, that the priests were wont to keep the *Terumah* (preserved first-fruits) close to the Roll of the Law, on which account the latter was injured by mice. The Rabbinic ordinance was intended to avert this danger. {Shabb. 14 *a*.} ^{f1513} To increase this precaution, it was next laid down as a principle, that all that renders the *Terumah* unfit, also defiles the hands. {Yad. 3:2.} Hence, the Holy Scriptures defiled not only the food but the hands that touched them, and this not merely in the Temple, but anywhere, while it was also explained that the Holy Scriptures included the whole of the inspired writings — the Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa. This gave rise to interesting discussions, whether the Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, or Esther were to be regarded as ‘defiling the hands,’ that is, as part of the Canon. The ultimate decision was in favor of these books:

‘all the holy writings defile the hands; the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes defile the hands.’ {Yad. 3:5.} Nay, so far were sequences carried, that even a small portion of the Scriptures was declared to defile the hands if it contained eighty-five letters, because the smallest ‘section’ (*Parashah*) in the Law {~~Chull.~~ Numbers 10:35, 36.} consisted of exactly that number. Even the Phylacteries, because they contained portions of the sacred text, the very leather straps by which they were bound to the head and arm, nay — the blank margins around the text of the Scriptures, or at the beginning and end of sections, were declared to defile the hands. {Yad. 3:3-5.} ¹⁵¹⁴

From this exposition it will be understood what importance the Scribes attached to the rite which the disciples had neglected. Yet at a later period Pharisaism, with characteristic ingenuity, found a way of evading even this obligation, by laying down what we would call the Popish (or semi-Popish) principle of ‘intention.’ It was ruled, that if anyone had performed the rite of handwashing in the morning, ‘with intention’ that it should apply to the meals of the whole day, this was (with certain precautions) valid. {Chull. 106 b.} But at the time of which we write the original ordinance was quite new. This touches one of the most important, but also most intricate questions in the history of Jewish dogmas. Jewish tradition traced, indeed, the command of washing the hands before eating — at least of sacrificial offerings — to Solomon, {Shabb. 14 b, end.} in acknowledgment of which ‘the voice from heaven’ (*Bath-Qol*) had been heard to utter ~~Chull.~~ Proverbs 23:15, and 27:11. But the earliest trace of this custom occurs in a portion of the Sibylline Books, which dates from about 160 B.C., {Or. Sib. 3:591-593.} where we find an allusion to the practice of continually washing the hands, in connection with prayer and thanksgiving. ¹⁵¹⁵ It was reserved for Hillel and Shammai, the two great rival teachers and heroes of Jewish traditionalism, immediately before Christ, to fix the Rabbinic ordinance about the washing of hands (*Netilath Yadayim*), as previously described. This was one of the few points on which they were agreed, {Shabb. 14 b, about the middle.} and hence emphatically ‘a tradition of the Elders,’ since these two teachers bear, in Rabbinic writings, each the designation of ‘the Elder.’ Then followed a period of developing traditionalism, and hatred of all that was Gentile. The tradition of the Elders was not yet so established as to command absolute and universal obedience, while the disputes of Hillel and Shammai, who seemed almost on principle to have taken divergent views on every question, must have disturbed the minds of many. We have an account of a stormy meeting between the two Schools,

attended even with bloodshed. The story is so confusedly, and so differently told in the Jerusalem {Jer. Shabb. p. 3 *x*, *d*.} and in the Babylon Talmud, {Shabb. 13 *b* to 14 *b*.} that it is difficult to form a clear view of what really occurred. Thus much, however, appears that the Shammaites had a majority of votes, and that ‘eighteen decrees’ (μῦρβρ j y) were passed in which the two Schools agreed, while on other eighteen questions (perhaps a round number) the Shammaites carried their views by a majority, and yet other eighteen remained undecided. Each of the Schools spoke of that day according to its party-results. The Shammaites (such as Rabbi Eliezer) extolled it as that on which the measure of the Law had been filled up to the full, {Jer. Shabb. 3 *c*.} while the Hillelites (like Rabbi Joshua) deplored, that on that day water had been poured into a vessel full of oil, by which some of the more precious fluid had been split. In general, the tendency of these eighteen decrees was of the most violently anti-Gentile, intolerant, and exclusive character. Yet such value was attached to them, that, while any other decree of the sages might be altered by a more grave, learned, and authoritative assembly, these eighteen decrees might not under any circumstances, be modified. {Jer. Shabb. 3 *d*.} But, besides these eighteen decrees, the two Schools on that day {Shabb. 13 *b*; 14 *b*.} agreed in solemnly re-enacting ‘the decrees about the Book (the copy of the Law), and the hands’ μῦρῃηω ρψη τωρῃζγ. The Babylon Talmud {Shabb. 14 *b*, towards end.} notes that the latter decree, though first made by Hillel and Shammai, ‘the Elders,’ was not universally carried out until re-enacted by their colleges. It is important to notice, that this ‘Decree’ dates from the time just before, and was finally carried into force in the very days of Christ. This fully accounts for the zeal which the Scribes displayed — and explains ‘the extreme minuteness of details’ with which St. Mark ‘calls attention’ to this Pharisaic practice.¹⁵¹⁶ For, it was an express Rabbinic principle {Ab. Z. 35 *a*.} that, if an ordinance had been only recently re-enacted ḥḥṛj ḥṛṛṇṇ, it might not be called in question or ‘invalidated’ ḥḥ ṽṇṇṇṇṇ ṽṇṇ.¹⁵¹⁷ Thus it will be seen, that the language employed by the Evangelist affords most valuable indirect confirmation of the trustworthiness of his Gospel, as not only showing intimate familiarity with the *minutiae* of Jewish ‘tradition,’ but giving prominence to what was then a present controversy — and all this the more, that it needs intimate knowledge of that Law even fully to understand the language of the Evangelist.

After this full exposition, it can only be necessary to refer in briefest manner to those other observances which orthodox Judaism had 'received to hold.' They connect themselves with those eighteen decrees, intended to separate the Jew from all contact with Gentiles. Any contact with a heathen, even the touch of his dress, might involve such defilement, that on coming from the market the orthodox Jew would have to immerse. Only those who know the complicated arrangements about the defilements of vessels that were in any part, however small, hollow, as these are described in the Mishnah (Tractate *Kelim*), can form an adequate idea of the painful minuteness with which every little detail is treated. Earthen vessels that had contracted impurity were to be broken; those of wood, horn, glass, or brass immersed; while, if vessels were brought of Gentiles, they were (as the case might be) to be immersed, put into boiling water, purged with fire, or at least polished. {Ab. Zar. v *passim*.}

Let us now try to realize the attitude of Christ in regard to these ordinances about purification, and seek to understand the reason of His bearing. That, in replying to the charge of the Scribes against His disciples, He neither vindicated their conduct, nor apologized for their breach of the Rabbinic ordinances, implied at least an attitude of indifference towards traditionalism. This is the more noticeable, since, as we know, the ordinances of the Scribes were declared more precious, {Jer. Chag. 76 *d*.} ¹⁵¹⁸ and of more binding importance than those of Holy Scripture itself. {Jer. Ber. 3 *b*; Sanh. 11:3; Erub. 21 *b*.} But, even so, the question might arise, why Christ should have provoked such hostility by placing Himself in marked antagonism to what, after all, was indifferent in itself. The answer to this inquiry will require a disclosure of that aspect of Rabbinism which, from its painfulness, has hitherto been avoided. Yet it is necessary not only in itself, but as showing the infinite distance between Christ and the teaching of the Synagogue. It has already been told, how Rabbinism, in the madness of its self-exaltation, represented God as busying Himself by day with the study of the Scriptures, and by night with that of the Mishnah; {Targum (ed. Ven.) on ²¹⁵⁰Song of Solomon 5:10; comp. Ab. Z. 3 *b*.} and how, in the heavenly Sanhedrin, over which the Almighty presided, the Rabbis sat in the order of their greatness, and the Halakhah was discussed, and decisions taken in accordance with it. {Baba Mez. 86 *a*.} Terrible as this sounds, it is not nearly all. Anthropomorphism of the coarsest kind is carried beyond the verge of profanity, when God is represented as spending the last three hours of every day in playing with Leviathan, {Ab.

Z. u. s.} and it is discussed, how, since the destruction of Jerusalem, God no longer laughs, but weeps, and that, in a secret place of His own, according to Jer. 13:17. {Comp. Chag. 5 *b*.} Nay, ^{<2531>}Jeremiah 25:30 is profanely misinterpreted as implying that, in His grief over the destruction of the Temple, the Almighty roars like a lion in each of the three watches of the night. {Ber. 3 *a*.} The two tears which He drops into the sea are the cause of earthquakes; although other, though not less coarsely realistic, explanations are offered of this phenomenon. {Ber. 59 *a*.}

Sentiments like these, which occur in different Rabbinic writings, cannot be explained away by any ingenuity of allegorical interpretation. There are others, equally painful, as regards the anger of the Almighty, which, as kindling specially in the morning, when the sun-worshippers offer their prayers, renders it even dangerous for an individual Israelite to say certain prayers on the morning of New Year's Day, on which the throne is set for judgment. {Ber. 7 *a*; Ab. Z. 4 *b*.} Such realistic anthropomorphism, combined with the extravagant ideas of the eternal and heavenly reality of Rabbinism and Rabbinic ordinances, help us to understand, how the Almighty was actually represented as saying prayers. This is proved from ^{<2507>}Isaiah 56:7. Sublime through the language of these prayers is, we cannot but notice that the all-covering mercy, for which He is represented as pleading, is extended only to Israel. {Ber. 7 *a*.} It is even more terrible to read of God wearing the Tallith, {Shem. R. 42, comp. Rosh haSh. 17 *b*.} or that He puts on the Phylacteries, which is deduced from ^{<2518>}Isaiah 62:8. That this also is connected with the vain-glorious boasting of Israel, appears from the passage supposed to be enclosed in these Phylacteries. We know that in the ordinary Phylacteries these are: ^{<2511>}Exodus 13:1-10; 10-16; ^{<2504>}Deuteronomy 6:4-10; ^{<25113>}11:13-22. In the Divine Phylacteries they were: ^{<13721>}1 Chronicles 17:21; ^{<2507>}Deuteronomy 4:7-8; ^{<2539>}33:29; 4:34; 26:19. {Ber. 6 *a*.} Only one other point must be mentioned as connected with Purifications. To these also the Almighty is supposed to submit. Thus He was purified by Aaron, when He had contracted defilement by descending into Egypt. {Shem. R. 15, ed. Warsh. p. 22 *a*, line 13 from top.} This is deduced from ^{<25165>}Leviticus 16:16. Similarly, He immersed in a bath of fire, {^{<25165>}Isaiah 66:15; comp. ^{<25123>}Numbers 31:23.} after the defilement of the burial of Moses.

These painful details, most reluctantly given, are certainly not intended to raise or strengthen ignorant prejudices against Israel, to whom 'blindness in part' has truly happened; far less to encourage the wicked spirit of

contempt and persecution which is characteristic, not of believing, but of negative theology. But they will explain, how Jesus could not have assumed merely an attitude of indifference towards traditionalism. For, even if such sentiments were represented as a later development, they are the outcome of a direction, of which that of Jesus was the very opposite, and to which it was antagonistic. But, if Jesus was not sent of God — not the Messiah — whence this wonderful contrast of highest spirituality in what He taught of God as our Father, and of His Kingdom as that over the hearts of all men? The attitude of antagonism to traditionalism was never more pronounced than in what He said in reply to the charge of neglect of the ordinance about ‘the washing of hands.’ Here it must be remembered, that it was an admitted Rabbinic principle that, while the ordinances of Scripture required no confirmation, those of the Scribes needed such, {Jer. Taan. 66 *a*, about the middle.} and that no Halakhah (traditional law) might contradict Scripture.¹⁵¹⁹ When Christ, therefore, next proceeded to show, that in a very important point, nay — in ‘many such like things’ — the Halakhah was utterly incompatible with Scripture, that, indeed, they made ‘void the Word of God’ by their traditions which they had received, {St. ~~415B~~ Matthew 15:3, 6; St. ~~410D~~ Mark 7:9, 13.} He dealt the heaviest blow to traditionalism. Rabbinism stood self-condemned; on its own showing, it was to be rejected as incompatible with the Word of God.

It is not so easy to understand, why the Lord should, out of ‘many such things,’ have selected in illustration the Rabbinic ordinance concerning vows, as in certain circumstances, contravening the fifth commandment. Of course, the ‘Ten Words’ were the Holy of Holies of the Law; nor was there any obligation more rigidly observed — indeed, carried in practice almost to the verge of absurdity¹⁵²⁰ — than that of honor to parents. In both respects, then, this was a specially vulnerable point, and it might well be argued that, if in this Law Rabbinic ordinances came into conflict with the demands of God’s Word, the essential contrariety between them must, indeed, be great. Still, we feel as if this were not all. Was there any special instance in view, in which the Rabbinic law about votive offerings had led to such abuse? Or was it only, that at this festive season the Galilean pilgrims would carry with them to Jerusalem their votive offerings? Or, could the Rabbinic ordinances about ‘the sanctification of the hands’ (*Yadayim*) have recalled to the Lord another Rabbinic application of the word ‘hand’ (*yad*) in connection with votive offerings? It is at least sufficiently curious to find mention here, and it will afford the opportunity

of briefly explaining, what to a candid reader may seem almost inexplicable in the Jewish legal practice to which Christ refers.

At the outset it must be admitted, that Rabbinism did *not* encourage the practice of promiscuous vowing. As we view it, it belongs, at best, to a lower and legal standpoint. In this respect Rabbi Akiba put it concisely, in one of his truest sayings: ‘Vows are a hedge to abstinence.’ {Ab. 3:18.} On the other hand, if regarded as a kind of return for benefits received, or as a promise attaching to our prayers, a vow — unless it form part of our absolute and entire self-surrender — partakes either of work-righteousness, or appears almost a kind of religious gambling. And so the Jewish proverb has it: ‘In the hour of need a vow; in time of ease excess.’ {Ber. R. 81.} Towards such work-righteousness and religious gambling the Eastern, and especially the Rabbinic Jew, would be particularly inclined. But even the Rabbis saw that its encouragement would lead to the profanation of what was holy; to rash, idle, and wrong vows; and to the worst and most demoralizing kind of perjury, as inconvenient consequences made themselves felt. Of many sayings, condemnatory of the practice, one will suffice to mark the general feeling: ‘He who makes a vow, even if he keeps it, deserves the name of wicked.’ {Nedar. 9 a; 22 a.} Nevertheless, the practice must have attained terrible proportions, whether as regards the number of vows, the lightness with which they were made, or the kind of things which became their object. The larger part of the Mishnic Tractate on ‘Vows’ (*Nedarim*, in eleven chapters) describes what expressions were to be regarded as equivalent to vows, and what would either legally invalidate and annul a vow, or leave it binding. And here we learn, that those who were of full age, and not in a position of dependence (such as wives) would make almost any kind of vows, such as that they would not lie down to sleep, not speak to their wives or children, not have intercourse with their brethren, and even things more wrong or foolish — all of which were solemnly treated as binding on the conscience. Similarly, it was not necessary to use the express words of vowing. Not only the word ‘*Qorban*’ [*Korban*] — ‘given to God’ — but any similar expression, such as *Qonakh*, or *Qonam*¹⁵²¹ (the latter also a Phœnician expression, and probably an equivalent for *Qeyam*, ‘let it be established’) would suffice; the mention of anything laid upon the altar (though not of the altar itself). such as the wood, or the fire, would constitute a vow, {Nedar. 1:1-3.} nay, the repetition of the form which generally followed on the votive *Qonam* or *Qorban* had binding force, even though not preceded

by these terms. Thus, if a man said: ‘That I eat or taste of such a thing,’ it constituted a vow, which bound him not to eat or taste it, because the common formula was: ‘Qorban (or Qonam) that I eat or drink, or do such a thing,’ and the omission of the votive word did not invalidate a vow, if it were otherwise regularly expressed. {Jer. Nedar. 36 *d*, line 20 from top.}

It is in explaining this strange provision, intended both to uphold the solemnity of vows, and to discourage the rash use of words, that the Talmud {u. s.} makes use of the word ‘*hand*’ in a connection which we have supposed might, by association of ideas, have suggested to Christ the contrast between what the Bible and what the Rabbis regarded as ‘sanctified hands,’ and hence between the commands of God and the traditions of the Elders. For the Talmud explains that, when a man simply says: ‘That (or if) I eat or taste such a thing,’ it is imputed as a vow, and he may not eat or taste of it, ‘because the hand is on the Qorban’ {Jer. Nedar. 36 *d*, line 22).} — the mere touch of Qorban had sanctified it, and put it beyond his reach, just as if it had been laid on the altar itself. Here, then, was a contrast. According to the Rabbis, the touch of ‘a common’ hand defiled God’s good gift of meat, while the touch of ‘a sanctified’ hand in rash or wicked words might render it impossible to give anything to a parent, and so involve the grossest breach of the Fifth Commandment! Such, according to Rabbinic Law, was the ‘common’ and such the ‘sanctifying’ touch of the hands — and did such traditionalism not truly ‘make void the Word of God’?

A few further particulars may serve to set this in clearer light. It must not be thought that the pronunciation of the votive word ‘*Qorban*,’ although meaning ‘a gift,’ or ‘given to God,’ necessarily dedicated a thing to the Temple. The meaning might simply be, and generally was, that it was to be regarded like *Qorban* — that is, that in regard to the person or persons named, the thing termed was to be considered as if it were *Qorban*, laid on the altar, and put entirely out of their reach. For, although included under the one name, there were really two kinds of vows: those of consecration to God, and those of personal obligation ^{f1522} — and the latter were the most frequent.

To continue. The legal distinction between a vow, an oath, and ‘the ban,’ are clearly marked both in reason and in Jewish Law. The oath was an absolute, the vow a conditional undertaking — their difference being marked even by this, that the language of a vow ran thus: ‘That’ or ‘if’ ‘I

or another do such a thing,' 'if I eat;' {ygac l kwa} while that of the oath was a simple affirmation or negation, {l kwa al} 'I shall not eat.' {Jer. Ned. u. s.} On the other hand, the 'ban' might refer to one of three things: those dedicated for the use of the priesthood, those dedicated to God, or else to a sentence pronounced by the Sanhedrin. {Tos. Arach. 4.} In any case it was not lawful to 'ban' the whole of one's property, nor even one class of one's property (such as all one's sheep), nor yet what could not, in the fullest sense, be called one's *property*, such as a child, a Hebrew slave, or a purchased field, which had to be restored in the Year of Jubilee; while an inherited field, if banned, would go in perpetuity for the use of the priesthood. Similarly, the Law limited vows. Those intended to incite to an act (as on the part of one who sold a thing), or by way of exaggeration, or in cases of mistake, and, lastly, vows which circumstances rendered impossible, were declared null. To these four classes the Mishnah added those made to escape murder, robbery, and the exactions of the publican. If a vow was regarded as rash or wrong, attempts were made {'they open a door.'} to open a door for repentance. {Nedar. 9 passim.} Absolutions from a vow might be obtained before a 'sage,' or, in his absence, before three laymen,^{f1523} when all obligations became null and void. At the same time the Mishnah {Chag. 1:8.} admits, that this power of absolving from vows was a tradition hanging, as it were, in the air,^{f1524} since it received little (or, as *Maimonides* puts it, no) support from Scripture.^{f1525}

There can be no doubt, that the words of Christ referred to such vows of personal obligation. By these a person might bind himself in regard to men or things, or else put that which was another's out of his own reach, or that which was his own out of the reach of another, and this as completely as if the thing or things had been *Qorban*, a gift given to God. Thus, by simply saying, 'Qorban,' or 'Qorban, that by which I might be profited by thee,' a person bound himself never to touch, taste, or have anything that belonged to the person so addressed. Similarly, by saying 'Qorban, that by which thou mightest be profited by me,' he would prevent the person so addressed from ever deriving any benefit from that which belonged to him. And so stringent was the ordinance that (almost in the words of Christ) it is expressly stated that such a vow was binding, even if what was vowed involved a breach of the Law. {Nedar. 2:2.} It cannot be denied that such vows, in regard to parents, would be binding, and that they were actually made.^{f1526} Indeed, the question is discussed in the Mishnah in so many words, whether 'honor of father and mother' {rwbk wmaz wyba}

constituted a ground for invalidating a vow, and decided in the negative against a solitary dissenting voice. {Ned. 9:1.} And if doubt should still exist, a case is related in the Mishnah, {Nedar. 5.} in which a father was thus shut out by the vow of his son from anything by which he might be profited by him. *Hanh wnmv yh rdm wyka hyhç*^{f1527} Thus the charge brought by Christ is in fullest accordance with the facts of the case. More than this, the manner in which it is put by St. Mark shows the most intimate knowledge of Jewish customs and law. For, the seemingly inappropriate addition to our Lord's mention of the Fifth Commandment of the words: 'He that revileth father or mother, he shall (let him) surely die,' {<1217>Exodus 21:17.} is not only explained but vindicated by the common usage of the Rabbis,^{f1528} to mention along with a command the penalty attaching to its breach, so as to indicate the importance which Scripture attached to it. On the other hand, the words of St. Mark: 'Qorban (that is to say, gift (viz., to God)) that by which thou mightest be profited by me,' are a most exact transcription into Greek of the common formula of vowing, as given in the Mishnah and Talmud *yl hghg htaç `krq*^{f1529}.

But Christ did not merely show the hypocrisy of the system of traditionalism in conjoining in the name of religion the greatest outward punctiliousness with the grossest breach of real duty. Never, alas! was that aspect of prophecy, which in the present saw the future, more clearly vindicated than as the words of Isaiah to Israel now appeared in their final fulfillment: 'This people honoreth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. Howbeit, in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.'^{f1530} But in thus setting forth for the first time the real character of traditionalism, and setting Himself in open opposition to its fundamental principles, the Christ enunciated also for the first time the fundamental principle of His own interpretation of the Law. That Law was not a system of externalism, in which outward things affected the inner man. It was moral and addressed itself to man as a moral being — to his heart and conscience. As the spring of all moral action was within, so the mode of affecting it would be inward. Not from without inwards, but from within outwards: such was the principle of the new Kingdom, as setting forth the Law in its fullness and fulfilling it. 'There is nothing from without the'^{f1531} man, that, entering into him, can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man, those are they that defile the'^{f1531} man.'^{f1532} Not only negatively, but positively, was this the fundamental principle of Christian practice in direct contrast to that of Pharisaic Judaism. It is in this

essential contrariety of principle, rather than in any details, that the unspeakable difference between Christ and all contemporary teachers appears. Nor is even this all. For, the principle laid down by Christ concerning that which entereth from without and that which cometh from within, covers, in its full application, not only the principle of Christian liberty in regard to the Mosaic Law, but touches far deeper and permanent questions, affecting not only the Jew, but all men and to all times.

As we read it, the discussion, to which such full reference has been made, had taken place between the Scribes and the Lord, while the multitude perhaps stood aside. But when enunciating the grand principle of what constituted real defilement, 'He called to Him the multitude.' {St. ~~4050~~ Matthew 15:10; St. ~~4074~~ Mark 7:14.} It was probably while pursuing their way to Capernaum, when this conversation had taken place, that His disciples afterwards reported, that the Pharisees had been offended by that saying of His to the multitude. Even this implies the weakness of the disciples: that they were not only influenced by the good or evil opinion of these religious leaders of the people, but in some measure sympathized with their views. All this is quite natural, and as bringing before us real, not imaginary persons, so far evidential of the narrative. The answer which the Lord gave the disciples bore a twofold aspect: that of solemn warning concerning the inevitable fate of every plant which God had not planted, and that of warning concerning the character and issue of Pharisaic teaching, as being the leadership of the blind by the blind, ^{f1533} which must end in ruin to both.

But even so the words of Christ are represented in the Gospel as sounding strange and difficult to the disciples — so truthful and natural is the narrative. But they were earnest, genuine men; and when they reached the home in Capernaum, Peter, as the most courageous of them, broke the reserve — half of fear and half of reverence, — which, despite their necessary familiarity, seems to have subsisted between the Master and His disciples. And the existence of such reverential reserve in such circumstances appears, the more it is considered, yet another evidence of Christ's Divine Character, just as the implied allusion to it in the narrative is another undesigned proof of its truthfulness. And so Peter would seek for himself and his fellow-disciples an explanation of what still seemed to him only parabolic in the Master's teachings. He received it in the fullest manner. There was, indeed, one part even in the teaching of the Lord, which accorded with the higher views of the Rabbis. Those sins which

Christ set before them as sins of the outward and inward man, ^{f1534} and of what connects the two: our relation to others, were the outcome of evil thoughts.’ And this, at least, the Rabbis also taught; explaining, with much detail, how the heart was alike the source of strength and of weakness, of good and of evil thoughts, loved and hated, envied, lusted and deceived, proving each statement from Scripture. {Midr. on ^{<2016} Ecclesiastes 1:16.} But never before could they have realized, that anything entering from without could not defile a man. Least of all could they perceive the final inference which St. Mark long afterwards derived from this teaching of the Lord: ‘*This He said*, making all meats clean. {St. ^{<4079} Mark 7:19, last clause.} ^{f1535}

Yet another time had Peter to learn that lesson, when his resistance to the teaching of the vision of the sheet let down from heaven was silenced by this: ‘What God hath cleansed, make not thou common.’ {^{<4404} Acts 10:14.} Not only the spirit of legalism, but the very terms ‘common’ (in reference to the unwashed hands) and ‘making clean’ are the same. Nor can we wonder at this, if the vision of Peter was real, and not, as negative criticism would have it, invented so as to make an imaginary Peter — Apostle of the Jews — speak and act like Paul. On that hypothesis, the correspondence of thought and expression would seem, indeed, inexplicable; on the former, the Peter, who has had that vision, is telling through St. Mark the teaching that underlay it all, and, as he looked back upon it, drawing from it the inference which he understood not at the time: ‘This He said, making all meats clean.’

A most difficult lesson this for a Jew, and for one like Peter, nay — for us all, to learn. And still a third time had Peter to learn it, when, in his fear of the Judaisers from Jerusalem, he made that common which God had made clean, had care of the unwashed hands, but forgot that the Lord had made clean all meats. Terrible, indeed, must have been that contention which followed between Paul and Peter. Eighteen centuries have passed, and that fatal strife is still the ground of theological contention against the truth.

^{f1536} Eighteen centuries, and within the Church also the strife still continues. Brethren sharply contend and are separated, because they will insist on that as of necessity which should be treated as of indifference: because of the not eating with unwashed hands, forgetful that He has made all meats clean to him who is inwardly and spiritually cleansed.

CHAPTER 32

THE GREAT CRISIS IN POPULAR FEELING — THE LAST DISCOURSES IN THE SYNAGOGUE OF CAPERNAUM — CHRIST THE BREAD OF LIFE — ‘WILL YE ALSO GO AWAY?’

(St. ~~4162~~ John 6:22-71.) ^{F1537}

THE narrative now returns to those who, on the previous evening, had, after the miraculous meal, been ‘sent away’ to their homes. We remember, that this had been after an abortive attempt on their part to take Jesus by force and make Him their Messiah-King. We can understand that the effectual resistance of Jesus to their purpose not only weakened, but in great measure neutralized, the effect of the miracle which they had witnessed. In fact, we look upon this check as the first turning of the tide of popular enthusiasm. Let us bear in mind what ideas and expectations of an altogether external character those men connected with the Messiah of their dreams. At last, by some miracle more notable even than the giving of the Manna in the wilderness, enthusiasm has been raised to the highest pitch, and thousands were determined to give up their pilgrimage to the Passover, and then and there proclaim the Galilean Teacher Israel’s King. If He were the Messiah, such was His rightful title. Why then did He so strenuously and effectually resist it? In ignorance of His real views concerning the Kingship, they would naturally conclude that it must have been from fear, from misgiving, from want of belief in Himself. At any rate, He could not be the Messiah, Who would not be Israel’s King. Enthusiasm of this kind, once repressed, could never be kindled again. Henceforth there was continuous misunderstanding, doubt and defection among former adherents, growing into opposition and hatred unto death. Even to those who took not this position, Jesus, His Words and Works, were henceforth a constant mystery. ^{f1538} And so it came, that the morning after the miraculous meal found the vast majority of those who had been fed, either in their homes or on their pilgrim-way to the Passover at Jerusalem. Only comparatively few came back to seek Him, where they had eaten bread at His Hand. And even to them, as the after-conversation shows, Jesus was a mystery. They could not disbelieve, and yet they could not believe; and they sought both ‘a sign’ to guide, and an explanation to give them its understanding. Yet out of them was there such selection of grace, that all

that the Father had given would reach Him, and that they who, by a personal act of believing choice and by determination of conviction, would come, should in no wise be rejected of Him.

It is this view of the mental and moral state of those who, on the morning after the meal, came to seek Jesus, which alone explains the question and answers of the interview at Capernaum. As we read it: 'the day following the multitude which stood on the other (the eastern) side of the sea' 'saw that Jesus was not there, neither His disciples.' {vv. 22, 24.} But of two facts they were cognizant. They knew that, on the evening before, only one boat had come over, bringing Jesus and His disciples; and that Jesus had not returned in it with His disciples, for they had seen them depart, while Jesus remained to dismiss the people. In these circumstances they probably imagined, that Christ had returned on foot by land, being, of course, ignorant of the miracle of that night. But the wind which had been contrary to the disciples, had also driven over to the eastern shore a number of fishing-boats from Tiberias (and this is one of the undesigned confirmations of the narrative). These they now hired, and came to Capernaum, making inquiry for Jesus. Whether on that Friday afternoon they went to meet Him on His way from Gennesaret (which the wording of St. ~~John~~ John 6:25 makes likely), or awaited His arrival at Capernaum, is of little importance. Similarly, it is difficult to determine whether the conversation and outlined address of Christ took place on one or partly on several occasions: on the Friday afternoon or Sabbath morning, or only on the Sabbath. All that we know for certain is, that the *last* part (at any rate {St. ~~John~~ John 6:53-58.}) was spoken 'in Synagogue, as He taught in Capernaum.' {ver. 59.} It has been well observed, that 'there are evident breaks after verse 40 and verse 51.' ^{f1539} Probably the succession of events may have been that part of what is here recorded by St. John {6:25-65.} had taken place when those from across the Lake had first met Jesus; {vv. 25-36.} part on the way to, and entering, the Synagogue; {vv. 41-52.} and part as what He spoke in His Discourse, {vv. 52-58.} and then after the defection of some of His former disciples. {vv. 61-65.} But we can only suggest such an arrangement, since it would have been quite consistent with Jewish practice, that the greater part should have taken place in the Synagogue itself, the Jewish questions and objections representing either an irregular running commentary on His Words, or expressions during breaks in, or at the conclusion of, His teaching.

This, however, is a primary requirement, that, what Christ is reported to have spoken, should appear suited to His hearers: such as would appeal to what they knew, such also as they could understand. This must be kept in view, even while admitting that the Evangelist wrote his Gospel in the light of much later and fuller knowledge, and for the instruction of the Christian Church, and that there may be breaks and omissions in the reported, as compared with the original Discourse, which, if supplied, would make its understanding much easier to a Jew. On the other hand, we have to bear in mind all the circumstances of the case. The Discourse in question was delivered in the city, which had been the scene of so many of Christ's great miracles, and the center of His teaching, and in the Synagogue, built by the good Centurion, and of which Jairus was the chief ruler. Here we have the outward and inward conditions for even the most advanced teaching of Christ. Again, it was delivered under twofold moral conditions, to which we may expect the Discourse of Christ to be adapted. For, first, it was after that miraculous feeding which had raised the popular enthusiasm to the highest pitch, and also after that chilling disappointment of their Judaistic hopes in Christ's utmost resistance to His Messianic proclamation. They now came 'seeking for Jesus,' in every sense of the word. They knew not what to make of those, to them, contradictory and irreconcilable facts; they came, because they did eat of the loaves, without seeing in them 'signs.' {ver. 26.} And therefore they came for such a 'sign' as they could perceive, and for such teaching in interpretation of it as they could understand. They were outwardly — by what had happened — prepared for the very highest teaching, to which the preceding events had led up, and therefore they must receive such, if any. But they were not inwardly prepared for it, and therefore they could not understand it. Secondly, and in connection with it, we must remember that two high points had been reached, by the people, that Jesus was the Messiah-King; by the ship's company, that He was the Son of God. However imperfectly these truths may have been apprehended, yet the teaching of Christ, if it was to be progressive, must start from them and then point onwards and upwards. In this expectation we shall not be disappointed. And if, by the side of all this, we shall find allusions to peculiarly Jewish thoughts and views, these will not only confirm the Evangelic narrative, but furnish additional evidence of the Jewish authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

1. The question {St. ~~John~~ John 6:25-29.}: 'Rabbi, when camest Thou hither?' with which they from the eastern shore greeted Jesus, seems to

imply that they were perplexed about, and that some perhaps had heard a vague rumor of the miracle of His return to the western shore. It was the beginning of that unhealthy craving for the miraculous which the Lord had so sharply to reprove. In His own words: they sought Him not because they ‘saw signs,’ but because they ‘ate of the loaves,’ and, in their coarse love for the miraculous, ‘were filled.’^{f1540} What brought them, was not that they had discerned either the higher meaning of that miracle, or the Son of God, but those carnal Judaistic expectancies which had led them to proclaim Him King. What they waited for, was a Kingdom of God — not in righteousness, joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost, but in meat and drink — a kingdom with miraculous wilderness-banquets to Israel, and coarse miraculous triumphs over the Gentiles. Not to speak of the fabulous Messianic banquet which a sensuous realism expected, or of the achievements for which it looked, every figure in which prophets had clothed the brightness of those days was first literalized, and then exaggerated, till the most glorious poetic descriptions became the most repulsively incongruous caricatures of spiritual Messianic expectancy. The fruit-trees were every day, or at least every week or two, to yield their riches, the fields their harvests; {Shabb. 30 *b*; Jer. Sheqal. 6:2.} the grain was to stand like palm trees, and to be reaped and winnowed without labor. {Kethub. 111 *b*.} Similar blessings were to visit the vine; ordinary trees would bear like fruit trees, and every produce, of every clime, would be found in Palestine in such abundance and luxuriance as only the wildest imagination could conceive.

Such were the carnal thoughts about the Messiah and His Kingdom of those who sought Jesus because they ‘ate of the loaves, and were filled.’ What a contrast between them and the Christ, as He pointed them from the search for *such* meat to ‘work for the meat which He would give them,’ not a merely Jewish Messiah, but as ‘the son of Man.’ And yet, in uttering this strange truth, Jesus could appeal to something they knew when He added, ‘for Him the Father hath sealed, even God.’ The words, which seem almost inexplicable in this connection, become clear when we remember that this was a well-known Jewish expression. According to the Rabbis, ‘the seal of God was Truth (*AeMeTH*),’ the three letters of which this word is composed in Hebrew (*tma*) being, as was significantly pointed out, respectively the first, the middle, and the last letters of the alphabet. {Jer. Sanh. 18 *a*; Ber. R. 81.} Thus the words of Christ would convey to His hearers that for the real meat, which would endure to eternal life, for

the better Messianic banquet — they must come to Him, because God had impressed upon Him His own seal of truth, and so authenticated His Teaching and Mission.

In passing, we mark this as a Jewish allusion, which only a Jewish writer (not an Ephesian Gospel) would have recorded. But it is by no means the only one. It almost seems like a sudden gleam of light — as if they were putting their hand to this Divine Seal, when they now ask Him what they must do, in order to work the Works of God? Yet strangely refracted seems this ray of light, when they connect the Works of God with their own doing. And Christ directed them, as before, only more clearly, to Himself. To work the Works of God they must not do, but believe in Him Whom God had sent. Their twofold error consisted in imagining, that they could work the Works of God, and this by some doing of their own. On the other hand, Christ would have taught them that these Works of God were independent of man, and that they would be achieved through man's faith in the Mission of the Christ.

2. As it impresses itself on our minds, what now follows {St. ~~<B6>~~ John 6:30-36.} took place at a somewhat different time — perhaps on the way to the Synagogue. It is a remarkable circumstance, that among the ruins of the Synagogue of Capernaum the lintel has been discovered, and that it bears the device of a pot of manna, ornamented with a flowing pattern of vine leaves and clusters of grapes.^{f1541} Here then were the outward emblems, which would connect themselves with the Lord's teaching on that day. The miraculous feeding of the multitude in the 'desert place' the evening before, and the Messianic thoughts which clustered around it, would naturally suggest to their minds remembrance of the manna. That manna, which was Angels' food, distilled (as they imagined) from the upper light, 'the dew from above' {Yoma 75 b.} — miraculous food, of all manner of taste, and suited to every age, according to the wish or condition of him who see ate it, {Shem. B. 25.} but bitterness to Gentile palates — they expected the Messiah to bring again from heaven. For, all that the first deliverer Moses had done, the second — Messiah, — would also do. {Midr. on ~~<200>~~ Ecclesiastes 1:9.} And here, over their Synagogue, was the pot of manna — symbol of what God had done, earnest of what the Messiah would do: that pot of manna, which was now among the things hidden, but which Elijah, when he came, would restore again!

Here, then, was a real sign. In their view the events of yesterday must lead up to some such sign, if they had any real meaning. They had been told to believe on Him, as the One authenticated by God with the seal of Truth, and Who would give them meat to eternal life. By what sign would Christ corroborate His assertion, that they might see and believe? What work would He do to vindicate His claim? Their fathers had eaten manna in the wilderness. To understand the reasoning of the Jews, implied but not fully expressed, as also the answer of Jesus, it is necessary to bear in mind (what forms another evidence of the Jewish authorship of the Fourth Gospel), that it was the oft and most anciently expressed opinion that, although God had given them this bread out of heaven, yet it was given through the merits of Moses, and ceased with his death. {Targ. Pseudo Jon. on ^{f1548}Deuteronomy 34:8; Taan. 9 *a.*} This the Jews had probably in view, when they asked: ‘What workest Thou?’; and this was the meaning of Christ’s emphatic assertion, that it was *not* Moses who gave Israel that bread. And then by what, with all reverence, may still be designated a peculiarly Jewish turn of reasoning — such as only those familiar with Jewish literature can fully appreciate (and which none but a Jewish reporter would have inserted in his Gospel) — the Savior makes quite different, yet to them familiar, application of the manna. Moses had not given it — his merits had not procured it, — but His Father gave them the true bread out of heaven. ‘For,’ as He explained, ‘the bread of God is that ^{f1542} which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.’ Again, this very Rabbinic tradition, which described in such glowing language the wonders of that manna, also further explained its other and real meaning to be, that if Wisdom said, ‘Eat of my bread and drink of my wine,’ {^{f1543} ~~Prov~~ Proverbs 9:5.} it indicated that the manna and the miraculous water-supply were the sequence of Israel’s receiving the Law and the Commandments {Shem. R. 25.}, — for the real bread from heaven was the Law. {Comp. Chag. 14 *a.*}

It was an appeal which the Jews understood, and to which they could not but respond. Yet the mood was brief. As Jesus, in answer to the appeal that He would evermore give them this bread, once more directed them to Himself — from works of men to the Works of God and to faith, — the passing gleam of spiritual hope had already died out, for they had seen Him and ‘yet did not believe.’

With these words of mingled sadness and judgment, Jesus turned away from His questioners. The solemn sayings which now followed {St.

~~¶157~~ John 6:37-40.} could not have been spoken to, and they would not have been understood by, the multitude. And accordingly we find that, when the conversation of the Jews is once more introduced, {ver. 41.} it takes up the thread where it had been broken off, when Jesus spake of Himself as the Bread Which had come down from heaven. Had they heard what, in our view, Jesus spake only to His disciples, their objections would have been to more than merely the incongruity of Christ's claim to have come down from heaven. ^{f1544}

3. Regarding these words of Christ, then, as addressed to the disciples, there is really nothing in them beyond their standpoint, though they open views of the far horizon. They had the experience of the raising of the young man at Nain, and there, at Capernaum, of Jairus' daughter. Besides, believing that Jesus *was* the Messiah, it might perhaps not be quite strange nor new to them as Jews — although not commonly received, — that He would at the end of the world raise the pious dead. ^{f1545} Indeed, one of the names given to the Messiah — that of *Yinnon*, according to ~~¶127~~ Psalm 72:17 {Sanh. 98 *b.*} — has by some been derived from this very expectancy. {Midrash on ~~¶991~~ Psalm 93:1; Pirke de R. Eliez. 32, ed. Lemb. p. 39 *b.*} Again, He had said, that it was not any Law, but His Person, that was the bread which came down from heaven, and gave life, not to Jews only, but unto the world — and they had seen Him and believed not. But none the less would the loving purpose of God be accomplished in the totality of His true people, and its joyous reality be experienced by every individual among them: 'All that (the total number $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}$) which the Father giveth Me shall come unto Me (shall reach Me ^{f1546}), and him that cometh unto Me (the coming one to Me) I will not cast out outside.' What follows is merely the carrying out in all directions, and to its fullest consequences, of this twofold fundamental principle. The totality of the God-given would really reach Him, despite all hindrances, for the object of His Coming was to do the Will of His Father; and those who came would not be cast outside, for the Will of Him that had sent Him, and which He had come to do, was that of 'the *all* which He has given' Him, He 'should not lose *anything* out of this, but raise it up in the last day.' Again, the totality — the all — would reach Him, since it was the Will of Him that sent Him 'that everyone $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ who intently looketh ^{f1547} at the Son, and believeth on Him, should have eternal life;' and the coming ones would not be cast outside, since this was His undertaking and promise as the Christ in regard to each: 'And raise him up will I at the last day.' {St. ~~¶160~~ John 6:40.}

Although these wonderful statements reached in their full meaning far beyond the present horizon of His disciples, and even to the utmost bounds of later revelation and Christian knowledge, there is nothing in them which could have seemed absolutely strange or unintelligible to those who heard them. Given belief in the Messiahship of Jesus and His Mission by the Father; given experience of what He had done, and perhaps, to a certain extent, Jewish expectancy of what the Messiah would do in the last day; and all this directed or corrected by the knowledge concerning His work which His teaching had imparted, and the words were intelligible and most suitable, even though they would not convey to them all that they mean to us. If so seemingly incongruous an illustration might be used, they looked through a telescope that was not yet drawn out, and saw the same objects, through quite diminutively and far otherwise than we, as gradually the hand of Time has drawn out fully that through which both they and we, who believe, intently gaze on the Son.

4. What now follows {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓ~~ John 6:41-51.} is again spoken to ‘the Jews,’ and may have occurred just as they were entering the Synagogue. To those spiritually unenlightened, the point of difficulty seemed, how Christ could claim to be the Bread come down from heaven. Making the largest allowance, His known parentage and early history ^{f1548} forbade anything like a literal interpretation of His Words. But this inability to understand, ever brings out the highest teaching of Christ. We note the analogous fact, and even the analogous teaching, in the case of Nicodemus. {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃⲓ~~ John 3:3 etc.} ^{f1549} Only, his was the misunderstanding of ignorance, theirs of willful resistance to His Manifestation; and so the tone towards them was other than to the Rabbi.

Yet we also mark, that what Jesus now spake to ‘the Jews’ was the same in substance, though different in application, from what He had just uttered to the disciples. This, not merely in regard to the Messianic prediction of the Resurrection, but even in what He pronounced as the judgment on their murmuring. The words: ‘No man can come to Me, except the Father Which hath sent Me draw him,’ present only the converse aspect of those to the disciples: ‘All that which the Father giveth Me shall come unto Me, and him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out.’ For, far from being a judgment on, it would have been an excuse of, Jewish unbelief, and, indeed, entirely discordant with all Christ’s teaching, if the inability to come were regarded as other than personal and moral, springing from man’s ignorance and opposition to spiritual things. No man can come to

the Christ — such is the condition of the human mind and heart, that coming to Christ as a disciple is, not an outward, but an inward, not a physical, but a moral impossibility — except the Father ‘draw him.’ And this, again, not in the sense of any constraint, but in that of the personal, moral, loving influence and revelation, to which Christ afterwards refers when He saith: ‘And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself.’ {St. ⁴⁸¹²⁰John 12:32.}

Nor did Jesus, even while uttering these high, entirely un-Jewish truths, forget that He was speaking them to Jews. The appeal to their own Prophets was the more telling, that Jewish tradition also applied these two prophecies (²⁵⁴¹³Isaiah 54:13; ²⁸¹³⁴Jeremiah 31:34) to the teaching by God in the Messianic Age. {²⁵⁴¹³Isaiah 54:13 in Ber. R. 95 on ⁰⁴⁶³⁸Genesis 46:28; ²⁸¹³⁴Jeremiah 31:34 in Yalkut vol. 2 p. 66 d.} ^{f1550} But the explanation of the manner and issue of God’s teaching was new: ‘Everyone that hath heard from the Father, and learned, cometh unto Me.’ And this, not by some external or realistic contact with God, such as they regarded that of Moses in the past, or expected for themselves in the latter days; only ‘He Which is from God, He hath seen the Father.’ But even this might sound general and without exclusive reference to Christ. So, also, might this statement seem: ‘He that believeth ^{f1551} hath eternal life.’ Not so the final application, in which the subject was carried to its ultimate bearing, and all that might have seemed general or mysterious plainly set forth. The Personality of Christ *was* the Bread of Life: ‘I am the Bread of Life.’ {ver. 48.} The Manna had not been bread of life, for those who ate it had died, their carcasses had fallen in the wilderness. Not so in regard to this, the true Bread from heaven. To share in that Food was to have everlasting life, a life which the sin and death of unbelief and judgment would not cut short, as it had that of them who had eaten the Manna and died in the wilderness. It was another and a better Bread which came from heaven in Christ, and another, better, and deathless life which was connected with it: ‘the Bread that I will give is My Flesh, ^{f1552} for the life of the world.’

5. These words, so deeply significant to us, as pointing out the true meaning of all His teaching, must, indeed, have sounded most mysterious. Yet the fact that they strove about their meaning shows, that they must have had some glimmer of apprehension that they bore on His self-surrender, or, as they might view it, His martyrdom. This last point is set forth in the concluding Discourse, {vv. 53-58.} which we know to have been delivered in the Synagogue, whether before, during, or after, His

regular Sabbath address. It was not a mere martyrdom for the life of the world, in which all who benefited by it would share — but personal fellowship with Him. Eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of the Son of Man, such was the necessary condition of securing eternal life. It is impossible to mistake the primary reference of these words to our personal application of His Death and Passion to the deepest need and hunger of our souls; most difficult, also, to resist the feeling that, secondarily, ^{f1553} they referred to that Holy Feast which shows forth that Death and Passion, and is to all time its remembrance, symbol, seal, and fellowship. In this, also, has the hand of History drawn out the telescope; and as we gaze through it, every sentence and word sheds light upon the Cross and light from the Cross, carrying to us this twofold meaning: His Death, and its Celebration in the great Christian Sacrament.

6. But to them that heard it, nay even to many of His disciples, this was an hard saying. Who could bear it? For it was a thorough disenchantment of all their Judaic illusions, an entire upturning of all their Messianic thoughts, and that, not merely to those whose views were grossly carnal, but even to many who had hitherto been drawn closer to Him. The ‘meat’ and ‘drink’ from heaven which had the Divine seal of ‘truth’ were, according to Christ’s teaching, not ‘the Law,’ nor yet Israel’s privileges, but fellowship with the Person of Jesus in that state of humbleness (‘the Son of Joseph,’ {ver. 42.}), nay, or martyrdom, which His words seemed to indicate, ‘My Flesh is the true ^{f1554} meat, and My Blood is the true drink;’ {ver. 55.} and whatever this fellowship secured, consisted only in abiding in Him and He in them; {ver. 56.} or, as they would understand it, in inner communion with Him, and in sharing His condition and views. Truly, this was a totally different Messiah and Messianic Kingdom from what they either conceived or wished.

Though they spake it not, this was the rock of offense over which they stumbled and fell. And Jesus read their thoughts. How unfit were they to receive all that was yet to happen in connection with the Christ — how unprepared for it! If they stumbled at this, what when they came to contemplate ^{f1555} the far more mysterious and un-Jewish facts of the Messiah’s Crucifixion and Ascension ! {ver. 62.} Truly, not outward following, but only inward and spiritual life-quickenings could be of profit — even in the case of those who heard the very Words of Christ, which were spirit and life. Thus it again appeared, and most fully, that, morally speaking, it was absolutely impossible to come to Him, even if His Words

were heard, except under the gracious influence from above. {ver. 65; comp. vv. 37, 44.}

And so this was the great crisis in the History of the Christ. We have traced the gradual growth and development of the popular movement, till the murder of the Baptist stirred popular feeling to its inmost depth. With his death it seemed as if the Messianic hope, awakened by his preaching and testimony to Christ, were fading from view. It was a terrible disappointment, not easily borne. Now must it be decided, whether Jesus was really the Messiah. His Works, notwithstanding what the Pharisees said, seemed to prove it. Then let it appear; let it come, stroke upon stroke — each louder and more effective than the other — till the land rang with the shout of victory and the world itself re-echoed it. And so it seemed. That miraculous feeding — that wilderness-cry of Hosanna to the Galilean King-Messiah from thousands of Galilean voices — what were they but its beginning? All the greater was the disappointment: first, in the repression of the movement — so to speak, the retreat of the Messiah, His voluntary abdication, rather, His defeat; then, next day, the incongruousness of a King, Whose few unlearned followers, in their ignorance and un-Jewish neglect of most sacred ordinances, outraged every Jewish feeling, and whose conduct was even vindicated by their Master in a general attack on all traditionalism, that basis of Judaism — as it might be represented, to the contempt of religion and even of common truthfulness in the denunciation of solemn vows! This was not the Messiah Whom the many, nay — Whom almost any — would own. {St. ^{f152}Matthew 15:12.}

Here, then, we are at the parting of the two ways; and, just because it was the hour of decision, did Christ so clearly set forth the highest truths concerning Himself, in opposition to the views which the multitude entertained about the Messiah. The result was yet another and a sorer defection. ‘Upon this many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him.’ {St. ^{f153}John 6:66.} Nay, the searching trial reached even unto the hearts of the Twelve. Would they also go away? It was an anticipation of Gethsemane — its first experience. But one thing kept them true. It was the experience of the past. This was the basis of their present faith and allegiance. They *could* not go back to their old past; they must cleave to Him. So Peter spake it in name of them all: ‘Lord, to whom shall we go? Words of Eternal Life hast Thou!’ Nay, and more than this, as the result of what they had learned: ‘And we have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God.’ {vv. 68, 69.} ^{f156} It is thus, also, that

many of us, whose thoughts may have been sorely tossed, and whose foundations terribly assailed, may have found our first resting-place in the assured, unassailable spiritual experience of the past. Whither can we go for Words of Eternal Life, if not to Christ? If He fails us, then all hope of the Eternal is gone. But He *has* the Words of Eternal life — and we believed when they first came to us; nay, we know that He is the Holy One of God. And this conveys all that faith needs for further learning. The rest will He show, when He is transfigured in our sight.

But of these Twelve Christ knew one to be ‘a devil’ — like that Angel, fallen from highest height to lowest depth. ^{f1557} The apostasy of Judas had already commenced in his heart. And, the greater the popular expectancy and disappointment had been, the greater the reaction and the enmity that followed. The hour of decision was past, and the hand on the dial pointed to the hour of His Death.

CHAPTER 33

JESUS AND THE SYRO-PHOENICIAN WOMAN

(St. ~~<4152>~~ Matthew 15:21-28; St. ~~<4074>~~ Mark 7:24-30.)

THE purpose of Christ to withdraw His disciples from the excitement of Galilee, and from what might follow the execution of the Baptist, had been interrupted by the events at Bethsaida-Julias, but it was not changed. On the contrary, it must have been intensified. That wild, popular outburst, which had almost forced upon Him a Jewish Messiah-Kingship; the discussion with the Jerusalem Scribes about the washing of hands on the following day; the Discourses of the Sabbath, and the spreading disaffection, defection, and opposition which were its consequences — all pointed more than ever to the necessity of a break in the publicity of His Work, and to withdrawal from that part of Galilee. The nearness of the Sabbath, and the circumstance that the Capernaum-boat lay moored on the shore of Bethsaida, had obliged Him, when withdrawing from that neighborhood, to return to Capernaum. And there the Sabbath had to be spent — in what manner we know. But as soon as its sacred rest was past, the journey was resumed. For the reasons already explained, it extended much further than any other, and into regions which, we may venture to suggest, would not have been traversed but for the peculiar circumstances of the moment.

A comparatively short journey would bring Jesus and His companions from Capernaum ‘into the parts,’ or, as St. Mark more specifically calls them, ‘the borders of Tyre and Sidon.’ At that time this district extended, north of Galilee, {*Jos. War* 3:3. 1.} from the Mediterranean to the Jordan. But the event about to be related occurred, as all circumstances show, not within the territory of Tyre and Sidon, but on its borders, and within the limits of the Land of Israel. If any doubt could attach to the objects which determined Christ’s journey to those parts, it would be removed by the circumstance that St. Matthew {St. ~~<4152>~~ Matthew 15:21.} tells us, He ‘withdrew’ ^{f1558} thither, while St. Mark notes that He ‘entered into an house, and would have no man know it.’ That house in which Jesus sought shelter and privacy would, of course, be a Jewish home; and, that it was within the borders of Israel, is further evidenced by the notice of St.

Matthew, that ‘the Canaanitish woman’ who sought His help ‘came out from those borders’ — that is, from out the Tyro-Sidonian district — into that Galilean border where Jesus was.

The whole circumstances seem to point to more than a night’s rest in that distant home. Possibly, the two first Passover-days may have been spent here. If the Savior had left Capernaum on the Sabbath evening, or the Sunday morning, He may have reached that home on the borders before the Paschal Eve, and the Monday and Tuesday ^{f1559} may have been the festive Paschal days, on which sacred rest was enjoined. This would also give an adequate motive for such a sojourn in that house, as seems required by the narrative of St. Mark. According to that Evangelist, ‘Jesus would have no man know’ His Presence in that place, ‘but He could not be hid.’ Manifestly, this could not apply to the rest of one night in a house.

According to the same Evangelist, the fame of His Presence spread into the neighboring district of Tyre and Sidon, and reached the mother of the demonized child, upon which she went from her home into Galilee to apply for help to Jesus. All this implies a stay of two or three days. And with this also agrees the after-complaint of the disciples: ‘Send her away, for she crieth after us.’ {St. ^{<4052>}Matthew 15:23.} As the Savior apparently received the woman in the house, {St. ^{<4072>}Mark 7:24, 25.} it seems that she must have followed some of the disciples, entreating their help or intercession in a manner that attracted the attention which, according to the will of Jesus, they would fain have avoided, before, in her despair, she ventured into the Presence of Christ within the house.

All this resolves into a higher harmony those small seeming discrepancies, which negative criticism had tried to magnify into contradictions. It also adds graphic details to the story. She who now sought His help was, as St. Matthew calls her, from the Jewish standpoint, ‘a Canaanitish {^{<1501>}Ezra 9:1.} woman,’ by which term a Jew would designate a native of Phoenicia, or, as St. Mark calls her, a Syro-Phoenician (to distinguish her country from Lybo-Phoenicia), and ‘a Greek’ — that is, a heathen. But, we can understand how she who, as *Bengel* says, made the misery of her little child her own, would, on hearing of the Christ and His mighty deed, seek His help with the most intense earnestness, and that, in so doing, she would approach Him with lowliest reverence, falling at His Feet. {St. ^{<4075>}Mark 7:25.} But what in the circumstances seems so peculiar, and, in our view, furnishes the explanation of the Lord’s bearing towards this woman, is her mode of addressing Him: ‘O Lord, Thou Son of David!’ This was the most

distinctively Jewish appellation of the Messiah; and yet it is emphatically stated of her, that she was a heathen. Tradition has preserved a few reported sayings of Christ, of which that about to be quoted seems, at least, quite Christ-like. It is reported that, ‘having seen a man working on the Sabbath, He said: “O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou are blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou are cursed, and art a transgressor of the Law.”’^{f1560} The same principle applied to the address of this woman — only that, in what followed, Christ imparted to her the knowledge needful to make her blessed.

Spoken by a heathen, these words were an appeal, not to the Messiah of Israel, but to an Israelitish Messiah, for David had never reigned over her or her people. The title might be most rightfully used, if the promises to David were fully and spiritually apprehended — not otherwise. If used without that knowledge, it was an address by a stranger to a Jewish Messiah, Whose works were only miracles, and not also and primarily signs. Now this was exactly the error of the Jews which Jesus had encountered and combated, alike when He resisted the attempt to make Him King, in His reply to the Jerusalem Scribes, and in His Discourses at Capernaum. To have granted her the help she so entreated, would have been, as it were, to reverse the whole of His Teaching, and to make His works of healing merely works of power. For, it will not be contended that this heathen woman had full spiritual knowledge of the world-wide bearing of the Davidic promises, or of the world embracing designation of the Messiah as the Son of David. In her mouth, then, it meant something to which Christ could not have yielded. And yet He could not refuse her petition. And so He first taught her, in such manner as she could understand — that which she needed to know, before she could approach Him in such manner — the relation of the heathen to the Jewish world, and of both to the Messiah, and then He gave her what she asked.

It is this, we feel convinced, which explains all. It could not have been, that from His human standpoint He first kept silence, His deep tenderness and sympathy forbidding Him to speak, while the normal limitation of His Mission forbade Him to act as she sought.^{f1561} Such limitations could not have existed in His mind; nor can we suppose such an utter separation of His Human from His Divine consciousness in His Messianic acting. And we recoil from the opposite explanation, which supposes Christ to have either tried the faith of the woman, or else spoken with a view to drawing it out. We shrink from the idea of anything like an after-thought, even for a

good purpose, on the part of the Divine Savior. All such afterthoughts are, to our thinking, incompatible with His Divine Purity and absolute rectitude. God does not make us good by a device — and that is a very wrong view of trials, or of delayed answers to prayer, which men sometimes take. Nor can we imagine, that the Lord would have made such cruel trial of the poor agonized woman, or played on her feelings, when the issue would have been so unspeakable terrible, if in her weakness she had failed. There is nothing analogous in the case of this poor heathen coming to petition, and being tried by being told that she could not be heard, because she belonged to the dogs, not the children, and the trial of Abraham, who was a hero of faith, and had long walked with God. In any case, on any of the views just combated, the Words of Jesus would bear a needless and inconceivable harshness, which grates on all our feelings concerning Him. The Lord does not afflict willingly, nor try needlessly, nor disguise His loving thoughts and purposes, in order to bring about some effect in us. He needs not such means; and, with reverence be it said, we cannot believe that He ever uses them.

But, viewed as the teaching of Christ to this heathen concerning Israel's Messiah, all becomes clear, even in the very brief reports of the Evangelists, of which that by St. Matthew reads like that of one present, that of St. Mark rather like that of one who relates what he has heard from another (St. Peter). She had spoken, but Jesus had answered her not a word. When the disciples — in some measure, probably, still sharing the views of this heathen, that he was the Jewish Messiah — without, indeed, interceding for her, asked that she might be sent away, because she was troublesome to them, He replied, that His Mission was only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. This was absolutely true, as regarded His Work while upon earth; and true, in every sense, as we keep in view the world-wide bearing of the Davidic reign and promises, and the real relation between Israel and the world. Thus baffled, as it might seem, she cried no longer 'Son of David,' but, 'Lord, help me.' It was then that the special teaching came in the manner she could understand. If it were as 'the Son of David' that He was entreated — if the heathen woman as such applied to the Jewish Messiah as such, what, in the Jewish view, were the heathens but 'dogs,' and what would be fellowship with them, but to cast to the dogs — housedogs, ^{f1562} it may be, what should have been the children's bread? And, certainly, no expression more common in the mouth of the Jews, than that which designated the heathens as dogs. {Midr. on ~~Psalm~~ Psalm

4:8; Meg. 7 b. } ^{f1563} Most harsh as it was, as the outcome of national pride and Jewish self-assertion, yet in a sense it was true, that those *within* were the children, and those '*without*' 'dogs.' { ~~<6215>~~ Revelation 22:15. } Only, who were they within and who they without? What made 'a child,' whose was the bread, and what characterized 'the dog,' that was 'without'?

Two lessons did she learn with that instinct-like rapidity which Christ's personal Presence — and it alone, — seemed ever and again to call forth, just as the fire which fell from heaven consumed the sacrifice of Elijah. 'Yea, Lord,' it is as Thou sayest: heathenism stands related to Judaism as the house-dogs to the children, and it were not meet to rob the children of their bread in order to give it to dogs. But Thine own words show, that such would not now be the case. If they are house-dogs, then they are the Master's, and under His table, and when He breaks the bread to the children, in the breaking of it the crumbs must fall all around. As St. Matthew puts it: 'The dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their Master's table;' as St. Mark puts it: 'The dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs.' Both versions present different aspects of the same truth. Heathenism may be like the dogs, when compared with the children's place and privileges; but He is their Master still, and they under His table; and when He breaks the bread there is enough and to spare for them — even under the table they eat of the children's crumbs.

But in so saying she was no longer 'under the table,' but had sat down at the table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and was partaker of the children's bread. He was no longer to her the Jewish Messiah, but truly 'the Son of David.' She now understood what she prayed, and she was a daughter of Abraham. And what had taught her all this was faith in His Person and Work, as not only just enough for the Jews, but enough and to spare for all — children at the table and dogs under it; that in and with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David, all nations were blessed in Israel's King and Messiah. And so it was, that the Lord said it: 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it done unto thee even as thou wilt.' Or, as St. Mark puts it, not quoting the very sound of the Lord's words, but their impression upon Peter: 'For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.' ^{f1564} 'And her daughter was healed from that hour.' { St. ~~<0153>~~ Matthew 15:28. } 'And she went away unto her house, and found her daughter prostrate [indeed] upon the bed, and [but] the demon gone out.'

To us there is in this history even more than the solemn interest of Christ's compassion and mighty Messianic working, or the lessons of His teaching. We view it in connection with the scenes of the previous few days, and see how thoroughly it accords with them in spirit, thus recognizing the deep internal unity of Christ's Words and Works, where least, perhaps, we might have looked for such harmony. And again we view it in its deeper bearing upon, and lessons to, all times. To how many, not only of all nations and conditions, but in all states of heart and mind, nay, in the very lowest depths of conscious guilt and alienation from God, must this have brought unspeakable comfort, the comfort of truth, and the comfort of His Teaching. Be it so, an outcast, 'dog;' not at the table, but under the table. Still we are at His Feet; it is our Master's Table; He is our Master; and, as He breaks the children's bread, it is of necessity that 'the children's crumbs' fall to us, enough, quite enough, and to spare. Never can we be outside His reach, nor of that of His gracious care, and of sufficient provision to eternal life.

Yet this lesson also must we learn, that as 'heathens' we may not call on Him as 'David's Son,' till we know why we so call Him. If there can be no despair, no being cast out by Him, no absolute distance that hopelessly separates from His Person and Provision, there must be no presumption, no forgetfulness of the right relation, no expectancy of magic-miracles, no viewing of Christ as a Jewish Messiah. We must learn it, and painfully, first by His silence, then by this, that He is only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, what we are and where we are — that we may be prepared for the grace of God and the gift of grace. All men, Jews and Gentiles, 'children' and 'dogs' — are as before Christ and God equally undeserving and equally sinners, but those who have fallen deep can only learn that they are sinners by learning that they are great sinners, and will only taste of the children's bread when they have felt, 'Yea, Lord,' 'for even the dogs' 'under the table eat of the children's crumbs,' 'which fall from their Master's table.'

CHAPTER 34

A GROUP OF MIRACLES AMONG A SEMI-HEATHEN POPULATION

(St. ^{<159>}Matthew 15:29-31; St. ^{<173>}Mark 7:31-37;
St. ^{<182>}Mark 8:22-26; St. ^{<117>}Matthew 11:27-31.)

IF even the brief stay of Jesus in that friendly Jewish home by the borders of Tyre could not remain unknown, the fame of the healing of the Syro-Phoenician maiden would soon have rendered impossible that privacy and retirement, which had been the chief object of His leaving Capernaum. Accordingly, when the two Paschal days were ended, He resumed His journey, extending it far beyond any previously undertaken, perhaps beyond what had been originally intended. The borders of Palestine proper, though not of what the Rabbis reckoned as belonging to it, ^{f1565} were passed. Making a long circuit through the territory of Sidon, ^{f1566} He descended, probably through one of the passes of the Hermon range — into the country of the Tetrarch Philip. Thence He continued ‘through the midst of the borders of Decapolis,’ till He once more reached the eastern, or south-eastern, shore of the Lake of Galilee. It will be remembered that the Decapolis, or confederacy of ‘the Ten Cities,’ ^{f1567} was wedged in between the Tetrarchies of Philip and Antipas. It embraced ten cities, although that was not always their number, and their names are variously enumerated. Of these cities Hippos, on the southeastern shore of the Lake, was the most northern, and Philadelphia, the ancient Rabbath-Ammon, the most southern. Scythopolis, the ancient Beth-Shean, with its district, was the only one of them on the western bank of the Jordan. This extensive ‘Ten Cities’ district was essentially heathen territory. Their ancient monuments show, in which of them Zeus, Astarte, and Athene, or else Artemis, Hercules, Dionysos, Demeter, or other Grecian divinities, were worshipped. ^{f1568} Their political constitution was that of the free Greek cities. They were subject only to the Governor of Syria, and formed part of Coele-Syria, in contradistinction to Syro-Phoenicia. Their privileges dated from the time of Pompey, from which also they afterwards reckoned their era.

It is important to keep in view that, although Jesus was now within the territory of ancient Israel, the district and all the surroundings were essentially heathen, although in closest proximity to, and intermingling with, that which was purely Jewish. St. Matthew {St. ~~4159~~ Matthew 15:29-31.} gives only a general description of Christ's activity there, concluding with a notice of the impression produced on those who witnessed His mighty deeds, as leading them to glorify 'the God of Israel.' This, of course, confirms the impression that the scene is laid among a population chiefly heathen, and agrees with the more minute notice of the locality in the Gospel of St. Mark. One special instance of miraculous healing is recorded in the latter, not only from its intrinsic interest, but perhaps, also, as in some respects typical.

1. Among those brought to Him was one deaf, whose speech had, probably in consequence of this, been so affected as practically to deprive him of its power. ^{f1569} This circumstance, and that he is not spoken of as so afflicted from his birth, leads us to infer that the affection was — as not infrequently — the result of disease, and not congenital. Remembering, that alike the subject of the miracle and they who brought him were heathens, but in constant and close contact with Jews, what follows is vividly true to life. The entreaty to 'lay His Hand upon him' was heathen, and yet semi-Jewish also. Quite peculiar it is, when the Lord took him aside from the multitude; and again that, in healing him, 'He spat,' applying it directly to the diseased organ. We read of the direct application of saliva only here and in the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida. {St. ~~4168~~ Mark 5:3, 23.} ^{f1570} We are disposed to regard this as peculiar to the healing of Gentiles. Peculiar, also, is the term expressive of burden on the mind, when, 'looking up to heaven, He sighed.' ^{f1571} Peculiar, also, is the 'thrusting' ^{f1572} of His Fingers into the man's ears, and the touch of his tongue. Only the upward look to Heaven and the command 'Ephphatha' — 'be opened' — seem the same as in His every day wonders of healing. But we mark that all here seems much more elaborate than in Israel. The reason of this must, of course, be sought in the moral condition of the person healed. Certain characteristics about the action of the Lord may, perhaps, help us to understand it better. There is an accumulation of means, yet each and all inadequate to effect the purpose, but all connected with His Person. This elaborate use of such means would banish the idea of magic; it would arouse the attention, and fix it upon Christ, as using these means, which were all connected with His

own person; while, lastly, the sighing, and the word of absolute command, would all have here their special significance.

Let us try to realize the scene. They have heard of Him as the wonder-worker, these heathens in the land so near to, and yet so far from, Israel; and they have brought to Him ‘the lame, blind, dumb, maimed, ^{f1573} and many others,’ and laid them at His Feet. Oh, what wonder! All disease vanishes in presence of Heaven’s Own Life Incarnate. Tongues long weighted are loosed, limbs maimed or bent by disease ^{f1573} are restored to health, the lame are stretched straight; the film of disease and the paralysis of nerve-impotence pass from eyes long insensible to the light. It is a new era — Israel conquers the heathen world, not by force, but by love; not by outward means, but by the manifestation of life-power from above. Truly, this is the Messianic conquest and reign: ‘and they glorified the God of Israel.’

From amongst this mass of misery we single out and follow one, {St. ~~4078~~ Mark 7:31-37.} whom the Savior takes aside, that it may not merely be the breath of heaven’s spring passing over them all, that wooeth him to new life, but that He may touch and handle him, and so give health to soul and body. The man is to be alone with Christ and the disciples. It is not magic; means are used, and such as might not seem wholly strange to the man. And quite a number of means! He thrust His Fingers into his deaf ears, as if to make a way for the sound: He spat on his tongue, using a means of healing accepted in popular opinion of Jew and Gentile; {Shabb. 108 b; Pliny, H. N. 28:7; *Suet.* Vesp. 7.} ^{f1574} He touched his tongue. Each act seemed a fresh incitement to his faith — and all connected itself with the Person of Christ. As yet there was not breath of life in it all. But when the man’s eyes followed those of the Savior to heaven, he would understand whence He expected, whence came to Him the power — Who had sent Him, and Whose He was. And as he followed the movement of Christ’s lips, as he groaned under the felt burden He had come to remove, the sufferer would look up expectant. Once more the Savior’s lips parted to speak the word of command: ‘Be opened’ {ἐφφαθά = j Tptħ} — and straightway the gladsome sound would pass into ‘his hearing,’ ^{f1575} and the bond that seemed to have held his tongue was loosed. He was in a new world, into which He had put him that had spoken that one Word; He, Who had been burdened under the load which He had lifted up to His Father; to Whom all the means that had been used had pointed, and with Whose Person they had been connected.

It was in vain to enjoin silence. Wider and wider spread the unbidden fame, till it was caught up in this one hymn of praise, which has remained to all time the jubilee of our experience of Christ as the Divine Healer: 'He hath done all things well — He maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.' This Jewish word, *Ephphatha*, spoken to the Gentile Church by Him, Who, looking up to heaven, sighed under the burden, even while He uplifted it, has opened the hearing and loosed the bond of speech. Most significantly was it spoken in the language of the Jews; and this also does it teach, that Jesus must always have spoken the Jews' language. For, if ever, to a Grecian in Grecian territory would He have spoken in Greek, not in the Jews' language, if the former and not the latter had been that of which He made use in His Words and Working.

2. Another miracle is recorded by St. Mark, {St. ~~Mark~~^{8:22} Mark 8:22-26.} as wrought by Jesus in these parts, and, as we infer, on a heathen.^{f1576} All the circumstances are kindred to those just related. It was in Bethsaida-Julias, that one blind was brought unto Him, with the entreaty that He would touch him — just as in the case of the deaf and dumb. Here, also, the Savior took him aside — 'led him out of the village' — and 'spat on his eyes, and put His Hands upon him. We mark not only the similarity of the means employed, but the same, and even greater elaborateness in the use of them, since a twofold touch is recorded before the man saw clearly.^{f1577} On any theory, even that which would regard the Gospel-narratives as spurious — this trait must have been intended to mark a special purpose, since this is the only instance in which a miraculous cure was performed gradually, and not at once and completely. So far as we can judge, the object was, by a gradual process of healing, to disabuse the man of any idea of magical cure, while at the same time the process of healing again markedly centered in the Person of Jesus. With this also agrees (as in the case of the deaf and dumb) the use of spittle in the healing. We may here recall, that the use of saliva was a well-known Jewish remedy for affections of the eyes. {Jer. Shabb. 14:4; Baba B. 126 *b*.} It was thus that the celebrated Rabbi Meir relieved one of his fair hearers, when her husband, in his anger at her long detention by the Rabbi's sermons, had ordered her to spit in the preacher's face. Pretending to suffer from his eyes, the Rabbi contrived that the woman publicly spat in his eyes, thus enabling her to obey her husband's command. {Jer. Sot. 16 *d*, about the middle.} The anecdote at least proves, that the application of saliva was popularly regarded as a remedy for affections of the eyes.

Thus in this instance also, as in that of the deaf and dumb, there was the use of means, Jewish means, means manifestly insufficient (since their first application was only partially successful), and a multiplication of means — yet all centering in, and proceeding from, His Person. As further analogies between the two, we mark that the blindness does not seem to have been congenital, {Comp. St. ~~4084~~ Mark 8:24.} but the consequence of disease, and that silence was enjoined after the healing. {ver. 26.} Lastly, the confusedness of his sight, when first restored to him, surely conveyed, not only to him but to us all, both a spiritual lesson and a spiritual warning.

3. Yet a third miracle of healing requires to be here considered, although related by St. Matthew in quite another connection. {St. ~~4087~~ Matthew 9:27-31.} But we have learned enough of the structure of the First Gospel to know, that its arrangement is determined by the plan of the writer rather than by the chronological succession of events. ^{f1578} The manner in which the Lord healed the two blind men, the injunction of silence, and the notice that none the less they spread His fame in *all that land*, ^{f1579} seem to imply that He was not on the ordinary scene of His labors in Galilee.

Nor can we fail to mark an internal analogy between this and the other two miracles enacted amidst a chiefly Grecian population. And, strange though it may sound, the cry with which the two blind men who sought His help followed Him, ‘Son of David, have mercy on us,’ comes, as might be expected, more frequently from Gentile than from Jewish lips. It was, of course, pre-eminently the Jewish designation of the Messiah, the basis of all Jewish thought of Him. But, perhaps on that very ground, it would express in Israel rather the homage of popular conviction, than, as in this case, the cry for help in bodily disease. Besides, Jesus had not as yet been hailed as the Messiah, except by His most intimate disciples; and, even by them, chiefly in the joy of their highest spiritual attainments. He was the Rabbi, Teacher, Wonder-worker, Son of Man, even Son of God; but the idea of the Davidic Kingdom as implying spiritual and Divine, not outwardly royal rule, lay as yet on the utmost edge of the horizon, covered by the golden mist of the Sun of Righteousness in His rising. On the other hand, we can understand, how to Gentiles, who resided in Palestine, the Messiah of Israel would chiefly stand out as ‘the Son of David.’ It was the most ready, and, at the same time, the most universal, form in which the great Jewish hope could be viewed by them. It presented to their minds the most marked contrast to Israel’s present fallen state, and it recalled the Golden Age of Israel’s past, and that, as only the symbol of a far wider and

more glorious reign, the fulfillment of what to David had only been promises. ^{f1580}

Peculiar to this history is the testing question of Christ, whether they really believed what their petition implied, that He was able to restore their sight; and, again, His stern, almost passionate, insistence ^{f1581} on their silence as to the mode of their cure. Only on one other occasion do we read of the same insistence. It is, when the leper had expressed the same absolute faith in Christ's ability to heal if He willed it, and Jesus had, as in the case of those two blind men, conferred the benefit by the touch of His Hand. {St. ~~4040~~ Mark 1:40, 41.} In both these cases, it is remarkable that, along with strongest faith of those who came to Him, there was rather an implied than an expressed petition on their part. The leper who knelt before Him only said: 'Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean;' and the two blind men: 'Have mercy on us, Thou Son of David.' Thus it is the highest and most realizing faith, which is most absolute in its trust and most reticent as regards the details of its request.

But as regards the two blind men (and the healed leper also), it is almost impossible not to connect Christ's peculiar insistence on their silence with their advanced faith. They had owned Jesus as 'the Son of David,' and that, not in the Judaic sense (as by the Syro-Phoenician woman ^{f1582}), but as able to do all things, even to open by His touch the eyes of the blind. And it had been done to them, as it always is — according to their faith. But a profession of faith so wide-reaching as theirs, and sealed by the attainment of what it sought, yet scarcely dared to ask, must not be publicly proclaimed. It would, and in point of fact did, bring to Him crowds which, unable spiritually to understand the meaning of such a confession, would only embarrass and hinder, and whose presence and homage would have to be avoided as much, if not more, than that of open enemies. {St. ~~4045~~ Mark 1:45.} For confession of the mouth must ever be the outcome of heart-belief, and the acclamations of an excited Jewish crowd were as incongruous to the real Character of the Christ, and as obstructive to the progress of His Kingdom, as is the outward homage of a world which has not heart-belief in His Power, nor heart-experience of His ability and willingness to cleanse the leper and to open the eyes of the blind. Yet the leprosy of Israel and the blindness of the Gentile world are equally removed by the touch of His Hand at the cry of faith.

The question has been needlessly discussed, ^{f1583} whether they were to praise or blame, who, despite the Savior's words, spread His fame. We scarcely know what, or how much, they disobeyed. They could not but speak of His Person; and theirs was, perhaps, not yet that higher silence which is content simply to sit at His Feet.

CHAPTER 35

THE TWO SABBATH-CONTROVERSIES — THE PLUCKING OF THE EARS OF CORN BY THE DISCIPLES, AND THE HEALING OF THE MAN WITH THE WITHERED HAND

(St. ~~401~~ Matthew 12:1-21; St. ~~402~~ Mark 2:23-3:6; St. ~~403~~ Luke 6:1-11.)

IN grouping together the three miracles of healing described in the last chapter, we do not wish to convey that it is certain they had taken place in precisely that order. Nor do we feel sure, that they preceded what is about to be related. In the absence of exact data, the succession of events and their location must be matter of combination. From their position in the Evangelic narratives, and the manner in which all concerned speak and act, we inferred, that they took place at that particular period and east of the Jordan, in the Decapolis or else in the territory of Philip. They differ from the events about to be related by the absence of the Jerusalem Scribes, who hung on the footsteps of Jesus. While the Savior tarried on the borders of Tyre, and thence passed through the territory of Sidon into the Decapolis and to the southern and eastern shores of the Lake of Galilee, they were in Jerusalem at the Passover. But after the two festive days, which would require their attendance in the Temple, they seem to have returned to their hateful task. It would not be difficult for them to discover the scene of such mighty works as His. Accordingly, we now find them once more confronting Christ. And the events about to be related are chronologically distinguished from those that had preceded, by this presence and opposition of the Pharisaic party. The contest now becomes more decided and sharp, and we are rapidly nearing the period when He, Who had hitherto been chiefly preaching the Kingdom, and healing body and soul, will, through the hostility of the leaders of Israel, enter on the second, or prevaillingly negative stage of His Work, in which, according to the prophetic description, ‘they compassed’ Him ‘about like bees,’ but ‘are quenched as the fire of thorns.’

Where fundamental principles were so directly contrary, the occasion for conflict could not be long wanting. Indeed, all that Jesus taught must have seemed to these Pharisees strangely un-Jewish in cast and direction, even if not in form and words. But chiefly would this be the case in regard to that

on which, of all else, the Pharisees laid most stress, the observance of the Sabbath. On no other subject is Rabbinic teaching more painfully minute and more manifestly incongruous to its professed object. For, if we rightly apprehend what underlay the complicated and intolerably burdensome laws and rules of Pharisaic Sabbath-observance, it was to secure, negatively, absolute rest from all labor, and, positively, to make the Sabbath a delight. The Mishnah includes Sabbath-desecration among those most heinous crimes for which a man was to be stoned. {Sanh. 7:4.} This, then, was their first care: by a series of complicated ordinances to make a breach of the Sabbath-rest impossible. How far this was carried, we shall presently see. The next object was, in a similarly external manner, to make the Sabbath a delight. A special Sabbath dress, the best that could be procured; the choicest food, even though a man had to work for it all the week, or public charity were to supply it {Peah 8:7.} — such were some of the means by which the day was to be honored and men to find pleasure therein. The strangest stories are told, how, by the purchase of the most expensive dishes, the pious poor had gained unspeakable merit, and obtained, even on earth, Heaven's manifest reward. And yet, by the side of these and similar strange and sad misdirections of piety, we come also upon that which is touching, beautiful, and even spiritual. On the Sabbath there must be no mourning, for to the Sabbath applies this saying: {In ~~Q102~~Proverbs 10:22.} 'The blessing of the Lord, it maketh rich, and He addeth no sorrow with it.' Quite alone was the Sabbath among the measures of time. Every other day had been paired with its fellow: not so the Sabbath. And so any festival, even the Day of Atonement, might be transferred to another day: not so the observance of the Sabbath. Nay, when the Sabbath complained before God, that of all days it alone stood solitary, God had wedded it to Israel; and this holy union God had bidden His people 'remember,' {~~Q218~~Exodus 20:8.} when it stood before the Mount. Even the tortures of Gehenna were intermitted on that holy, happy day. {Comp. Ber. R. 111 on ~~Q118~~Genesis 2:3.}

The terribly exaggerated views on the Sabbath entertained by the Rabbis, and the endless burdensome rules with which they encumbered everything connected with its sanctity, are fully set forth in another place. ^{f1584} The Jewish Law, as there summarized, sufficiently explains the controversies in which the Pharisaic party now engaged with Jesus. Of these the first was when, going through the cornfields on the Sabbath, His disciples began to pluck and eat the ears of corn. Not, indeed, that this was the first Sabbath-

controversy forced upon Christ. {Comp. St. ~~John~~ John 5:9, 16.} But it was the first time that Jesus allowed, and afterwards Himself did, in presence of the Pharisees, what was contrary to Jewish notions, and that, in express and unmistakable terms, He vindicated His position in regard to the Sabbath. This also indicates that we have now reached a further stage in the history of our Lord's teaching.

This, however, is not the only reason for placing this event so late in the personal history of Christ. St. Matthew inserts it at a different period from the other two Synoptists; and although St. Mark and St. Luke introduce it amidst the same surroundings, the connection, in which it is told in all the three Gospels, shows that it is placed out of the historical order, with the view of grouping together what would exhibit Christ's relation to the Pharisees and their teaching. Accordingly, this first Sabbath-controversy is immediately followed by that connected with the healing of the man with the withered hand. From St. Matthew and St. Mark it might, indeed, appear as if this had occurred on the same day as the plucking of the ears of corn, but St. Luke corrects any possible misunderstanding, by telling us that it happened 'on another Sabbath' — perhaps that following the walk through the cornfields.

Dismissing the idea of inferring the precise time of these two events from their place in the Evangelic record, we have not much difficulty in finding the needful historical data for our present inquiry. The first and most obvious is, that the harvest was still standing — whether that of barley or of wheat. The former began immediately after the Passover, the latter after the Feast of Pentecost; the presentation of the wave-omer of barley making the beginning of the one, that of the two wave-loaves that of the other. ^{f1585} Here another historical notice comes to our aid. St. Luke describes the Sabbath of this occurrence as 'the second-first' — an expression so peculiar that it cannot be regarded as an interpolation, ^{f1586} but as designedly chosen by the Evangelist to indicate something well understood in Palestine at the time. Bearing in mind the limited number of Sabbaths between the commencement of the barley and the end of the wheat-harvest, our inquiry is here much narrowed. In Rabbinic writings the term 'second-first' is not applied to any Sabbath. But we know that the fifty days between the Feast of Passover and that of Pentecost were counted from the presentation of the wave-omer on the Second Paschal Day, at the first, second, third day, etc., after the 'Omer.' Thus the 'second-first' Sabbath might be either 'the first Sabbath after the second day,' which was

that of the presentation of the Omer, or else the second Sabbath after this first day of reckoning, or ‘Sephirah,’ as it was called ([rm\[h tryps\]](#)). To us the first of these dates seems most in accord with the manner in which St. Luke would describe to Gentile readers the Sabbath which was ‘the first after the second,’ or, Sephirah-day. ^{f1587}

Assuming, then, that it was probably the first — possibly, the second, Sabbath after the ‘reckoning,’ or second Paschal Day, on which the disciples plucked the ears of corn, we have still to ascertain whether it was in the first or second Passover of Christ’s Ministry. ^{f1588} The reasons against placing it between the first Passover and Pentecost are of the strongest character. Not to speak of the circumstance that such advanced teaching on the part of Christ, and such advanced knowledge on the part of His disciples, indicate a later period, our Lord did not call His twelve Apostles till long after the Feast of Pentecost, viz. after His return from the so-called ‘Unknown Feast,’ {St. ~~REB~~ John 5.} which, as shown in another place, ^{f1589} must have been either that of ‘Wood-Gathering,’ in the end of the summer, or else New Year’s Day, in the beginning of autumn. Thus, as by ‘the disciples’ we must in this connection understand, in the first place, ‘the Apostles,’ the event could not have occurred between the first Passover and Pentecost of the Lord’s Ministry.

The same result is reached by another process of reasoning. After the first Passover {St. ~~REB~~ John 2:13.} our Lord, with such of His disciples as had then gathered to Him, tarried for some time — no doubt for several weeks, — in Judaea. {St. ~~REB~~ John 3:22; 5:1-3.} The wheat was ripe for harvesting, when he passed through Samaria. {St. ~~REB~~ John 4:35.} And, on His return to Galilee, His disciples seem to have gone back to their homes and occupations, since it was some time afterwards when even His most intimate disciples — Peter, Andrew, James, and John — were called a second time. {St. ~~REB~~ Matthew 4:18-22.} Chronologically, therefore, there is no room for this event between the first Passover and Pentecost. ^{f1590}

Lastly, we have here to bear in mind, that, on His first appearance in Galilee, the Pharisees had not yet taken up this position of determined hostility to Him. On the other hand, all agrees with the circumstance, that the active hostility of the Pharisees and Christ’s separation from the ordinances of the Synagogue commenced with His visit to Jerusalem in the early autumn of that year. {St. ~~REB~~ John 14.} If, therefore, we have to place the plucking of the ears of corn after the Feast recorded in St. John 5, as can scarcely be doubted, it must have taken place, not between the first,

but between the Second Passover and Pentecost of Christ's Public Ministry.

Another point deserves notice. The different 'setting' (chronologically speaking) in which the three Gospels present the event about to be related, illustrates that the object of the Evangelists was to present the events in the History of the Christ in their succession, not of time, but of bearing upon final results. This, because they do not attempt a Biography of Jesus, which, from their point of view, would have been almost blasphemy, but a History of the Kingdom which He brought; and because they write it, so to speak, not by adjectives (expressive of qualities), nor adverbially, ^{f1591} but by substantives. Lastly, it will be noted that the three Evangelists relate the event about to be considered (as so many others), not, indeed, with variations, ^{f1592} but with differences of detail, showing the independence of their narratives, which, as we shall see, really supplement each other.

We are now in a position to examine the narrative itself. It was on the Sabbath after the Second Paschal Day that Christ and His disciples passed ^{f1593} — probably by a field-path, through cornfields, when His disciples, being hungry, {St. Matthew.} as they went, {St. Mark.} plucked ears of corn and ate them, having rubbed off the husks in their hands. {St. Luke.} On any ordinary day this would have been lawful, {~~425~~Deuteronomy 23:25.} but on the Sabbath it involved, according to Rabbinic statutes, at least two sins. For, according to the Talmud, what was really one labor, would, if made up of several acts, each of them forbidden, amount to several acts of labor, each involving sin, punishment, and a sin-offering. {Shabb. 70 a.} ^{f1594} This so-called 'division' of labor applied only to infringement of the Sabbath-rest — not of that of feast-days. {Macc. 21 b.} Now in this case there were at least two such acts involved: that of plucking the ears of corn, ranged under the sin of reaping, and that of rubbing them, which might be ranged under sifting in a sieve, threshing, sifting out fruit, grinding, or fanning. The following Talmudic passage bears on this: 'In case a woman rolls wheat to remove the husks, it is considered as sifting; if she rubs the heads of wheat, it is regarded as threshing; if she cleans off the side-adherences, it is sifting out fruit; if she bruises the ears, it is grinding; if she throws them up in her hand, it is winnowing.' {Jer. Shabb. p. 10 a, lines 28 to 26 from bottom.} One instance will suffice to show the externalism of all these ordinances. If a man wished to move a sheaf on his field, which of course implied labor, he had only to lay upon it a spoon that was in his common use, when, in order to remove the spoon, he might also

remove the sheaf on which it lay! {Shabb. 142 *b*, line 6 from bottom.} And yet it was forbidden to stop with a little wax the hole in a cask by which the fluid was running out, {Shabb. 146 *a*.} or to wipe a wound!

Holding views like these, the Pharisees, who witnessed the conduct of the disciples, would naturally harshly condemn, what they must have regarded as gross desecration of the Sabbath. Yet it was clearly not a breach of the Biblical, but of the Rabbinic Law. Not only to show them their error, but to lay down principles which would for ever apply to this difficult question, was the object of Christ's reply. Unlike the others of the Ten Commandments, the Sabbath Law has in it two elements; the moral and the ceremonial: the eternal, and that which is subject to time and place; the inward and spiritual, and the outward (the one as the mode of realizing the other). In their distinction and separation lies the difficulty of the subject. In its spiritual and eternal element, the Sabbath Law embodied the two thoughts of rest for worship, and worship which pointed to rest. The keeping of the seventh day, and the Jewish mode of its observance, were the temporal and outward form in which these eternal principles were presented. Even Rabbinism, in some measure, perceived this. It was a principle, that danger to life superseded the Sabbath Law, ^{f1595} and indeed all other obligations. ^{f1596} Among the curious Scriptural and other arguments by which this principle was supported, that which probably would most appeal to common sense was derived from ~~Leviticus~~ ^{Leviticus} 18:5. It was argued, that a man was to keep the commandments that he might live — certainly not, that by so doing he might die. {Jer. Shabb. 14:4, pp. 14 *d*, 15 *a*.} In other words, the outward mode of observation was subordinate to the object of the observance. Yet this other and kindred principle did Rabbinism lay down, that every positive commandment superseded the Sabbath-rest. This was the ultimate vindication of work in the Temple, although certainly not its explanation. Lastly, we should in this connection, include this important canon, laid down by the Rabbis: 'a single Rabbinic prohibition is not to be heeded, where a graver matter is in question.' {Jer. Shabb. 16:1.}

All these points must be kept in view for the proper understanding of the words of Christ to the Scribes. For, while going far beyond the times and notions of His questioners, His reasoning must have been within their comprehension. Hence the first argument of our Lord, as recorded by all the Synoptists, was taken from Biblical History. When, on his flight from Saul, David had, 'when an hungered,' eaten of the shewbread, and given it

to his followers, ^{f1597} although, by the letter of the Levitical Law, {^{<R345>} Leviticus 24:5-9.} it was only to be eaten by the priests, Jewish tradition vindicated his conduct on the plea that ‘danger to life superseded the Sabbath-Law, and hence, all laws connected with it, ^{f1598} while, to show David’s zeal for the Sabbath-Law, the legend was added, that he had reproved the priests of Nob, who had been baking the shewbread on the Sabbath. {Yalkut 2 par. 130, p. 18 *d.*} To the first argument of Christ, St. Matthew adds this as His second, that the priests, in their services in the Temple, necessarily broke the Sabbath-Law without thereby incurring guilt. It is curious, that the Talmud discusses this very point, and that, by way of illustration, it introduces an argument from ^{<R210>} Leviticus 22:10: ‘There shall no stranger eat of things consecrated.’ This, of course, embodies the principle underlying the prohibition of the shewbread to all who were not priests. {Jer. Shabb. 2:5, p. 5 *a.*} Without entering further on it, the discussion at least shows, that the Rabbis were by no means clear on the rationale of Sabbath-work in the Temple.

In truth, the reason why David was blameless in eating the shewbread was the same as that which made the Sabbath-labor of the priests lawful. The Sabbath-Law was not one merely of rest, but of rest for worship. The Service of the Lord was the object in view. The priests worked on the Sabbath, because this service was the object of the Sabbath; and David was allowed to eat of the shewbread, not because there was danger to life from starvation, but because he pleaded that he was on the service of the Lord and needed this provision. The disciples, when following the Lord, were similarly on the service of the Lord; ministering to Him was more than ministering in the Temple, for He was greater than the Temple. If the Pharisees had believed this, they would not have questioned their conduct, nor in so doing have themselves infringed that higher Law which enjoined mercy, not sacrifice.

To this St. Mark adds as corollary: ‘The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.’ It is remarkable, that a similar argument is used by the Rabbis. When insisting that the Sabbath Law should be set aside to avoid danger to life, it is urged: ‘the Sabbath is handed over to you; not, ye are handed over to the Sabbath.’ {Mechilt. on ^{<R313>} Exodus 31:13, ed. Weiss, p. 109 *b.*} Lastly, the three Evangelists record this as the final outcome of His teaching on this subject, that ‘the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath also.’ The Service of God, and the Service of the Temple, by universal consent superseded the Sabbath-Law. But Christ was greater than the

Temple, and His Service more truly that of God, and higher than that of the outward Temple — and the Sabbath was intended for man, to serve God: therefore Christ and His Service were superior to the Sabbath-Law. Thus much would be intelligible to these Pharisees, although they would not receive it, because they believed not on Him as the Sent of God. ^{f1599}

But to us the words mean more than this. They preach not only that the Service of Christ is that of God, but that, even more than in the Temple, all of work or of liberty is lawful which this service requires. We are free while we are doing anything for Christ; God loves mercy, and demands not sacrifice; His sacrifice is the service of Christ, in heart, and life, and work. We are not free to do anything we please; but we are free to do anything needful or helpful, while we are doing any service to Christ. He is the Lord of the Sabbath, Whom we serve in and through the Sabbath. And even this is significant, that, when designating Himself Lord of the Sabbath, it is as ‘the Son of Man.’ It shows, that the narrow Judaistic form regarding the day and the manner of observance is enlarged into the wider Law, which applies to all humanity. Under the New Testament the Sabbath has, as the Church, become *Catholic*, and its Lord is Christ as the Son of Man, to Whom the body Catholic offers the acceptable service of heart and life.

The question as between Christ and the Pharisees was not, however, to end here. ‘On another Sabbath’ — probably that following — He was in their Synagogue. Whether or not the Pharisees had brought ‘the man with the withered hand’ on purpose, or placed him in a conspicuous position, or otherwise raised the question, certain it is that their secret object was to commit Christ to some word or deed, which would lay Him open to the capital charge of breaking the Sabbath-law. It does not appear, whether the man with the withered hand was consciously or unconsciously their tool. But in this they judged rightly: that Christ would not witness disease without removing it — or, as we might express it, that disease *could* not continue in the Presence of Him, Who was the Life. He read their inward thoughts of evil, and yet he proceeded to do the good which He purposed. So God, in His majestic greatness, carries out the purpose which He has fixed — which we call the law of nature, whoever and whatever stand in the way; and so God, in His sovereign goodness, adapts it to the good of His creatures, notwithstanding their evil thoughts.

So much unclearness prevails as to the Jewish views about healing on the Sabbath, that some connected information on the subject seems needful.

We have already seen, that in their view only actual danger to life warranted a breach of the Sabbath-Law. But this opened a large field for discussion. Thus, according to some, disease of the ear, {Debar. R. 10.} according to some throat-disease, {Yoma 8:6.} while, according to others, such a disease as angina, {Yoma 84 *a.*} involved danger, and superseded the Sabbath-Law. All applications to the outside of the body were forbidden on the Sabbath. As regarded internal remedies, such substances as were used in health, but had also a remedial effect, might be taken {Shabb. 14:3.} although here also there was a way of evading the Law. ^{f1600} A person suffering from toothache might not gargle his mouth with vinegar, but he might use an ordinary toothbrush and dip it in vinegar. {u. s. 4.} The Gemara here adds, that gargling was lawful, if the substance was afterwards swallowed. It further explains, that affections extending from the lips, or else from the throat, inwards, may be attended to, being regarded as dangerous. Quite a number of these are enumerated, showing, that either the Rabbis were very lax in applying their canon about mortal diseases, or else that they reckoned in their number not a few which we would not regard as such. ^{f1601} External lesions also might be attended to, if they involved danger to life. ^{f1602} Similarly, medical aid might be called in, if a person had swallowed a piece of glass; a splinter might be removed from the eye, and even a thorn from the body. {Comp. Jer. Shabb. 14 *d.*}

But although the man with the withered hand could not be classed with those dangerously ill, it could not have been difficult to silence the Rabbis on their own admissions. Clearly, their principle implied, that it was lawful on the Sabbath to do that which would save life or prevent death. To have taught otherwise, would virtually have involved murder. But if so, did it not also, in strictly logical sequence, imply this far wider principle, that it must be lawful to do good on the Sabbath? For, evidently, the omission of such good would have involved the doing of evil. Could this be the proper observance of God's holy day? There was no answer to such an argument; St. Mark expressly records that they dared not attempt a reply. {St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 3:4.} On the other hand, St. Matthew, while alluding to this terribly telling challenge, {St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 12:12.} records yet another and a personal argument. It seems that Christ publicly appealed to them: If any poor man among them, who had one sheep, were in danger of losing it through having fallen into a pit, would he not lift it out? To be sure, the Rabbinic Law ordered that food and drink should be lowered to it, or else that some means should be furnished by which it might either be kept up in

the pit, or enabled to come out of it. {Shabb. 128 *b.*} But even the Talmud discusses cases in which it was lawful to lift an animal out of a pit on a Sabbath. {Shabb. 117 *b.*, about the middle.} There could be no doubt, at any rate, that even if the Law was, at the time of Christ, as stringent as in the Talmud, a man would have found some device, by which to recover the solitary sheep which constituted his possession. And was not the life of a human being to be more accounted of? Surely, then, on the Sabbath-day it was lawful to do good? Yes — to do good, and to neglect it, would have been to do evil. Nay, according to their own admission, should not a man, on the Sabbath, save life? or should he, by omitting it, kill?

We can now imagine the scene in that Synagogue. The place is crowded. Christ probably occupies a prominent position as leading the prayers or teaching: a position whence He can see, and be seen by all. Here, eagerly bending forward, are the dark faces of the Pharisees, expressive of curiosity, malice, cunning. They are looking round at a man whose right hand is withered, {St. ^{<0000>}Luke 6:6.} perhaps putting him forward, drawing attention to him, loudly whispering, ‘Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day?’ The Lord takes up the challenge. He bids the man stand forth — right in the midst of them, where they might all see and hear. By one of those telling appeals, which go straight to the conscience, He puts the analogous case of a poor man who was in danger of losing his only sheep on the Sabbath: would he not rescue it; and was not a man better than a sheep? Nay, did they not themselves enjoin a breach of the Sabbath-Law to save human life? Then, must He not do so; might He not do good rather than evil?

They were speechless. But a strange mixture of feeling was in the Savior’s heart — strange to us, though it is but what Holy Scripture always tells us of the manner in which God views sin and the sinner, using terms, which, in their combination, seem grandly incompatible: ‘And when He had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart. It was but for a moment, and then, with life-giving power, He bade the man stretch forth his hand. Withered it was no longer, when the Word had been spoken, and a new sap, a fresh life had streamed into it, as, following the Savior’s Eye and Word, he slowly stretched it forth. And as He stretched it forth, his hand was restored. ^{f1603} The Savior had broken their Sabbath-Law, and yet He had not broken it, for neither by remedy, nor touch, nor outward application had He healed him. He had broken the Sabbath-rest, as God breaks it, when He sends, or sustains, or restores life,

or does good: all unseen and unheard, without touch or outward application, by the Word of His Power, by the Presence of His Life.

But who after this will say, that it was Paul who first introduced into the Church either the idea that the Sabbath-Law in its Jewish form was no longer binding, or this, that the narrow forms of Judaism were burst by the new wine of that Kingdom, which is that of the Son of Man?

They had all seen it, this miracle of almost new creation. As He did it, He had been filled with sadness: as they saw it, ‘they were filled with madness.’ {St. ~~QRI~~ Luke 6:11.} So their hearts were hardened. They could not gainsay, but they went forth and took counsel with the Herodians against Him, how they might destroy Him. Presumably, then, He was within, or quite close by, the dominions of Herod, east of the Jordan. And the Lord withdrew once more, as it seems to us, into Gentile territory, probably that of the Decapolis. For, as He went about healing all, that needed it, in that great multitude that followed His steps, yet enjoining silence on them, this prophecy of Isaiah blazed into fulfillment: ‘Behold My Servant, Whom I have chosen, My Beloved, in Whom My soul is well-pleased: I will put My Spirit upon Him, and He shall declare judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive nor cry aloud, neither shall any hear His Voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall He not break, and smoking flax shall He not quench, till He send forth judgment unto victory. And in His Name shall the Gentiles trust.’

And in His Name shall the Gentiles trust. Far out into the silence of those solitary upland hills of the Gentile world did the call, unheard and unheeded in Israel, travel. He had other sheep which were not of that fold. And down those hills, from the far-off lands, does the sound of the bells, as it comes nearer and nearer, tell that those other sheep, which are not of this fold, are gathering at His call to the Good Shepherd; and through these centuries, still louder and more manifold becomes this sound of nearing bells, till they shall all be gathered into one: one flock, one fold, one Shepherd.

CHAPTER 36

THE FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND — TO DALMANUTHA — ‘THE SIGN FROM HEAVEN’ — JOURNEY TO CAESAREA PHILIPPI, — WHAT IS THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES?

(St. ~~4152~~ Matthew 15:32-16:12; St. ~~4080~~ Mark 8:1-21.)

THEY might well gather to Jesus in their thousands, with their wants of body and soul, these sheep wandering without a shepherd; for His Ministry in that district, as formerly in Galilee, was about to draw to a close. And here it is remarkable, that each time His prolonged stay and Ministry in a district were brought to a close with some supper, so to speak, some festive entertainment on his part. The Galilean Ministry had closed with the feeding of the five thousand, the guests being mostly from Capernaum and the towns around, as far as Bethsaida (Julias), many in the number probably on their way to the Paschal feast at Jerusalem. ^{f1604} But now at the second provision for the four thousand, with which His Decapolis Ministry closed, the guests were not strictly Jews, but semi-Gentile inhabitants of that district and its neighborhood. Lastly, his Judæan Ministry closed with the Last Supper. At the first ‘Supper,’ the Jewish guests would fain have proclaimed Him Messiah-King; at the second, as ‘the Son of Man,’ He gave food to those Gentile multitudes which having been with Him those days, and consumed all their victuals during their stay with him, He could not send away fasting, lest they should faint by the way. And on the last occasion, as the true Priest and Sacrifice, He fed His own with the true Paschal Feast, ere He sent them forth alone into the wilderness. Thus these three ‘Suppers’ seem connected, each leading up, as it were, to the other.

There can, at any rate, be little doubt that this second feeding of the multitude took place in the Gentile Decapolis, and that those who sat down to the meal were chiefly the inhabitants of that district. ^{f1605} If it be lawful, departing from strict history, to study the symbolism of this event, as compared with the previous feeding of the five thousand who were Jews, somewhat singular differences will present themselves to the mind. On the former occasion there were five thousand fed with five loaves, when twelve baskets of fragments were left. On the second occasion, four thousand

were fed from seven loaves, and seven baskets of fragments collected. It is at least curious, that the number *five* in the provision for the Jews is that of the Pentateuch, just as the number *twelve* corresponds to that of the tribes and of the Apostles. On the other hand, in the feeding of the Gentiles we mark the number *four*, which is the signature of the world, and seven, which is that of the Sanctuary. We would not by any means press it, as if these were, in the telling of the narrative, designed coincidences; but, just because they are undesigned, we value them, feeling that there is more of undesigned symbolism in all God's manifestations — in nature, in history, and in grace — than meets the eye of those who observe the merely phenomenal. Nay, does it not almost seem, as if all things were cast in the mold of heavenly realities, and all earth's 'shewbread' Bread of His Presence'?

On all general points the narratives of the two-fold miraculous feeding run so parallel, that it is not necessary again to consider this event in detail. But the attendant circumstances are so different, that only the most reckless negative criticism could insist, that one and the same event had been presented by the Evangelists as two separate occasions.^{f1606} The broad lines of difference as to the number of persons, the provision, and the quantity of fragments left, cannot be overlooked. Besides, on the former occasion the repast was provided in the evening for those who had gone after Christ, and listened to Him all day, but who, in their eager haste, had come without victuals, when He would not dismiss them faint and hungry, because they had been so busy for the Bread of Life that they had forgotten that of earth. But on this second occasion, of the feeding of the Gentiles, the multitude had been three days with Him, and what sustenance they had brought must have failed, when, in His compassion, the Savior would not send them to their homes fasting, lest they should faint by the way. This could not have befallen those Gentiles, who had come to the Christ for food to their souls. And, it must be kept in view, that Christ dismissed them, not, as before, because they would have made Him their King, but because Himself was about to depart from the place; and that, sending them to their homes, He could not send them to faint by the way. Yet another marked difference lies even in the designation of 'the baskets' in which the fragments left were gathered. At the first feeding, there were, as the Greek word shows, the small wicker baskets which each of the Twelve would carry in his hand. At the second feeding they were the large baskets, in which provisions, chiefly bread, were stored or carried for longer

voyages.^{f1607} For, on the first occasion, when they passed into Israelitish territory — and, as they might think, left their home for a very brief time — there was not the same need to make provision for storing necessities as on the second, when they were on a lengthened journey, and passing through, or tarrying in Gentile territory.

But the most noteworthy difference seems to us this — that on the first occasion, they who were fed were Jews — on the second, Gentiles. There is an exquisite little trait in the narrative which affords striking, though utterly undesigned, evidence of it. In referring to the blessing which Jesus spake over the *first* meal, it was noted,^{f1608} that, in strict accordance with Jewish custom, He only rendered thanks once, over the bread. But no such custom would rule His conduct when dispensing the food to the Gentiles; and, indeed, His speaking the blessing only over the bread, while He was silent when distributing the fishes, would probably have given rise to misunderstanding. Accordingly, we find it expressly stated that He not only gave thanks over the bread, but also spake the blessing over the fishes. {St. ~~4006~~ Mark 8:6, 7.} Nor should we, when marking such undesigned evidences, omit to notice, that on the first occasion, which was immediately before the Passover, the guests were, as three of the Evangelists expressly state, ranged on ‘the grass,’ {St. ~~4049~~ Matthew 14:19; St. ~~4059~~ Mark 6:39; St. ~~4060~~ John 6:10.} while, on the present occasion, which must have been several weeks later, when in the East the grass would be burnt up, we are told by the two Evangelists that they sat on ‘the ground.’

^{f1609} Even the difficulty, raised by some, as to the strange repetition of the disciples’ reply, the outcome, in part, of non-expectancy, and, hence, non-belief, and yet in part also of such doubt as tends towards faith: ‘Whence should we have, in a solitary place,^{f1610} so many loaves as to fill so great a multitude?’ seems to us only confirmatory of the narrative, so psychologically true is it. There is no need for the ingenious apology,^{f1611} that, in the remembrance and tradition of the first and second feeding, the similarity of the two events had led to greater similarity in their narration than the actual circumstances would perhaps have warranted. Interesting thoughts are here suggested by the remark,^{f1612} that it is not easy to transport ourselves into the position and feelings of those who had witnessed such a miracle as that of the first feeding of the multitude. ‘We think of the Power as inherent, and, therefore, permanent. To them it might seem intermittent — a gift that came and went.’ And this might seem borne out by the fact that, ever since, their wants had been supplied in the

ordinary way, and that, even on the first occasion, they had been directed to gather up the fragments of the heaven-supplied meal.

But more than this requires to be said. First, we must here once more remind ourselves, that the former provision was for Jews, and the disciples might, from their standpoint, well doubt, or at least not assume, that the same miracle would supply the need of the Gentiles, and the same board be surrounded by Jew and Gentile. But, further, the repetition of the same question by the disciples really indicated only a sense of their own inability, and not a doubt of the Savior's power of supply, since on this occasion it was not, as on the former, accompanied by a request on their part, to send the multitude away. Thus the very repetition of the question might be a humble reference to the past, of which they dared not, in the circumstances, ask the repetition.

Yet, even if it were otherwise, the strange forgetfulness of Christ's late miracle on the part of the disciples, and their strange repetition of the self-same question which had once — and, as it might seem to us, for ever, — been answered by wondrous deed, need not surprise us. To them the miraculous on the part of Christ must ever have been the new, or else it would have ceased to be the miraculous. Nor did they ever fully realize it, till after His Resurrection they understood, and worshipped Him as God Incarnate. And it is only realizing faith of this, which it was intended gradually to evolve during Christ's Ministry on earth, that enables us to apprehend the Divine Help as, so to speak, incarnate and ever actually present in Christ. And yet even thus, how often we do, who have so believed in Him, forget the Divine provision which has come to us so lately, and repeat, though perhaps not with the same doubt, yet with the same want of certainty, the questions with which we had at first met the Savior's challenge of our faith. And even at the last it is met, as by the prophet, in sight of the apparently impossible, by: 'Lord, Thou knowest.' {~~4518~~ Ezekiel 37:3.} More frequently, alas! is it met by nonbelief, misbelief, disbelief, or doubt, engendered by misunderstanding or forgetfulness of that which past experience, as well as the knowledge of Him, should long ago have indelibly written on our minds.

On the occasion referred to in the preceding narrative, those who had lately taken counsel together against Jesus — the Pharisees and the Herodians, or, to put it otherwise, the Pharisees and Sadducees — were not present. For, those who, politically speaking, were 'Herodians,' might also, though

perhaps not religiously speaking, yet from the Jewish standpoint of St. Matthew, be designated as, or else include, Sadducees.^{f1613} But they were soon to reappear on the scene, as Jesus came close to the Jewish territory of Herod. We suppose the feeding of the multitude to have taken place in the Decapolis, and probably on, or close to, the Eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee. As Jesus sent away the multitude whom He had fed, He took ship with His disciples, and ‘came into the borders of Magadan,’ {St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 15:39.}^{f1614} or, as St. Mark puts it, ‘the parts of Dalmanutha.’ ‘The borders of Magadan’ must evidently refer to the same district as ‘the parts of Dalmanutha.’ The one may mark the extreme point of the district southwards, the other northwards — or else, the points west^{f1615} and east — in the locality where He and His disciples landed. This is, of course, only a suggestion, since neither ‘Magadan,’ nor ‘Dalmanutha,’ has been identified. This only we infer, that the place was close to, yet not within the boundary of, strictly Jewish territory; since on His arrival there the Pharisees are said to ‘come forth’ {St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 8:11.} — a word ‘which implies, that they resided elsewhere,’^{f1616} though, of course, in the neighborhood. Accordingly, we would seek Magadan south of the Lake of Tiberias, and near to the borders of Galilee, but within the Decapolis. Several sites bear at present somewhat similar names. In regard to the strange and un-Jewish name of *Dalmanutha*, such utterly unlikely conjectures have been made, that one based on etymology may be hazarded. If we take from *Dalmanutha* the Aramaic termination *-utha*, and regard the initial *de* as a prefix, we have the word *Laman*, *Limin*, or *Liminah* םל םל חנמל = λιμήν, which, in Rabbinic Hebrew, means a *bay*, or *port*, and Dalmanutha might have been the place of a small bay. Possibly, it was the name given to the bay close to the ancient *Tarichoea*, the modern *Kerak*, so terribly famous for a sea-fight, or rather a horrible butchery of poor fugitives, when Tarichaea was taken by the Romans in the great Jewish war. Close by, the Lake forms a bay (*Laman*), and if, as a modern writer asserts,^{f1617} the fortress of Tarichaea was surrounded by a ditch fed by the Jordan and the Lake, so that the fortress could be converted into an island, we see additional reason for the designation of *Lamanutha*.^{f1618}

It was from the Jewish territory of Galilee, close by, that the Pharisees now came ‘with the Sadducees’ tempting Him with questions, and desiring that His claims should be put to the ultimate arbitrament of ‘a sign from heaven.’ We can quite understand such a challenge on the part of

Sadducees, who would disbelieve the heavenly Mission of Christ, or, indeed, to use a modern term, any supra-naturalistic connection between heaven and earth. But, in the mouth of the Pharisees also, it had a special meaning. Certain supposed miracles had been either witnessed by, or testified to them, as done by Christ. As they now represented it — since Christ laid claims which, in their view, were inconsistent with the doctrine received in Israel, preached a Kingdom quite other than that of Jewish expectancy — was at issue with all Jewish customs, more than this, was a breaker of the Law, in its most important commandments, as they understood them — it followed that, according to Deuteronomy 13, He was a false prophet, who was not to be listened to. Then, also, must the miracles which He did have been wrought by the power of Beelzebul, ‘the lord of idolatrous worship,’ the very prince of devils. But had there been real signs, and might it not all have been an illusion? Let Him show them ‘a sign,’ ^{f1619} and let that sign come direct from heaven!

Two striking instances from Rabbinic literature will show, that this demand of the Pharisees was in accordance with their notions and practice. We read that, when a certain Rabbi was asked by his disciples about the time of Messiah’s Coming, he replied: ‘I am afraid that you will also ask me for a sign.’ When they promised they would not do so, he told them that the gate of Rome would fall and be rebuilt, and fall again, when there would not be time to restore it, ere the Son of David came. On this they pressed him, despite his remonstrance, for ‘a sign,’ when this was given them — that the waters which issued from the cave of Parnas were turned into blood. {Sanh. 98 *a* last 4 lines.} ^{f1620} Again, as regards ‘a sign from heaven,’ it is said that Rabbi Eliezer, when his teaching was challenged, successively appealed to certain ‘signs.’ First, a locust-tree moved at his bidding one hundred, or, according to some, four hundred cubits. Next, the channels of water were made to flow backwards; then the walls of the Academy leaned forward, and were only arrested at the bidding of another Rabbi. Lastly, Eliezer exclaimed: ‘If the Law is as I teach, let it be proved from heaven!’ when a voice fell from the sky (the *Bath Qol*): ‘What have ye to do with Rabbi Eliezer, for the Halakhah is as he teaches?’ {Baba Mez. 59 *b*, line 4 from top, etc.}

It was, therefore, no strange thing, when the Pharisees asked of Jesus ‘a sign from heaven,’ to attest His claims and teaching. The answer which He gave was among the most solemn which the leaders of Israel could have heard, and He spake it in deep sorrow of spirit. {St. ^{<1082>}Mark 8:12.} They

had asked Him virtually for some sign of His Messiahship; some striking vindication from heaven of His claims. It would be given them only too soon. We have already seen, ^{f1621} that there was a Coming of Christ in His Kingdom — a vindication of His kingly claim before His apostate rebellious subjects, when they who would not have Him to reign over them, but betrayed and crucified Him, would have their commonwealth and city, their polity and Temple, destroyed. By the lurid light of the flames of Jerusalem and the Sanctuary were the words on the cross to be read again. God would vindicate His claims by laying low the pride of their rebellion. The burning of Jerusalem was God's answer to the Jews' cry, 'Away with Him — we have no king but Caesar;' the thousands of crosses on which the Romans hanged their captives, the terrible counterpart of the Cross on Golgotha.

It was to this, that Jesus referred in His reply to the Pharisees and 'Sadducean' Herodians. How strange! Men could discern by the appearance of the sky whether the day would be fair or stormy. ^{f1622} And yet, when all the signs of the gathering storm, that would destroy their city and people, were clearly visible, they, the leaders of the people, failed to perceive them! Israel asked for 'a sign'! No sign should be given the doomed land and city other than that which had been given to Nineveh: 'the sign of Jonah.' ^{f1623} The only sign to Nineveh was Jonah's solemn warning of near judgment, and his call to repentance — and the only sign now, or rather 'unto this generation no sign,' {St. ~~1082~~ Mark 8:12.} was the warning cry of judgment and the loving call to repentance. {St. ~~1084~~ Luke 19:41-44.}

It was but a natural, almost necessary, sequence, that 'He left them and departed.' Once more the ship, which bore Him and His disciples, spread its sails towards the coast of Bethsaida-Julias. He was on His way to the utmost limit of the land, to Caesarea Philippi, in pursuit of His purpose to delay the final conflict. For the great crisis must begin, as it would end, in Jerusalem, and at the Feast; it would begin at the Feast of Tabernacles, {St. John 7} and it would end at the following Passover. But by the way, the disciples themselves showed how little even they, who had so long and closely followed Christ, understood His teaching, and how prone to misapprehension their spiritual dullness rendered them. Yet it was not so gross and altogether incomprehensible, as the common reading of what happened would imply.

When the Lord touched the other shore, His mind and heart were still full of the scene from which He had lately passed. For truly, on this demand for a sign did the future of Israel seem to hang. Perhaps it is not presumptuous to suppose, that the journey across the Lake had been made in silence on His part, so deeply were mind and heart engrossed with the fate of His own royal city. And now, when they landed, they carried ashore the empty provision-baskets; for, as, with his usual attention to details, St. Mark notes, they had only brought one loaf of bread with them. In fact, in the excitement and hurry ‘they forgot to take bread’ with them. Whether or not something connected with this arrested the attention of Christ, He at last broke the silence, speaking that which was so much on His mind. He warned them, as greatly they needed it, of the leaven with which Pharisees and Sadducees had, each in their own manner, leavened, and so corrupted, ^{f1624} the holy bread of Scripture truth. The disciples, aware that in their hurry and excitement they had forgotten bread, misunderstood these words of Christ, although not in the utterly unaccountable manner which commentators generally suppose: as implying ‘a caution against procuring bread from His enemies.’ It is well-nigh impossible, that the disciples could have understood the warning of Christ as meaning any such thing — even irrespective of the consideration, that a prohibition to buy bread from either the Pharisees or Sadducees would have involved an impossibility. The misunderstanding of the disciples was, if unwarrantable, at least rational. They thought the words of Christ implied, that in His view they had not *forgotten* to bring bread, but purposely omitted to do so, in order, like the Pharisees and Sadducees, to ‘seek of Him a sign’ of His Divine Messiahship, nay — to oblige Him to show such — that of miraculous provision in their want. The mere suspicion showed what was in their minds, and pointed to their danger. This explains how, in His reply, Jesus reproved them, not for utter want of discernment, but only for ‘little faith.’ It was their lack of faith — the very leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees — which had suggested such a thought. Again, if the experience of the past — their own twice-repeated question, and the practical answer which it had received in the miraculous provision of not only enough, but to spare — had taught them anything, it should have been to believe, that the needful provision of their wants by Christ was not ‘a sign,’ such as the Pharisees had asked, but what faith might ever expect from Christ, when following after, or waiting upon, Him. Then understood they truly, that it was not of the leaven of bread that He had bidden them beware — that His mysterious words bore no reference to bread, nor to their supposed

omission to bring it for the purpose of eliciting a sign from Him, but pointed to the far more real danger of 'the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees,' which had underlain the demand for a sign from heaven.

Here, as always, Christ rather suggests than gives the interpretation of His meaning. And this is the law of His teaching. Our modern Pharisees and Sadducees, also, too often ask of him a sign from heaven in evidence of His claims. And we also too often misunderstand His warning to us concerning their leaven. Seeing the scanty store in our basket, our little faith is busy with thoughts about possible signs in multiplying the one loaf which we have, forgetful that, where Christ is, faith may ever expect all that is needful, and that our care should only be in regard to the teaching which might leaven and corrupt that on which our souls are fed.

CHAPTER 37

THE GREAT CONFESSION — THE GREAT COMMISSION — THE GREAT INSTRUCTION — THE GREAT TEMPTATION — THE GREAT DECISION.

(St. ~~4163~~ Matthew 16:13-28; St. ~~4187~~ Mark 8:27, 9:1; St. ~~4198~~ Luke 9:18-27.)

IF we are right in identifying the little bay — Dalmanutha — with the neighborhood of Tarichaea, yet another link of strange coincidence connects the prophetic warning spoken there with its fulfillment. From Dalmanutha our Lord passed across the Lake to Caesarea Philippi. From Caesarea Philippi did Vespasian pass through Tiberias to Tarichaea, when the town and people were destroyed, and the blood of the fugitives reddened the Lake, and their bodies choked its waters. Even amidst the horrors of the last Jewish war, few spectacles could have been so sickening as that of the wild stand at Tarichaea, ending with the butchery of 6,500 on land and sea, and lastly, the vile treachery by which they, to whom mercy had been promised, were lured into the circus at Tiberias, when the weak and old, to the number of about 1,200, were slaughtered, and the rest — upwards of 30,400 — sold into slavery. {*Jos. Jew. War* 3:10.} ^{f1625} Well might He, Who foresaw and foretold that terrible end, standing on that spot, deeply sigh in spirit as He spake to them who asked ‘a sign,’ and yet saw not what even ordinary discernment might have perceived of the red and lowering sky overhead.

From Dalmanutha, across the Lake, then by the plain where so lately the five thousand had been fed, and near to Bethsaida, would the road of Christ and His disciples lead to the capital of the Tetrarch Philip, the ancient Paneas, or, as it was then called, Caesarea Philippi, the modern Banias. Two days’ journey would accomplish the whole distance. There would be no need of taking the route now usually followed, by Safed. Straight northwards from the Lake of Galilee, a distance of about ten miles, leads the road to the uppermost Jordan-Lake, that now called *Huleh*, the ancient Merom. ^{f1626} As we ascend from the shores of Gennesaret, we have a receding view of the whole Lake and the Jordan-valley beyond. Before us rise hills; over them, to the west, are the heights of Safed; beyond them swells the undulating plain between the two ranges of Anti-

Libanus; far off is Hermon, with its twin snow-clad heads ('the Hermons'), {~~<9136>~~ Psalm 13:6.} and, in the dim far background, majestic Lebanon. It is scarcely likely, that Jesus and His disciples skirted the almost impenetrable marsh and jungle by Lake Merom. It was there, that Joshua had fought the last and decisive battle against Jabin and his confederates, by which Northern Palestine was gained to Israel. {~~<610>~~ Joshua 11:1-5.} We turn north of the Lake, and west to Kedes, the Kedesh Naphtali of the Bible, the home of Barak. We have now passed from the limestone of Central Palestine into the dark basalt formation. How splendidly that ancient Priest-City of Refuge lay! In the rich heritage of Naphtali, {~~<6533>~~ Deuteronomy 33:23.} Kedesh was one of the fairest spots. As we climb the steep hill above the marshes of Merom, we have before us one of the richest plains of about two thousand acres. We next pass through olive-groves and up a gentle slope. On a knoll before us, at the foot of which gushes a copious spring, lies the ancient Kedesh.

The scenery is very similar, as we travel on towards Caesarea Philippi. About an hour and a half farther, we strike the ancient Roman road. We are now amidst vines and mulberry-trees. Passing through a narrow rich valley, we ascend through a rocky wilderness of hills, where the woodbine luxuriantly trails around the plane trees. On the height there is a glorious view back to Lake Merom and the Jordan-valley; forward, to the snowy peaks of Hermon; east, to height on height, and west, to peaks now only crowned with ruins. We still continued along the height, then descended a steep slope, leaving, on our left, the ancient Abel Beth Maachah, {~~<1014>~~ 2 Samuel 20:14.} the modern *Abil*. Another hour, and we are in a plain where all the springs of the Jordan unite. The view from here is splendid, and the soil most rich, the wheat crops being quite ripe in the beginning of May. Half an hour more, and we cross a bridge over the bright blue waters of the Jordan, or rather of the Hasbany, which, under a very wilderness of oleanders, honeysuckle, clematis, and wild rose, rush among huge boulders, between walls of basalt. We leave aside, at a distance of about half an hour to the east, the ancient Dan (the modern Tell-Kady), even more glorious in its beauty and richness than what we have passed. Dan lies on a hill above the plain. On the western side of it, under overhanging thickets of oleander and other trees, and amidst masses of basalt boulders, rise what are called 'the lower springs' of Jordan, issuing as a stream from a basin sixty paces wide, and from a smaller source close by. The 'lower

springs' supply the largest proportion of what forms the Jordan. And from Dan olive groves and oak-glades slope up to Banias, or Caesarea Philippi.

The situation of the ancient Caesarea Philippi (1,147 feet above the sea) is, indeed, magnificent. Nestling amid three valleys on a terrace in the angle of Hermon, it is almost shut out from view by cliffs and woods. 'Everywhere there is a wild medley of cascades, mulberry trees, fig-trees, dashing torrents, festoons of vines, bubbling fountains, reeds, and ruins, and the mingled music of birds and waters.'^{f1627} The vegetation and fertility all around are extraordinary. The modern village of Banias is within the walls of the old fortifications, and the ruins show that it must anciently have extended far southwards. But the most remarkable points remain to be described. The western side of a steep mountain, crowned by the ruins of an ancient castle, forms an abrupt rock-wall. Here, from out an immense cavern, bursts a river. These are 'the upper sources' of the Jordan. This cave, an ancient heathen sanctuary of Pan, gave its earliest name of Paneas to the town. Here Herod, when receiving the tetrarchy from Augustus, built a temple in his honor. On the rocky wall close by, votive niches may still be traced, one of them bearing the Greek inscription, 'Priest of Pan.' When Herod's son, Philip, received the tetrarchy, he enlarged and greatly beautified the ancient Paneas, and called it in honor of the Emperor, Caesarea Philippi. The castle-mount (about 1,000 feet above Paneas), takes nearly an hour to ascend, and is separated by a deep valley from the flank of Mount Hermon. The castle itself (about two miles from Banias) is one of the best preserved ruins, its immense beveled structure resembling the ancient forts of Jerusalem, and showing its age. It followed the irregularities of the mountain, and was about 1,000 feet long by 200 wide. The eastern and higher part formed, as in Machaerus, a citadel within the castle. In some parts the rock rises higher than the walls. The views, sheer down the precipitous sides of the mountain, into the valleys and far away, are magnificent.

It seems worth while, even at such length, to describe the scenery along this journey, and the look and situation of Caesarea, when we recall the importance of the events enacted there, or in the immediate neighborhood. It was into this chiefly Gentile district, that the Lord now withdrew with His disciples after that last and decisive question of the Pharisees. It was here that, as His question, like Moses' rod, struck their hearts, there leaped from the lips of Peter the living, life-spreading waters of his confession. It may have been, that this rock-wall below the castle, from under which

sprang Jordan, or the rock on which the castle stood, supplied the material suggestion for Christ's words: 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build My Church.' ^{f1628} In Caesarea, or its immediate neighborhood, ^{f1629} did the Lord spend, with His disciples, six days after this confession; and here, close by, on one of the heights of snowy Hermon, was the scene of the Transfiguration, the light of which shone for ever into the hearts of the disciples on their dark and tangled path; {~~6019~~ 2 Peter 1:19.} nay, far beyond that — beyond life and death, — beyond the grave and the judgment, to the perfect brightness of the Resurrection-day.

As we think of it, there seems nothing strange in it, but all most wise and most gracious, that such events should have taken place far away from Galilee and Israel, in the lonely grandeur of the shadows of Hermon, and even amongst a chiefly Gentile population. Not in Judaea, nor even in Galilee — but far away from the Temple, the Synagogue, the Priests, Pharisees and Scribes, was the first confession of the Church made, and on this confession its first foundations laid. Even this spoke of near judgment and doom to what had once been God's chosen congregation. And all that happened, though Divinely shaped as regards the end, followed in a natural and orderly succession of events. Let us briefly recall the circumstances, which in the previous chapters have been described in detail.

It had been needful to leave Capernaum. The Galilean Ministry of the Christ was ended, and, alike the active persecutions of the Pharisees from Jerusalem, the inquiries of Herod, whose hands, stained with the blood of the Baptist, were tremblingly searching for his greater Successor, and the growing indecision and unfitness of the people — as well as the state of the disciples — pointed to the need for leaving Galilee. Then followed 'the Last Supper' to Israel on the eastern shore of Lake Gennesaret, when they would have made Him a King. He must now withdraw quite away, out of the boundaries of Israel. Then came that miraculous night-journey, the brief Sabbath-stay at Capernaum by the way, the journey through Tyrian and Sidonian territory, and round to the Decapolis, the teaching and healing there, the gathering of the multitude to Him, together with that 'Supper,' which closed His Ministry there — and, finally, the withdrawal to Tarichaea, where His Apostles, as fishermen of the Lake, may have had business-connections, since the place was the great central depot for selling and preparing the fish for export.

In that distant and obscure corner, on the boundary-line between Jew and Gentile, had that greatest crisis in the history of the world occurred, which sealed the doom of Israel, and in their place substituted the Gentiles as citizens of the Kingdom. And, in this respect also, it is most significant, that the confession of the Church likewise took place in territory chiefly inhabited by Gentiles, and the Transfiguration on Mount Hermon. That crisis had been the public challenge of the Pharisees and Sadducees, that Jesus should legitimate His claims to the Messiahship by a sign from heaven. It is not too much to assert, that neither His questioners, nor even His disciples, understood the answer of Jesus, nor yet perceived the meaning of His 'sign.' To the Pharisees Jesus would seem to have been defeated, and to stand self-convicted of having made Divine claims which, when challenged, He could not substantiate. He had hitherto elected (as they, who understood not His teaching, would judge) to prove Himself the Messiah by the miracles which He had wrought — and now, when met on His own ground, He had publicly declined, or at least evaded, the challenge. He had conspicuously — almost self-confessedly — failed! At least, so it would appear to those who could not understand His reply and 'sigh.' We note that a similar final challenge was addressed to Jesus by the High-Priest, when he adjured Him to say, whether He was what He claimed. His answer then was an assertion — not a proof; and, unsupported as it seemed, His questioners would only regard it as blasphemy.

But what of the disciples, who (as we have seen) would probably understand 'the sign' of Christ little better than the Pharisees? That what might seem Christ's failure, in not daring to meet the challenge of His questioners, must have left some impression on them, is not only natural, but appears even from Christ's warning of the leaven — that is, of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Indeed, that this unmet challenge and virtual defeat of Jesus *did* make lasting and deepest impression in His disfavor, is evident from the later challenge of His own relatives to go and meet the Pharisees at headquarters in Judaea, and to show openly, if He could, by His works, that He was the Messiah. {St. ~~ROM~~ John 7:1-5.} All the more remarkable appears Christ's dealing with His disciples, His demand on, and training of their faith. It must be remembered, that His last 'hard' sayings at Capernaum had led to the defection of many, who till then had been His disciples. {St. ~~ROM~~ John 6:60-66; comp. St. ~~DIS2~~ Matthew 15:12.} Undoubtedly this had already tried their faith, as appears from the question

of Christ: 'Will ye also go away? {St. ~~4167~~ John 6:67.} It was this wise and gracious dealing with them — this putting the one disappointment of doubt, engendered by what they could not understand, against their whole past experience in following Him, which enabled them to overcome. And it is this which also enables us to answer the doubt, perhaps engendered by inability to understand seemingly unintelligible, hard sayings of Christ, such as that to the disciples about giving them His Flesh to eat, or about His being the Living Bread from heaven. And, this alternative being put to them: would they, could they, after their experience of Him, go away from Him, they overcame, as we overcome, through what almost sounds like a cry of despair, yet is a shout of victory: 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.'

And all that followed only renewed and deepened the trial of faith, which had commenced at Capernaum. We shall, perhaps, best understand it when following the progress of this trial in him who, at last, made shipwreck of his faith: Judas Iscariot. Without attempting to gaze into the mysterious abyss of the Satanic element in his apostasy, we may trace his course in its psychological development. We must not regard Judas as a monster, but as one with passions like ourselves. True, there was one terrible master-passion in his soul — covetousness; but that was only the downward, lower aspect of what seems, and to many really is, that which leads to the higher and better — ambition. It had been thoughts of Israel's King which had first set his imagination on fire, and brought him to follow the Messiah. Gradually, increasingly, came the disenchantment. It was quite another Kingdom, that of Christ; quite another Kingship than what had set Judas aglow. This feeling was deepened as events proceeded. His confidence must have been terribly shaken when the Baptist was beheaded. What a contrast to the time when his voice had bent the thousands of Israel, as trees in the wind! So this had been nothing — and the Baptist must be written off, not as for, but as really against, Christ. Then came the next disappointment, when Jesus would not be made King. Why not, if He were King? And so on, step by step, till the final depth was reached, when Jesus would not, or could not — which was it? — meet the public challenge of the Pharisees. We take it, that it was then that the leaven pervaded and leavened Judas in heart and soul.

We repeat it, that what so, and permanently, penetrated Judas, could not (as Christ's warning shows) have left the others wholly unaffected. The very presence of Judas with them must have had its influence. And how did

Christ deal with it? There was, first, the silent sail across the Lake, and then the warning which put them on their guard, lest the little leaven should corrupt the bread of the Sanctuary, on which they had learned to live. The littleness of their faith must be corrected; it must grow and become strong. And so we can understand what follows. It was after solitary prayer — no doubt for them {St. ~~1918~~ Luke 9:18.} — that, with reference to the challenge of the Pharisees, ‘the leaven’ that threatened them, He now gathered up all their experience of the past by putting to them the question, what men, the people who had watched His Works and heard His Words, regarded Him as being. Even on them some conviction had been wrought by their observance of Him. It marked Him out (as the disciples said) as different from all around, nay from all ordinary men: like the Baptist, or Elijah, or as if He were one of the old prophets alive again. But, if even the multitude had gathered such knowledge of Him, what was their experience, who had always been with Him? Answered he, who most truly represented the Church, because he combined with the most advanced experience of the three most intimate disciples the utmost boldness of confession: ‘Thou art the Christ!’

And so in part was this ‘leaven’ of the Pharisees purged! Yet not wholly. For then it was, that Christ spake to them of His sufferings and death, and that the resistance of Peter showed how deeply that leaven had penetrated. And then followed the grand contrast presented by Christ, between minding the things of men and those of God, with the warning which it implied. and the monition as to the necessity of bearing the cross of contempt, and the absolute call to do so, as addressed to those who would be His disciples. Here, then, the contest about ‘the sign,’ or rather the challenge about the Messiahship, was carried from the mental into the moral sphere, and so decided. Six days more of quiet waiting and growth of faith, and it was met, rewarded, crowned, and perfected by the sight on the Mount of Transfiguration; yet, even so, perceived only as through the heaviness of sleep.

Thus far for the general arrangement of these events. We shall now be prepared better to understand the details. It was certainly not for personal reasons, but to call attention to the impression made even on the popular mind, to correct its defects, and to raise the minds of the Apostles to far higher thoughts, that He asked them about the opinions of men concerning Himself. Their difference proved not only their incompetence to form a right view, but also how many-sided Christ’s teaching must have been. We

are probably correct in supposing, that popular opinion did not point to Christ as literally the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the other prophets who had long been dead. For, although the literal reappearance of Elijah, and probably also of Jeremiah, ^{f1630} was expected, the Pharisees did not teach, nor the Jews believe in, a transmigration of souls. Besides, no one looked for the return of any of the other old prophets, nor could any one have seriously imagined, that Jesus was, literally, John the Baptist, since all knew them to have been contemporaries. ^{f1631} Rather would it mean, that some saw in Him the continuation of the work of John, as heralding and preparing the way of the Messiah, or, if they did not believe in John, of that of Elijah; while to others He seemed a second Jeremiah, denouncing woe on Israel, ^{f1632} and calling to tardy repentance; or else one of those old prophets, who had spoken either of the near judgment or of the coming glory. But, however men differed on these points, in this all agreed, that they regarded Him not as an ordinary man or teacher, but His Mission as straight from heaven; and, alas, in this also, that they did *not* view Him as the Messiah. Thus far, then, there was already retrogression in popular opinion, and thus far had the Pharisees already succeeded.

There is a significant emphasis in the words, with which Jesus turned from the opinion of ‘the multitudes’ to elicit the faith of the disciples: ‘But you, whom do *you* say that I am?’ It is the more marked, as the former question was equally emphasized by the use of the article (in the original): ‘Who do the men say that I am?’ {St. ~~<187>~~Mark 8:27, 29.} In that moment it leaped, by the power of God, to the lips of Peter: ‘Thou art the Christ (the Messiah), the Son of the Living God.’ {St. ~~<166>~~Matthew 16:16.} St. Chrysostom has beautifully designated Peter as ‘the mouth of the Apostles’ — and we recall, in this connection, the words of St. Paul as casting light on the representative character of Peter’s confession as that of the Church, and hence on the meaning of Christ’s reply, and its equally representative application: ‘With the mouth confession is made unto salvation.’ {~~<500>~~Romans 10:10.} The words of the confession are given somewhat differently by the three Evangelists. From our standpoint, the briefest form (that of St. Mark): ‘Thou art the Christ,’ means quite as much as the fullest (that of St. Matthew): ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.’ We can thus understand, how the latter might be truthfully adopted, and, indeed, would be the most truthful, accurate, and suitable in a Gospel primarily written for the Jews. And here we notice, that the most exact

form of the words seems that in the Gospel of St. Luke: 'The Christ of God.'

In saying this, so far from weakening, we strengthen the import of this glorious confession. For first, we must keep in view, that the confession: 'Thou art the Messiah' is also that: 'Thou art the Son of the Living God.' If, according to the Gospels, we believe that Jesus was the true Messiah, promised to the fathers — 'the Messiah of God' — we cannot but believe that He is 'the Son of the Living God.' Scripture and reason equally point to this conclusion from the premises. But, further, we must view such a confession, even though made in the power of God, in its historical connection. The words must have been such as Peter could have uttered, and the disciples acquiesced in, at the time. Moreover, they should mark a distinct connection with, and yet progress upon, the past. All these conditions are fulfilled by the view here taken. The *full* knowledge, in the sense of really understanding, that He was the Son of the Living God, came to the disciples only after the Resurrection. {Comp. ~~ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲁ~~ Romans 1:4.} Previously to the confession of Peter, the ship's company, that had witnessed His walking on the water, had owned: 'Of a truth Thou art the Son of God,' {St. ~~ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲩⲁ~~ Matthew 14:33.} but not in the sense in which a well-informed, believing Jew would hail Him as the Messiah, and 'the Son of the Living God,' designating both His Office and His Nature, and these two in their combination. Again, Peter himself had made a confession of Christ, when, after his discourse at Capernaum, so many of His disciples had forsaken Him. It had been: 'We have believed, and know that Thou art the Holy One of God.' {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ~~ John 6:69.} ^{f1633} The mere mention of these words shows both their internal connection with those of his last and crowning confession: 'Thou art the Christ of God,' and the immense progress made.

The more closely we view it, the loftier appears the height of this confession. We think of it as an advance on Peter's past; we think of it in its remembered contrast to the late challenge of the Pharisees, and as so soon following on the felt danger of their leaven. And we think of it, also, in its almost immeasurable distance from the appreciative opinion of the better disposed among the people. In the words of this confession Peter has consciously reached the firm ground of Messianic acknowledgment. All else is implied in this, and would follow from it. It is the first real confession of the Church. We can understand, how it followed after solitary prayer by Christ {St. ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ~~ Luke 9:18.}, we can scarcely doubt, for

that very revelation by the Father, which He afterwards joyously recognized in the words of Peter.

The reply of the Savior is only recorded by St. Matthew. Its omission by St. Mark might be explained on the ground that St. Peter himself had furnished the information. But its absence there and in the Gospel of St. Luke ^{f1634} proves (as *Beza* remarks), that it could never have been intended as the foundation of so important a doctrine as that of the permanent supremacy of St. Peter. But even if it were such, it would not follow that this supremacy devolved on the successors of St. Peter, nor yet that the Pope of Rome is the successor of St. Peter; nor is there even solid evidence that St. Peter ever was Bishop of Rome. The dogmatic inferences from a certain interpretation of the words of Christ to Peter being therefore utterly untenable, we can, with less fear of bias, examine their meaning. The whole form here is Hebraistic. The ‘blessed art thou’ is Jewish in spirit and form; the address, ‘Simon bar Jona,’ proves that the Lord spake in Aramaic. Indeed, a Jewish Messiah responding, in the hour of his Messianic acknowledgment, in Greek to His Jewish confessor, seems utterly incongruous. Lastly, the expression ‘flesh and blood,’ as contrasted with God, occurs not only in that Apocryphon of strictly Jewish authorship, the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, {*Ecclus*, 14:18; 17:31.} and in the letters of St. Paul, {~~<6576>~~ 1 Corinthians 15:60; ~~<8116>~~ Galatians 1:16; ~~<8162>~~ Ephesians 6:12.} but in almost innumerable passages in Jewish writings, as denoting man in opposition to God; while the revelation of such a truth by ‘the Father Which is in Heaven,’ represents not only both Old and New Testament Teaching, but is clothed in language familiar to Jewish ears (*μῡimVKv, Wnyka*).

Not less Jewish in form are the succeeding words of Christ, ‘Thou art Peter (*Petros*), and upon this rock (*Petra*) will I build my Church.’ We notice in the original the change from the masculine gender, ‘Peter’ (*Petros*), to the feminine, ‘Petra’ (‘Rock’), which seems the more significant, that *Petros* is used in Greek for ‘stone,’ and also sometimes for ‘rock,’ while *Petra* always means a ‘rock.’ The change of gender must therefore have a definite object which will presently be more fully explained. Meantime we recall that, when Peter first came to Christ, the Lord had said unto him: ‘Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, Peter [*Petros*, a stone, or else, a rock]’ {St. ~~<8116>~~ John 1:42.} — the Aramaic word *Kepha* (*apjKehpjkeor*) meaning, like Peter, both

‘stone’ and ‘rock.’” But both the Greek Petros and Petra have (as already stated) passed into Rabbinic language. Thus, the name *Peter*, or rather *Petros*, is Jewish, and occurs, for example, as that of the father of a certain Rabbi (*Jose bar Petros*). {Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 158 *a*, line 8 from bottom.} When the Lord, therefore, prophetically gave the name Cephas, it may have been that by that term He gave only a prophetic interpretation to what had been his previous name Peter **ṣrḥyyp**. This seems the more likely, since, as we have previously seen, it was the practice in Galilee to have two names, ^{f1635} especially when the strictly Jewish name, such as Simon, had no equivalent among the Gentiles. ^{f1636} Again, the Greek word Petra, Rock — (‘on this *Petra* [rock] will I build my Church’) was used in the same sense in Rabbinic language. It occurs twice in a passage, which so fully illustrates the Jewish use, not only of the word, but of the whole figure, that it deserves a place here. According to Jewish ideas, the world would not have been created, unless it had rested, as it were, on some solid foundation of piety and acceptance of God’s Law — in other words, it required a moral, before it could receive a physical foundation. Rabbinism here contrasts the Gentile world with Israel. It is, so runs the comment, as if a king were going to build a city. One and another site is tried for a foundation, but in digging they always come upon water. At last they come upon a *Rock* (*Petra*, **arḥp**). So, when God was about to build his world, He could not rear it on the generation of Enos nor on that of the flood, who brought destruction on the world; but ‘when He beheld that Abraham would arise in the future, He said: Behold I have found a Rock (*Petra*, **arḥp**) to build on it, and to found the world,’ whence also Abraham is called a Rock (*Tsur*, **rwḥ**) as it is said: {^{2510b} Isaiah 51:1.} ‘Look unto the Rock whence ye are hewn.’ ^{f1637} {Yalkut on ^{429b} Numbers 23:9, vol. 1 p.243, *b*, last 6 lines, and *c*, first 3 lines.} The parallel between Abraham and Peter might be carried even further. If, from a misunderstanding of the Lord’s promise to Peter, later Christian legend represented the Apostle as sitting at the gate of heaven, Jewish legend represents Abraham as sitting at the gate of Gehenna, so as to prevent all who had the seal of circumcision from falling into its abyss. {Erub. 19 *a* Ber. R. 48.} ^{f1638} To complete this sketch, in the curious Jewish legend about the Apostle Peter, which is outlined in an Appendix to this volume, ^{f1639} Peter is always designated as *Simon Kepha* (spelt **apyq**), there being, however, some reminiscence of the meaning attached to his name in the statement made, that, after his death, they built a church and tower, and called it *Peter ṣrḥyyp* ‘which is the

name for stone, because he sat there upon a stone till his death (‘kah I [μς κςγς.) ^{f1640}

But to return. Believing, that Jesus spoke to Peter in the Aramaic, we can now understand how the words *Petros* and *Petra* would be purposely used by Christ to mark the difference, which their choice would suggest. Perhaps it might be expressed in this somewhat clumsy paraphrase: ‘Thou art Peter (Petros — a Stone or Rock, and upon this Petra, the Rock, the Petrine — will I found My Church.’ If, therefore, we would not certainly apply them to the words of Peter’s confession, we would certainly apply them to that which was the Petrine in Peter: the heaven-given faith which manifested itself in his confession. ^{f1641} And we can further understand how, just as Christ’s contemporaries may have regarded the world as reared on the rock of faithful Abraham, so Christ promised, that He would build His Church on the Petrine in Peter — on his faith and confession. Nor would the term ‘Church’ sound strange in Jewish ears. The same Greek word ἐκκλησία, as the equivalent of the Hebrew *Qahal*, ‘convocation,’ ‘the called,’ ^{f1642} occurs in the LXX. rendering of the Old Testament, and in ‘the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach’ {Ecclus. 24:2.} and was apparently in familiar use at the time. {Comp. ~~4073~~ Acts 7:38, and even St. ~~4087~~ Matthew 18:17.} In Hebrew use it referred to Israel, not in their national but in their religious unity. As here employed, it would convey the prophecy, that His disciples would in the future be joined together in a religious unity; that this religious unity or ‘Church’ would be a building of which Christ was the Builder; that it would be founded on ‘the Petrine’ of heaven-taught faith and confession; and that this religious unity, this Church, was not only intended for a time, like a school of thought, but would last beyond death and the disembodied state: that, alike as regarded Christ and His Church — ‘the gates of Hades’ ^{f1643} shall not prevail against it. { ~~4157~~ Acts 15:7. }

Viewing ‘the Church’ as a building founded upon ‘the Petrine,’ ^{f1644} it was not to vary, but to carry on the same metaphor, when Christ promised to give to him who had spoken as representative of the Apostles — ‘the stewards of the mysteries of God’ — ‘the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.’ For, as the religious unity of His disciples, or the Church, represented ‘the royal rule of heaven,’ so, figuratively, entrance into the gates of this building, submission to the rule of God, to that Kingdom of which Christ was the King. And we remember how, in a special sense, this

promise was fulfilled to Peter. Even as he had been the first to utter the confession of the Church, so was he also privileged to be the first to open its hitherto closed gates to the Gentiles, when God made choice of him, that, through his mouth, the Gentiles should first hear the words of the Gospel, {~~415~~ Acts 15:7.} and at his bidding first be baptized. {~~410~~ Acts 10:48.}

If hitherto it has appeared that what Christ said to Peter, though infinitely transcending Jewish ideas, was yet, in its expression and even cast of thought, such as to be quite intelligible to Jewish minds, nay so familiar to them, that, as by well-marked steps, they might ascend to the higher Sanctuary, the difficult words with which our Lord closed must be read in the same light. For, assuredly, in interpreting such a saying of Christ to Peter, our first inquiry must be, what it would convey to the person to whom the promise was addressed. And here we recall, that no other terms were in more constant use in Rabbinic Canon-Law than those of ‘binding’ and ‘loosing.’ The words are the literal translation of the Hebrew equivalents *Asar* *rsa*, which means ‘to bind,’ in the sense of prohibiting, and *Hittir* (*ryth*, from *rtn*) which means ‘to loose,’ in the sense of permitting. For the latter the term *Shera* or *Sheri* (*arç*, or *yrç*) is also used. But this expression is, both in Targumic and Talmudic diction, not merely the equivalent of permitting, but passes into that of remitting or pardoning. On the other hand, ‘binding and loosing’ referred simply to things or acts prohibiting or else permitting them, declaring them lawful or unlawful. This was one of the powers claimed by the Rabbis. As regards their laws (not decisions as to things or acts), it was a principle, that while in Scripture there were some that bound and some that loosed, all the laws of the Rabbis were in reference to ‘binding.’ {Jer. Ber. 3 *b*; Jer. Meg. 71 *a*; Jer. Sanh. 30 *a*.} If this then represented the *legislative*, another pretension of the Rabbis, that of declaring ‘free’ or else ‘liable,’ i.e., guilty (*Patur* or *Chayyabh*), expressed their claim to the *judicial* power. By the first of these they ‘bound’ or ‘loosed’ acts or things; by the second they ‘remitted’ or ‘retained,’ declared a person free from, or liable to punishment. to compensation, or to sacrifice. These two powers — the legislative and judicial — which belonged to the Rabbinic office, Christ now transferred, and that not in their pretension, but in their reality, to His Apostles: the first here to Peter as their Representative, the second after His Resurrection to the Church. {St. ~~412~~ John 20:23.}

On the second of these powers we need not at present dwell. That of 'binding' and 'loosing' included all the legislative functions for the new Church. And it was a reality. In the view of the Rabbis heaven was like earth, and questions were discussed and settled by a heavenly Sanhedrin. Now, in regard to some of their earthly decrees, they were wont to say that 'the Sanhedrin above' confirmed what 'the Sanhedrin beneath' had done. But the words of Christ, as they avoided the foolish conceit of His contemporaries, left it not doubtful, but conveyed the assurance that, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, whatsoever they bound or loosed on earth would be bound or loosed in heaven.

But all this that had passed between them could not be matter of common talk, least of all, at that crisis in His History, and in that locality.

Accordingly, all the three Evangelists record, each with distinctive emphasis ^{f1645} — that the open confession of his Messiahship, which was virtually its proclamation, was not to be made public. Among the people it could only have led to results the opposite of those to be desired. How unprepared even that Apostle was, who had made proclamation of the Messiah, for what his confession implied, and how ignorant of the real meaning of Israel's Messiah, appeared only too soon. For, His proclamation as the Christ imposed on the Lord, so to speak, the necessity of setting forth the mode of His contest and victory — the Cross and the Crown. Such teaching was the needed sequence of Peter's confession — needed, not only for the correction of misunderstanding, but for direction. And yet significantly it is only said, that '*He began*' to teach them these things — no doubt, as regarded the *manner*, as well as the time of this teaching. The Evangelists, indeed, write it down in plain language, as fully taught them by later experience, that He was to be rejected by the rulers of Israel, slain, and to rise again the third day. And there can be as little doubt, that Christ's language (as afterwards they looked back upon it) must have clearly implied all this, as that at the time they did not fully understand it. ^{f1646} He was so constantly in the habit of using symbolic language, and had only lately reproved them for taking that about 'the heaven' in a literal, which He had meant in a figurative sense, that it was but natural, they should have regarded in the same light announcements which, in their strict literality, would seem to them well nigh incredible. They could well understand His rejection by the Scribes — a sort of figurative death, or violent suppression of His claims and doctrines, and then, after

briefest period, their resurrection, as it were — but not these terrible details in their full literality.

But, even so, there was enough of terrible realism in the words of Jesus to alarm Peter. His very affection, intensely human, to the Human Personality of his Master would lead him astray. That He, Whom he verily believed to be the Messiah, Whom he loved with all the intenseness of such an intense nature — that he should pass through such an ordeal, — No! Never! He put it in the very strongest language, although the Evangelist gives only a literal translation of the Rabbinic expression ^{f1647} God forbid it, ‘God be merciful to Thee:’ ^{f1648} no, such never could, nor should be to the Christ! It was an appeal to the Human in Christ, just as Satan had, in the great Temptation after the forty days’ fast, appealed to the purely Human in Jesus. Temptations these, with which we cannot reason, but which we must put behind us as *behind*, or else they will be a stumbling-block before us; temptations, which come to us often through the love and care of others, Satan transforming himself into an Angel of light; temptations, all the more dangerous, that they appeal to the purely human, not the sinful, element in us, but which arise from the circumstance, that they who so become our stumbling-block, so long as they are *before* us, are prompted by an affection which has regard to the purely human, and, in its one-sided human intenseness, minds the things of man, and not those of God.

Yet Peter’s words were to be made useful, by affording to the Master the opportunity of correcting what was amiss in the hearts of all His-disciples, and teaching them such general principles about His Kingdom, and about that implied in true discipleship, as would, if received in the heart, enable them in due time victoriously to bear those trials connected with that rejection and Death of the Christ, which at the time they could not understand. Not a Messianic Kingdom, with glory to its heralds and chieftains, but self-denial, and the voluntary bearing of that cross on which the powers of this world would nail the followers of Christ. They knew the torture which their masters — the power of the world, — the Romans, were wont to inflict: such must they, and similar must we all, be prepared to bear, ^{f1649} and, in so doing, begin by denying self. In such a contest, to lose life would be to gain it, to gain would be to lose life. And, if the issue lay between these two, who could hesitate what to choose, even if it were ours to gain or lose a whole world? For behind it all there was a reality — a Messianic triumph and Kingdom — not, indeed, such as they imagined, but far higher, holier: the Coming of the Son of Man in the glory of His

Father, and with His Angels, and then eternal gain or loss, according to our deeds. {St. ~~<0162>~~Matthew 16:24-27.}

But why speak of the future and distant? ‘A sign’ — a terrible sign of it ‘from heaven,’ a vindication of Christ’s ‘rejected’ claims, a vindication of the Christ, Whom they had slain, invoking His Blood on their City and Nation, a vindication, such as alone these men could understand, of the reality of His Resurrection and Ascension, was in the near future. The flames of the City and Temple would be the light in that nation’s darkness, by which to read the inscription on the Cross. All this not afar off. Some of those who stood there would not ‘taste death,’ ^{f1650} till in those judgments they would see that the Son of Man had come in His Kingdom. {St. ~~<0162>~~Matthew 16:28.}

Then — only then — at burning of the City! Why not now, visibly, and immediately on their terrible sin? Because God shows not ‘signs from heaven’ such as man seeks; because His long-suffering waiteth long; because, all unnoticed, the finger moves on the dial-plate of time till the hour strikes; because there is Divine grandeur and majesty in the slow, unheard, certain night-march of events under His direction. God is content to wait, because He reigneth; man must be content to wait, because he believeth.

END OF BOOK THREE

FOOTNOTES

- ^{ft1} Such is the literal meaning of what is translated by ‘shewbread.’
- ^{ft2} Macc. 1:54, 59; *Jos. Ant.* 12:5. 4.
- ^{ft3} After the deposition of Onias III. through the bribery of his own brother Jason, the latter and Menelaus outvied each other in bribery for, and prostitution of the holy office.
- ^{ft4} Modin, the birthplace of the Maccabees, has been identified with the modern *El-Medyeh*, about sixteen miles northwest of Jerusalem, in the ancient territory of Ephraim. Comp. *Conder’s Handbook of the Bible*, p. 291; and for a full reference to the whole literature of the subject, see *Schurer* (Neutest. Zeitgesch. p. 78, note 1).
- ^{ft5} On the meaning of the name Maccabee, comp. *Grimm’s Kurzgef.* Exeget. Handb. z. d. Apokr. Lief. 3, pp. 9:10. We adopt the derivation from *Maqqabha*, a hammer, like Charles *Martel*.
- ^{ft6} 1 Macc. 4:52-54: Megill. Taan. 23.
- ^{ft7} 1 Macc. 1. 54.
- ^{ft8} Alike the verb in Hebrew **חל ג**, and in Greek **διασπείρω**, with their derivatives, are used in the Old Testament, and in the rendering of the LXX., with reference to punitive banishment. See, for example, ~~<1783>~~ Judges 18:30; ~~<902>~~ 1 Samuel 4:21; and in the LXX. ~~<6104>~~ Deuteronomy 30:4; ~~<9570>~~ Psalm 147:2; ~~<3406>~~ Isaiah 49:6, and other passages.
- ^{ft9} There is some truth, although greatly exaggerated, in the bitter remarks of *Hausrath* (Neutest. Zeitgesch. 2 p. 93), as to the sensitiveness of the Jews in the diaspora, and the loud outcry of all its members at any interference with them, however trivial. But events unfortunately too often proved how real and near was their danger, and how necessary the caution ‘Obsta principis.’
- ^{ft10} St. Peter seems to have used it in that sense, ~~<1000>~~ 1 Peter 1:1.
- ^{ft11} Comp. the remarks of *Schneckenburger* (Vorles u. Neutest. Zeitg. p. 95).
- ^{ft12} Comp. *Friedlieb*, D. Sibyll. Weissag. 22:39.
- ^{ft13} Orac Sibyll. 3:271,272, apud *Friedlieb*, p. 62.

- ^{ft14} *Strabo* apud *Jos. Ant.* 14:7.2: 'It is not easy to find a place in the world that has not admitted this race, and is not mastered by it.'
- ^{ft15} *Philo* in *Flaccum* (ed. Francf.), p. 971.
- ^{ft16} *Comp. Jos. Ant.* 12:3; 13:10. 4; 13. 1; 14:6. 2; 8. 1; 10. 8; *Sueton. Caes.* 85.
- ^{ft17} *Grimm* (*Clavis N.T.* p. 113) quotes two passages from *Philo*, in one of which he contradistinguishes 'us,' the Hellenist Jews, from 'the Hebrews,' and speaks of the Greek as 'our language.'
- ^{ft18} Similarly we have (in *Men.* 110*a*) this curious explanation of ^{<2816>}Isaiah 43:6: 'My sons from afar' — these are the exiles in Babylon, whose minds were settled, like men, 'and my daughters from the ends of the earth' — these are the exiles in other lands, whose minds were not settled, like women.
- ^{ft19} *Ber. R.* 17.
- ^{ft20} *Comp. Furst, Kult. u. Literaturgesch d. Jud. in Asien*, vol. 1 p. 8.
- ^{ft21} *Jos. Ant.* 18:9. 9.
- ^{ft22} *Midrash on Cant.* 5:5, ed. Warsh. p. 26 *a*.
- ^{ft23} *Philo* ad *Caj.*
- ^{ft24} The following are the chief passages in *Josephus* relating to that part of Jewish history: *Ant.* 11:5. 2; 14:13. 5; 15:2. 7; 3. 1; 17:2. 1-3; 18:9. 1, etc.; 20:4. *Jew. W.* 1:13. 3.
- ^{ft25} *Rosh. haSh.* 2:4; *comp. the Jer. Gemara* on it, and in the *Bab. Talmud* 23 *b*.
- ^{ft26} *Rosh. haSh.* 1:4.
- ^{ft27} *Shev.* 6 *passim*; *Gitt.* 8 *a*.
- ^{ft28} *Cheth.* 111 *a*.
- ^{ft29} As comments upon the genealogies from 'Azal' in ^{<1387>}1 *Chronicles* 8:37 to 'Azal' in 9:44. *Pes.* 62 *b*.
- ^{ft30} *Pes.* 62 *b*; *Sachs, Beitr.* vol. 2 p. 157.
- ^{ft31} According to tradition he returned to Babylon, and died there. *Josephus* says that he died in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 11 5. 5).
- ^{ft32} *Herzfeld* has given a very clear historical arrangement of the order in which, and the persons by whom, the various legal determinations were supposed to have been given. See *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* vol. 3 pp. 240 etc.

- ^{ft33} Although thus introduced under Ezra, the ancient Hebrew characters, which resemble the Samaritan, only very gradually gave way. They are found on monuments and coins.
- ^{ft34} *Herzfeld* (u. s. vol. 3 p. 46) happily designates the Palestinian as the Hebraeo-Aramaic, from its Hebraistic tinge. The Hebrew, as well as the Aramaean, belongs to the Semitic group of languages, which has thus been arranged: 1. North Semitic: Punico-Phoenician, Hebrew, and Aramaic (Western and Eastern dialects). 2. South Semitic: Arabic, Himyaritic, and Ethiopian. 3. East Semitic: The Assyro-Babylonian cuneiform. When we speak of the dialect used in Palestine, we do not, of course, forget the great influence of Syria, exerted long before and after the Exile. Of these three branches the Aramaic is the most closely connected with the Hebrew. Hebrew occupies an intermediate position between the Aramaic and the Arabic, and may be said to be the oldest, certainly from a literary point of view. Together with the introduction of the new dialect into Palestine, we mark that of the new, or square, characters of writing. The Mishnah and all the kindred literature up to the fourth century are in Hebrew, or rather in a modern development and adaptation of that language; the Talmud is in Aramaean. Comp. on this subject: *DeWette-Schrader*, *Lehrb. d. hist. kr. Eink.* (8 ed.) pp. 71-88; *Herzog's Real-Encykl.* vol. 1 466, 468; 5:614 etc., 710; *Zunz*, *Gottesd. Vortr. d. Jud.* pp. 7-9; *Herzfeld*, u.s. pp. 44 etc., 58 etc.
- ^{ft35} Could St. Paul have had this in mind when, in referring to the miraculous gift of speaking in other languages, he directs that one shall always interpret (^{<46427>}1 Corinthians 14:27)? At any rate, the word *targum* in ^{<45947>}Ezra 4:7 is rendered in the LXX by ἑρμηνεύω. The following from the Talmud (Ber. 8 *a* and *b*) affords a curious illustration of ^{<46427>}1 Corinthians 14:27: 'Let a man always finish his Parashah (the daily lesson from the Law) with the congregation (at the same time) — twice the text, and once targum.'
- ^{ft36} From *darash*, to search out, literally, to tread out. The preacher was afterwards called the Darshan.
- ^{ft37} The *Halakhah* might be described as the apocryphal Pentateuch, the *Hagga-dah* as the apocryphal Prophets.
- ^{ft38} We may here remind ourselves of ^{<54517>}1 Timothy 5:17. St. Paul, as always, writes with the familiar Jewish phrases ever recurring to his

mind. The expression **διδασκαλία** seems to be equivalent to Halakhic teaching. Comp. *Grimm*, Clavis N. T. pp. 98, 99.

^{ft39} In Moed Q. 25 *a*. sojourn in Babylon is mentioned as a reason why the Shekhinah could not rest upon a certain Rabbi.

^{ft40} Pes. 34 *b*; Men. 52 *a*; Sanh. 24 *a*; Bets. 16 *a*, apud *Neubauer*, Geogr. du Talmud, p. 323. In Keth. 75 *a*, they are styled the ‘silly Babylonians.’ See also Jer. Pes. 32 *a*.

^{ft41} Sukk. 20 *a*. R. Chija, one of the teachers of the second century, is among the most celebrated Rabbinical authorities, around whose memory legend has thrown a special halo.

^{ft42} In this, as in so many respects, Dr. *Neubauer* has collated very interesting information, to which we refer. See his Geogr. du Talm. pp. 369-399.

^{ft43} The whole section gives a most curious glimpse of the dress and ornaments worn by the Jews at that time. The reader interested in the subject will find special information in the three little volumes of *Hartmann* (Die Hebraerin am Putztische), in *N. G. Schroder's* somewhat heavy work: *De Vestitu Mulier. Hebr.*, and especially in that interesting tractate, *Trachten d. Juden*, by Dr. A. Brull, of which, unfortunately, only one part has appeared.

^{ft44} *Philo* ad Cajum, ed. Frcf. p. 1023.

^{ft45} Pes. 56 *a*, apud *Neubauer*, u. s., p. 351.

^{ft46} Comp. *Neubauer*, pp. 315, 372; *Hamburger*, Real-Encykl. p. 135.

^{ft47} Comp. *Volkmar*, Handb. d. Einl. in d. Apokr. ii^{te} Abth., pp. 193, 194, notes. For the reasons there stated, I prefer this to the ingenious interpretation proposed by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy (*Journ. of Philol.* for 1870, pp. 113, 114), who regards it as a contraction of *Erez achereth*, ‘another land,’ referred to in ⁽⁶²²⁷⁾Deuteronomy 29:27 (28).

^{ft48} R. Eliezer seems to connect their return with the dawn of the new Messianic day.

^{ft49} This is not the place to discuss the later Jewish fiction of a second or ‘suffering’ Messiah, ‘the son of Joseph,’ whose special mission it would be to bring back the ten tribes, and to subject them to Messiah, ‘the son of David,’ but who would perish in the war against Gog and Magog.

- ^{ft50} Comp. the work of Dr. *Asahel Grant* on the Nestorians. His arguments have been well summarized and expanded in an interesting note in Mr. *Nutt's Sketch of Samaritan History*, pp. 2-4.
- ^{ft51} I would here call special attention to a most interesting paper on the subject ('A New Afghan Question'), by Mr. H. W. *Bellew*, in the 'Journal of the United Service Institution of India,' for 1881, pp. 49-97.
- ^{ft52} Kidd. 69 *b*.
- ^{ft53} So Anna from the tribe of Aser, St. ~~<4026>~~ Luke 2:36. *Lutterbeck* (Neutest. Lehrbegr. pp. 102, 103) argues that the ten tribes had become wholly indistinguishable from the other two. But his arguments are not convincing, and his opinion was certainly not that of those who lived in the time of Christ, or who reflected their ideas.
- ^{ft54} Indeed, the word *Alnisti* (or *Alunistin*), 'Greek', actually occurs, as in Jer. Sot. 21 *b*, line 14 from bottom. *Bohl* (Forsch. n. ein. Volksb. p. 7) quotes *Philo* (Leg. ad Caj. p. 1023) in proof that he regarded the Eastern dispersion as a branch separate from the Palestinians. But the passage does not convey to me the inference which he draws from it. Dr. Guillemard (Hebraisms in the Greek Test.) on ~~<406>~~ Acts 6:1, agreeing with Dr. Roberts, argues that the term 'Hellenist' indicated only principles, and not birthplace, and that there were Hebrews and Hellenists in and out of Palestine. But this view is untenable.
- ^{ft55} An account of this propaganda of Judaism and of its results will be given in another connection.
- ^{ft56} St. Paul fully describes these feelings in the Epistle to the Romans.
- ^{ft57} The '*Gerey haShaar*,' proselytes of the gate, a designation which some have derived from the circumstance that Gentiles were not allowed to advance beyond the Temple Court, but more likely to be traced to such passages as ~~<1220>~~ Exodus 20:10; ~~<1542>~~ Deuteronomy 14:21; 24:14.
- ^{ft58} Comp. here Targ. Jon. on ~~<1002>~~ Judges 5:2, 9. I feel more hesitation in appealing to such passages as Ber. 19 *a*, where we read of a Rabbi in Rome, Thodos (Theudos?), who flourished several generations before Hillel, for reasons which the passage itself will suggest to the student. At the time of *Philo*, however, such instructions in the Synagogues at Rome were a long, established institution (Ad Caj. p. 1014).
- ^{ft59} [φιλοξενία ~~<1002>~~ Hebrews 13:2.

- ^{ft60} Through this literature, which as being Jewish might have passed unsuspected, a dangerous acquaintance might have been introduced with Greek writings, the more readily, that for example Aristobulus described Homer and Hesiod as having ‘drawn from our books’ (ap. *Euseb. Praepar. Evang.* 13:12). According to *Hamburger* (Real-Encykl. fur Bibel u. Talmud, vol. 2 pp. 68, 69), the expression *Siphrey Homeros* applies exclusively to the Judaeo-Alexandrian heretical writings; according to *Furst* (Kanon d. A. Test. p. 98), simply to Homeric literature. But see the discussion in *Levy*, Neuhebr. u. Chald. Worterb., vol. 1 p. 476 *a* and *b*.
- ^{ft61} Comp. *Friedlander*, Sitteng. Roms, vol. 3 p. 315.
- ^{ft62} To these causes there should perhaps be added the attempt to introduce Grecianism by force into Palestine, the consequences which it may have left, and the existence of a Grecian party in the land.
- ^{ft63} *Aristobulus* in *Euseb. Praepar. Evang.* 9:6; 13:12. The doubts raised by *Hody* against this testimony have been generally repudiated by critics since the treatise by *Valkenaer* (Diatr. de Aristob. Jud. appended to Gaisford’s ed. of the *Praepar. Evang.*).
- ^{ft64} Comp. *Josephi Opera*, ed. Havercamp, vol. 2 App. pp. 103-132. The best and most critical edition of this letter by Prof. *M. Schmidt*, in *Merx’ Archiv.* 1 pp. 252-310. The story is found in *Jos. Ant.* 12:2. 2; *Ag. Ap.* 2:4; *Philo*, de Vita Mosis, lib. 2 section 5-7. The extracts are most fully given in *Euseb. Praepar. Evang.* Some of the Fathers give the story, with additional embellishments. It was first critically called in question by *Hody* (*Contra Historiam Aristae de L. X. interpret. dissert.* Oxon. 1685), and has since been generally regarded as legendary. But its foundation in fact has of late been recognized by well nigh all critics, though the letter itself is pseudonymic, and full of fabulous details.
- ^{ft65} This is also otherwise attested. See *Keil*, Lehrb. d. hist. kr. Einl. d. A. T., p. 551, note 5.
- ^{ft66} It is scarcely worth while to refute the view of Tychsen, *Jost* (Gesch. d. Judenth.), and others, that the Jewish writers only wrote down for Ptolemy the Hebrew words in Greek letters. But the word **btl** cannot possibly bear that meaning in this connection. Comp. also Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 31.

- ^{ft67} According to Sopher. 1 8, by five persons, but that seems a round number to correspond to the five books of Moses. *Frankel* (Ueber d. Einfl. d. palast. Exeg.) labors, however, to show in detail the differences between the different translators. But his criticism is often strained, and the solution of the question is apparently impossible.
- ^{ft68} *Bohl* would have it, 'the Jerusalem Sanhedrin!'
- ^{ft69} But the expression has also been referred to the thirty-eighth year of the reign of *Euergetes*.
- ^{ft70} To my mind, at least, the historical evidence, apart from critical considerations, seems very strong. Modern writers on the other side have confessedly been influenced by the consideration that the earlier date of the Book of Sirach would also involve a much earlier date for the close of the O. T. Canon than they are disposed to admit. More especially would it bear on the question of the so-called 'Maccabean Psalms,' and the authorship and date of the Book of Daniel. But historical questions should be treated independently of critical prejudices. *Winer* (Bibl. Realwörterb. 1 p. 555), and others after him admit that the Simon of Ecclus. ch. L. was indeed Simon the Just (I.), but maintain that the *Euergetes* of the Prologue was the second of that name, Ptolemy VII., popularly nicknamed *Kakergetes*. Comp. the remarks of *Fritzsche* on this view in the *Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. z. d. Apokr.* 5te Lief. p. 17.
- ^{ft71} Comp. here, besides the passages quoted in the previous note, *Baba B.* 13 *b* and 14 *b*; for the cessation of revelation in the Maccabean period, 1 Macc. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41; and, in general, for the Jewish view on the subject at the time of Christ, *Jos. Ag. Ap.* 1:8.
- ^{ft72} *Anterior*: Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel 1 and 2 Kings. *Posterior*: Major: Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; and the Minor Prophets.
- ^{ft73} They occur chiefly in 1 Kings, the books of Esther, Job, Proverbs, Jeremiah, and Daniel. In the Pentateuch we find them only in four passages in the Book of Exodus.
- ^{ft74} There is also a curious correspondence between the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch and that of the LXX., which in no less than about 2,000 passages agree as against our Hebrew, although in other instances the Greek text either agrees with the Hebrew against the Samaritan, or else is independent of both. On the connection between

Samaritan literature and Hellenism there are some very interesting notices in *Freudenthal*, *Hell. Stud.* pp. 82-103, 130-136, 186, etc.

^{ft75} The extravagant computations in this respect of *Frankel* (both in his work, *Ueber d. Einfl. d. Palast. Exeg.*, and also in the *Vorstud. z. Sept.* pp. 189-191) have been rectified by *Herzfeld* (*Gesch. d. Vol. Isr.* vol. 3.), who, perhaps, goes to the other extreme. *Herzfeld* (pp. 548-550) admits, and even this with hesitation — of only six distinct references to Halakhoth in the following passages in the LXX.: ~~<0004>~~Genesis 9:4; ~~<0032>~~Genesis 32:32; ~~<0019>~~Leviticus 19:19; 24:7; ~~<0025>~~Deuteronomy 25:5; 26:12. As instances of Haggadah we may mention the renderings in ~~<0074>~~Genesis 5:24 and ~~<0013>~~Exodus 10:23.

^{ft76} *Dahne* and *Gfrorer* have in this respect gone to the same extreme as *Frankel* on the Jewish side. But even *Siegfried* (*Philo* 5 Alex. p. 8) is obliged to admit that the LXX. Rendering ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἄόρατος ἀκαὶ κατασκεύαστος, ~~<0002>~~Genesis 1:2), bears undeniable mark of Grecian philosophic views. And certainly this is not the sole instance of the kind.

^{ft77} As in the so-called '*Tiqquney Sopherim*,' or 'emendations of the scribes.' Comp. here generally the investigations of *Geiger* (*Urschrift u. Uebers. z. d. Bibel*). But these, however learned and ingenious, require, like so many of the dicta of modern Jewish criticism, to be taken with the utmost caution, and in each case subjected to fresh examination, since so large a proportion of their writings are what is best designated by the German *Tendenz-Schriften*, and their inferences *Tendenz-Schlüsse*. But the critic and the historian should have no *Tendenz* — except towards simple fact and historical truth.

^{ft78} Meg. 1:8 It is, however, fair to confess strong doubt, on my part, whether this passage may not refer to the Greek translation of *Akylas*. At the same time it simply speaks of a translation into Greek. And before the version of *Aquila* the LXX. alone held that place. It is one of the most daring modern Jewish perversions of history to identify this *Akylas*, who flourished about 130 after Christ, with the *Aquila* of the Book of Acts. It wants even the excuse of a colorable perversion of the confused story about *Akylas*, which *Epiphanius* who is so generally inaccurate, gives in *De Pond. et Mensur.* c. 14:

^{ft79} The 'Shema' (Jewish creed), with its collects, the eighteen 'benedictions,' and 'the grace at meat.' A later Rabbi vindicated the use

of the 'Shema' in Greek by the argument that the word *Shema* meant not only 'Hear,' but also 'understand' (Jer. Sotah 7:1.) Comp. Sotah 7:1, 2. In Ber. 40 *b*, it is said that the Parashah connected with the woman suspected of adultery, the prayer and confession at the bringing of the tithes, and the various benedictions over food, may be said not only in Hebrew, but in any other languages.

^{ft80} All the Apocrypha were originally written in Greek, except 1 Macc., Judith, part of Baruch, probably Tobit, and, of course, the 'Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach.'

^{ft81} It is printed in Havercamp's edition of Josephus, vol. 2 pp. 497-520. The best edition is in *Fritzsche*, Libri Apocryphi Vet. Test. (Lips. 1871).

^{ft82} *Ewald* (Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., vol. 4 pp. 626-632) has given a glowing sketch of it. Ewald rightly says that its Grecian elements have been exaggerated; but *Bucher* (Lehre vom Logos, pp. 59-62) utterly fails in denying their presence altogether.

^{ft83} Compare especially 9:1; 18:14-16, where the idea of *passes* into that *σοφία* of the *λόγος*. Of course the above remarks are not intended to depreciate the great value of this book, alike in itself, and in its practical teaching, in its clear enunciation of a retribution as awaiting man, and in its important bearing on the New Testament revelation of the *λόγος*.

^{ft84} Some Apocryphal books which have not been preserved to us are mentioned in Talmudical writings, among them one, 'The roll of the building of the Temple,' alas, lost to us! Comp. *Hamburger*, vol. 2 pp. 66-70.

^{ft85} Comp. *Siegfried*, *Philo* von Alex. pp. 275-299, who, however, perhaps overstates the matter.

^{ft86} Comp. *Siegfried*, pp. 9-16; *Hartmann*, Enge Verb. d. A. Test. mit d. N., pp. 568-572.

^{ft87} This is to be carefully distinguished from the typical interpretation and from the mystical, the type being prophetic, the mystery spiritually understood.

^{ft88} Not to speak of such sounder interpretations as that of the brazen serpent (Wisd. 16:6, 7), and of the Fall (2 24), or of the view presented of the early history of the chosen race in ch. 10, we may mention as

instances of allegorical interpretation that of the manna (16:26-28), and of the high-priestly dress (18:24), to which, no doubt, others might be added. But I cannot find sufficient evidence of this allegorical method in the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach. The reasoning of *Hartmann* (u. s., pp. 542-547) seems to me greatly strained. Of the existence of allegorical interpretations in the Synoptic Gospels, or of any connection with Hellenism, such as *Hartmann*, *Siegfried*, and *Loesner* (Obs. ad. N.T. e Philippians Alex) put into them, I cannot, on examination, discover any evidence. Similarity of expressions, or even of thought, afford no evidence of inward connection. Of the Gospel by St. John we shall speak in the sequel. In the Pauline Epistles we find, as might be expected, some allegorical interpretations, chiefly in those to the Corinthians, perhaps owing to the connection of that church with Apollos. Comp here ~~499~~ 1 Corinthians 9:9; 10:4 (*Philo*, Quod deter. potiori insid. 31); ~~496~~ 2 Corinthians 3:16; ~~492~~ Galatians 4:21. Of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse we cannot here speak.

^{ft89} See p. 25.

^{ft90} A similar principle applied to the prohibition of such species as the mouse or the weasel, not only because they destroyed everything, but because they latter, from its mode of conceiving and bearing, symbolized listening to evil tales, and exaggerated, lying, or malicious speech.

^{ft91} Of course this method is constantly adopted by Josephus. Comp. for example, Ant. 3:1. 6; 7. 7.

^{ft92} Or *Dorshey Chamuroth*, searchers of difficult passages. Zunz. Gottesd. Vortr. p. 323. note *b*.

^{ft93} The seventy languages in which the Law was supposed to have been written below Mount Ebal (Sotah 7:5). I cannot help feeling this may in part also refer to the various modes of interpreting Holy Scripture, and that there is an allusion to this Shabb. 88 *b*, where ~~490~~ Psalm 128:12. and ~~493~~ Jeremiah 23:29, are quoted, the latter to show that the word of God is like a hammer that breaks the rock in a thousand pieces. Comp. Rashi on ~~493~~ Genesis 33:20.

^{ft94} Perhaps we ought here to point out one of the most important principles of Rabbinism, which has been almost entirely overlooked in modern criticism of the Talmud. It is this: that any ordinance, not only of the Divine law, but of the Rabbis, even though only given for a particular

time or occasion, or for a special reason, remains in full force for all time unless it be expressly recalled (Betsah 5 b). Thus *Maimonides* (Sepher ha Mitsv.) declares the law to extirpate the Canaanites as continuing in its obligations. The inferences as to the *perpetual obligation*, not only of the ceremonial law, but of sacrifices, will be obvious, and their bearing on the Jewish controversy need not be explained. Comp. Chief Rabbi *Holdheim*. d. Ceremonial Gesetz in Messasreich, 1845.

^{ft95} The καίρῳς of St. Paul seems here used in exactly the same sense as in later Hebrew ʿmz. The LXX. render it so in five passages (^{1918B}Ezra 5:3; ^{2048B}Daniel 4:33; ^{2060B}Daniel 6:10; ^{2072B}Daniel 7:22, 25).

^{ft96} Of course, it suits Jewish, writers, like Dr. Jost, to deprecate the value of the Pseudepigrapha. Their ardor of expectancy ill agrees with the modern theories, which would eliminate, if possible, the Messianic hope from ancient Judaism.

^{ft97} Comp. *Dillmann* in Herzog's Real-Encykl. vol. 12 p. 301.

^{ft98} For a brief review of the 'Pseudepigraphic Writings,' see Appendix I.

^{ft99} Hausrath (N.T. Zeitg. vol. 2 p. 222 etc.) has given a highly imaginative picture of *Philo* — as, indeed, of many other persons and things.

^{ft100} *Siegfried* has, with immense labor, collected a vast number of parallel expressions, chiefly from Plato and Plutarch (pp. 39-47).

^{ft101} Comp. *Grossmann*, Quaest. Philippian 1 p. 5 etc.

^{ft102} In this sketch of the system of *Philo* I have largely availed myself of the careful analysis of *Siegfried*.

^{ft103} It should be noted that these are also Talmudical canons, not indeed for allegorical interpretation, but as pointing to some special meaning, since there was not a word or particle in Scripture without a definite meaning and object.

^{ft104} To illustrate what use might be made of such alterations, the Midrash (Ber. R. 65) would have us punctuate ¹⁰²⁷¹⁹Genesis 27:19, as follows: 'And Jacob said unto his father, I (viz. am he who will receive the ten commandments) — (but) Esau (is) thy firstborn.' In Yalkut there is the still more curious explanation that in heaven the soul of Jacob was the firstborn!

- ft105 Each of these positions is capable of ample proof from Philo's writings, as shown by Siegfried. But only a bare statement of these canons was here possible.
- ft106 Comp. our above outline with the 'XXV. theses de modis et formulis quibus pr. Hebr. doctores SS. interpretari etc. soliti fuerunt,' in *Surenhusius*, *Biblos*, *Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς* pp. 57-88.
- ft107 For a comparison between *Philo* and Rabbinic theology, see Appendix II.: '*Philo* and Rabbinic Theology.' *Freudenthal* (Hellen. Studien, pp. 67 etc.) aptly designates this mixture of the two as 'Hellenistic Midrash,' it being difficult sometimes to distinguish whether it originated in Palestine or in Egypt, or else in both independently. *Freudenthal* gives a number of curious instances in which Hellenism and Rabbinism agree in their interpretations. For other interesting comparisons between Haggadic interpretations and those of *Philo*, see *Joel*, *Blick* in d. *Religionsgesch.* 1 p. 38 etc.
- ft108 Thus, to give only a few out of many examples, *Ruth* is derived from *ravah*, to satiate to give to drink, because David, her descendant, satiated God with his Psalms of praise (Ber. 7 *b*). Here the principle of the significance of Bible names is deduced from ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 46:8 (9 in the Hebrew): 'Come, behold the works of the Lord, who hath made names on earth,' the word 'desolations,' SHAMOTH, being altered to SHEMOTH, 'names.' In general, that section, from Ber. 3 *b*, to the end of 8 *a*, is full of Haggadic Scripture interpretations. On fol. 4 *a* there is the curious symbolical derivation of *Mephibosheth*, who is supposed to have set David right on halakhic questions, as *Mippi bosheth*: 'from my mouth shaming,' 'because he put to shame the face of David in the Halakhah.' Similarly in *Siphre* (Par. Behaalothekha, ed. Friedmann, p. 20 *a*) we have very beautiful and ingenious interpretations of the names *Reuel*, *Hobab* and *Jethro*.
- ft109 It would be impossible here to give the references, which would occupy too much space.
- ft110 For want of handier material I must take leave to refer to my brief sketch of the Kabbalah in the 'History of the Jewish Nation,' pp. 434-446.
- ft111 In short, the *λόγος σπερματικός* of the Stoics.
- ft112 Supposed to mean either *numerationes*, or splendor. But why not derive the word from *σφαίρα*? The ten are: *Crown*, *Wisdom*,

Intelligence, Mercy, Judgment, Beauty, Triumph, Praise, Foundation, Kingdom.

- ^{ft113} For the teaching of Eastern Judaism in this respect, see Appendix II.: ‘*Philo* and Rabbinic Theology.’
- ^{ft114} A very interesting question arises: how far *Philo* was acquainted with, and influenced by, the Jewish traditional law or the Halakhah. This has been treated by Dr. *B. Ritter* in an able tractate (*Philo* u. die Halach.), although he attributes more to *Philo* than the evidence seems to admit.
- ^{ft115} At the same time there is a remarkable difference here between *Philo* and Rabbinism. *Philo* holds that the creation of the world was brought about by the *Potencies*, but the Law was given directly through Moses, and *not* by the *mediation of angels*. But this latter was certainly the view generally entertained in Palestine as expressed in the LXX. rendering of ^{<K32>}Deuteronomy 32:2, in the Targumim on that passage, and more fully still in *Jos. Ant.* 15:5. 3, in the Midrashim and in the Talmud, where we are told (Macc. 24 a) that only the opening words, ‘I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods but Me,’ were spoken by God Himself. Comp. also ^{<473>}Acts 7:38, 53; ^{<K19>}Galatians 3:19; ^{<K12>}Hebrews 2:2.
- ^{ft116} *Hammejuchad*, ‘appropriatum,’ *hammephorash*, ‘expositum,’ ‘separatum,’ the ‘tetragrammaton,’ or four-lettered name **whhy**, There was also a *Shem* with ‘twelve,’ and one with ‘forty-two’ letters (*Kidd.* 71 a).
- ^{ft117} *Levy* (Neuhebr. Worterb. 1 p. 374 a.) seems to imply that in the Midrash the term *dibbur* occupies the same place and meaning. But with all deference I cannot agree with this opinion, nor do the passages quoted bear it out.
- ^{ft118} The ‘word,’ as spoken, is distinguished from the ‘Word’ as speaking, or revealing Himself. The former is generally designated by the term ‘*pithgama*.’ Thus in Genesis XV. 1, ‘After these words (things) came the “pithgama” of Jehovah to Abram in prophecy, saying, Fear not, Abram, My “Memra” shall be thy strength, and thy very great reward.’ Still, the term *Memra*, as applied not only to man, but also in reference to God, is not always the equivalent of ‘the Logos.’
- ^{ft119} The various passages in the Targum of Onkelos, the Jerusalem, and the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum on the Pentateuch will be found enumerated and classified, as those in which it is a *doubtful*, a *fair*, or an

unquestionable inference, that the word *Memra* is intended for God revealing Himself, in Appendix II.: ‘*Philo* and Rabbinic Theology.

ft120 As, for example, ^{<0120>}Genesis 28:21, ‘the *Memra* of Jehovah shall be my God.’

ft121 As, for example, ^{<0121>}Numbers 23:21, ‘the *Memra* of Jehovah their God is their helper, and the *Shekhinah* of their King is in the midst of them.’

ft122 That term is often used by Onkelos. Besides, the expression itself is ‘the *Memra* of Jehovah.’

ft123 Onkelos only once (in ^{<0123>}Exodus 4:24) paraphrases Jehovah by ‘*Malakha*.’

ft124 *Metatron*, either = μετὰ θρόνον, or μετὰ τύραννον In the Talmud it is applied to the Angel of Jehovah (^{<0124>}Exodus 23:20), ‘the Prince of the World,’ ‘the Prince of the Face’ or ‘of the Presence,’ as they call him; he who sits in the innermost chamber before God while the other angels only hear His commands from behind the veil (*Chag.* 15 *a*; 16 *a*; *Toseft. ad Chull.* 60 *a*; *Jer.* 16 *b*). This *Metatron* of the Talmud and the Kabbalah is also the *Adam Qadmon*, or archetypal man.

ft125 Of deep interest is Onkelos’ rendering of ^{<0125>}Deuteronomy 33:27, where, instead of ‘underneath are the everlasting arms,’ Onkelos has, ‘and by His *Memra* was the world created,’ exactly as in St ^{<0126>}John 1:10. Now this divergence of Onkelos from the Hebrew text seems unaccountable. *Winer*, whose inaugural dissertation, ‘*De Onkeloso ejusque paraph. Chald.*’ Lips. 1820, most modern writers have followed (with amplifications, chiefly from *Luzzato’s Philoxenus*), makes no reference to this passage, nor do his successors, so far as I know. It is curious that, as our present Hebrew text of this verse consists of three words, so does the rendering of Onkelos, and that both end with the same word. Is the rendering of Onkelos then a paraphrase, or does it represent another reading? Another interesting passage is ^{<0127>}Deuteronomy 8:3. Its quotation by Christ in St. ^{<0128>}Matthew 4:4 is deeply interesting, as read in the light of the rendering of Onkelos, ‘Not by bread alone is man sustained, but by every forthcoming *Memra* from before Jehovah shall man live.’ Yet another rendering of Onkelos is significantly illustrative of ^{<0129>}1 Corinthians 10:1-4. He renders ^{<0130>}Deuteronomy 33:3 ‘with power He brought them out of Egypt; they were led under thy cloud; they journeyed according to (by) thy *Memra*.’ Does this represent a

difference in Hebrew from the admittedly difficult text in our present Bible? Winer refers to it as an instance in which Onkelos ‘suapte ingenio et copiose admodum eloquitur vatum divinatorum mentem,’ adding, ‘ita ut de his, quas singulis vocibus inesse crediderit, significationibus non possit recte judicari;’ and Winer’s successors say much the same. But this is to state, not to explain, the difficulty. In general, we may here be allowed to say that the question of the Targumim has scarcely received as yet sufficient treatment. Mr. *Deutsch’s* Article in Smith’s ‘Dictionary of the Bible’ (since reprinted in his ‘Remains’) is, though brilliantly written, unsatisfactory. Dr. *Davidson* (in Kitto’s Cyclop., vol. 3 pp. 948-966) is, as always, careful, laborious, and learned. Dr. *Volck’s* article (in Herzog’s Real-Encykl., vol. 15 pp. 672-683) is without much intrinsic value, though painstaking. We mention these articles, besides the treatment of the subject in the Introduction to the Old Testament (Keil, De Wette-Schrader, Bleek-kamphausen, Reuss), and the works of Zunz, Geiger, Noldeke, and others, to whom partial reference has already been made. *Frankel’s* interesting and learned book (Zu dem Targum der Propheten) deals almost exclusively with the Targum Jonathan, on which it was impossible to enter within our limits. As modern brochures of interest the following three may be mentioned: *Maybaum*, Anthropomorphien bei Onkelos; *Gronemann*, Die Jonath. Pentat. Uebers. im Verh. z. Halacha; and *Singer*, Onkelos im Verh. z. Halacha.

^{ft126} See the enumeration of these 70 Names in the Baal-ha-Turim on ~~Numbers~~ Numbers 11:16.

^{ft127} Comp. Siegfried, u. s., pp. 221-223.

^{ft128} For a full discussion of this similarity of form and divergence of spirit, between *Philo*— or, rather, between Alexandrianism — and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the reader is referred to the masterly treatise by *Riehm* (Der Lehrbegriff d. Hebraerbr. ed. 1867, especially pp. 247-268, 411-424, 658-670, and 855-860). The author’s general view on the subject is well and convincingly formulated on p. 249. We must, however, add, in opposition to *Riehm*, that, by his own showing the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews displays few traces of a *Palestinian* training.

^{ft129} On the subject of *Philo’s* Logos generally the brochure of *Harnoch* (Königsberg, 1879) deserves perusal, although it does not furnish much that is new. In general, the student of *Philo* ought especially to study

the sketch by *Zeller* in his *Philosophie der Gr.* vol. 3 pt. 2, 3rd ed. pp. 338-418.

ft130 With singular and characteristic inconsistency, *Philo*, however, ascribes also to God the creation of matter (de Somn. 1:13).

ft131 So the Talmudists certainly understood it, Jer. Chag. 2:1.

ft132 Comp. *Grimm*, Exeg. Handb. zu d. Apokr., Lief. 6 pp. 55, 56.

ft133 They were arranged into those concerning the *Maasey Bereshith* (Creation), and the *Maasey Merkabbah*, 'the chariot' of Ezekiel's vision (Providence in the widest sense, or God's manifestation in the created world).

ft134 Of the four celebrities who entered the 'Pardes,' or enclosed Paradise of theosophic speculation, one became an apostate, another died, a third went wrong (Ben Soma), and only Akiba escaped unscathed, according to the Scripture saying, 'Draw me, and we will run' (Chag. 14 b).

ft135 'It is not lawful to enter upon the *Maasey Bereshith* in presence of two, nor upon the *Merkabbah* in presence of one, unless he be a "sage," and understands of his own knowledge. Any one who ratiocinates on these four things, it were better for him that he had not been born: What is above and what is below; what was afore, and what shall be hereafter.' (Chag. 2:1).

ft136 'Ben Soma went astray (mentally): he shook the (Jewish) world.'

ft137 That criticism, which one would designate as impertinent, which would find this view in ~~GRS~~ 2 Peter 3:5, is, alas! not confined to Jewish writers, but hazarded even by De Wette.

ft138 Judah bar Pazi, in the second century. Ben Soma lived in the first century of our era.

ft139 According to the Jerusalem Talmud (Ber. 1:I) the firmament was at first soft, and only gradually became hard. According to Ber. R. 10, God created the world from a mixture of fire and snow, other Rabbis suggesting four original elements, according to the quarters of the globe, or else six, adding to them that which is above and that which is below. A very curious idea is that of R. Joshua ben Levi, according to which all the works of creation were really finished on the first day, and only, as it were, extended on the other days. This also represents really a doubt of the Biblical account of creation. Strange though it may

sound, the doctrine of development was derived from the words (Gen 2:4). ‘These are the generations of heaven and earth when they were created, in the day when Jahveh Elohim made earth and heavens.’ It was argued, that the expression implied, they were developed from the day in which they had been created. Others seem to have held, that the three principal things that were created, earth, heaven, and water, remained, each for three days, at the end of which they respectively developed what is connected with them (Ber. R. 12).

ft140 For further notices on the Cosmology and Anthropology of *Philo*, see Appendix II.: ‘*Philo* and Rabbinic Theology.’

ft141 We cannot help quoting the beautiful Haggadic explanation of the name Adam, according to its three letters, A, D, M, as including these three names, *Adam*, *David*, *Messiah*.

ft142 *Raymundus Martini*, in his ‘*Pugio Fidei*’ (orig. ed. p. 675; ed. *Voisin et Carpzov*, pp. 866, 867), quotes from the book *Siphre*: ‘Go and learn the merit of Messiah the King, and the reward of the righteous from the first Adam, on whom was laid only one commandment of a prohibitive character, and he transgressed it. See how many deaths were appointed on him, and on his generations, and on the generations of his generations to the end of all generations. (*Wunsche*, Leiden d. Mess. p. 65, makes here an unwarrantable addition, in his translation.) But which attribute (measuring?) is the greater — the attribute of goodness or the attribute of punishment (retribution)? He answered, the attribute of goodness is the greater, and the attribute of punishment the less. And Messiah the King, who was chastened and suffered for the transgressors, as it is said, “He was wounded for our transgressions,” and so on — how much more shall He justify (make righteous — by His merit) all generations; and this is what is meant when it is written, “And Jehovah made to meet upon Him the sin of us all.” We have rendered this passage as literally as possible, but we are bound to add that it is not found in any now existing copy of *Siphre*.

ft143 Death is not considered an absolute evil. In short, all the various consequences which Rabbinical writings ascribe to the sin of Adam may be designated either as physical, or, if mental, as amounting only to detriment, loss, or imperfectness. These results had been partially counteracted by Abraham, and would be fully removed by the Messiah. Neither Enoch nor Elijah had sinned, and accordingly they did not die.

Comp. generally, *Hamburger*, Geist d. Agada, pp. 81-84, and in regard to death as connected with Adam, p. 85.

^{ft144} These are also hypostatized as Angels. Comp. *Levy*, Chald. Worterb. p. 342 *a*; Neuhebr. Worterb. p. 259, *a*, *b*.

^{ft145} Or with 'two reins the one, advising to good, being at his right, the other, counselling evil, at his left, according to ~~2100~~ Ecclesiastes 10:2 (Ber. 61 *a*, towards the end of the page).

^{ft146} In a sense its existence was necessary for the continuance of this world. The conflict between these two impulses constituted the moral life of man.

^{ft147} The solitary exception here is 4 Esdras, where the Christian doctrine of original sin is most strongly expressed, being evidently derived from New Testament teaching. Comp. especially 4 Esdras (our Apocryphal 2 Esdras) 7:46-53, and other passages. Wherein the hope of safety lay, appears in ch. 9.

^{ft148} Symbolized by Lot's wife.

^{ft149} Symbolized by *Ebher*, Hebrew.

^{ft150} The Sabbath, Jerusalem.

^{ft151} For further details on these points see Appendix II.: '*Philo* and Rabbinic Theology.'

^{ft152} The views of *Philo* on the Messiah will be presented in another connection.

^{ft153} This is not the place to enter on the question of the composition, date, and authorship of the four Gospels. But as regards the point on which negative criticism has of late spoken strongest — and on which, indeed (as Weiss rightly remarks) the very existence of 'the Tübingen School' depends — that of the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel, I would refer to Weiss, *Leben Jesu* (1882: vol. 1 pp. 84-139), and to *Dr. Salmon's* *Introd. to the New Test.* pp. 266-365.

^{ft154} No one not acquainted with this literature can imagine the character of the arguments sometimes used by a certain class of critics. To say that they proceed on the most forced perversion of the natural and obvious meaning of passages, is but little. But one cannot restrain moral indignation on finding that to Evangelists and Apostles is imputed, on such grounds, not only systematic falsehood, but falsehood with the most sinister motives.

- ^{ft155} I do not, of course, mean that the narration of St. Mark was not itself derived chiefly from Apostolic preaching, especially that of St. Peter. In general, the question of the authorship and source of the various Gospels must be reserved for separate treatment in another place.
- ^{ft156} Comp. *Mangold's* ed. of *Bleek*, Einl. in d. N.T. (3te Aufl. 1875), p. 346.
- ^{ft157} With the sole exception of St. ^{<0128>}Matthew 12:18, where the expression is a quotation from the LXX. of ^{<240>}Isaiah 42:1.
- ^{ft158} First expressed by *Delitzsch* (Bibl. Comm. u. d. Proph. Jes. p. 414), and then adopted by *Oehler* (Theol. A. Test. vol. 2 pp. 270-272).
- ^{ft159} The two fundamental principles in the history of the Kingdom of God are *selection* and *development*. It is surely remarkable, not strange, that these are also the two fundamental truths in the history of that other Kingdom of God, Nature, if modern science has read them correctly. These two *substantives* would mark the *facts* as ascertained; the *adjectives*, which are added to them by a certain class of students, mark only their *inferences* from these facts. These facts may be true, even if as yet incomplete, although the inferences may be false. Theology should not here rashly interfere. But whatever the ultimate result, these two are certainly the fundamental facts in the history of the Kingdom of God, and, marking them as such, the devout philosopher may rest contented.
- ^{ft160} The Gnostics, to whom, in the opinion of many, so frequent references are made in the writings of St. John and St. Paul, were only an offspring (rather, as the Germans would term it, an *Abart*) of Alexandrianism on the one hand, and on the other of Eastern notions, which are so largely embodied in the later Kabbalah.
- ^{ft161} A complement, not a supplement, as many critics put it (*Ewald*, *Weizsacker*, and even *Hengstenberg*), least of all a rectification (*Godet*, *Evang. Joh.* p. 633).
- ^{ft162} *Keim* (Leben Jesu von Nazara, 1 a, pp. 112-114) fully recognizes this; but I entirely differ from the conclusions of his analytical comparison of *Philo* with the fourth Gospel.
- ^{ft163} The student who has carefully considered the views expressed by *Philo* about the Logos, and analyzed, as in the Appendix, the passages in the Targumim in which the word *Memra* occurs, cannot fail to perceive the immense difference in the presentation of the Logos by St. John. Yet

M. *Renan*, in an article in the 'Contemporary Review' for September 1877, with utter disregard of the historical evidence on the question, maintains not only the identity of these three sets of ideas, but actually grounds on it his argument against the authenticity of the fourth Gospel. Considering the importance of the subject, it is not easy to speak with moderation of assertions so bold based on statements so entirely inaccurate.

^{ft164} Dr. *Bucher*, whose book, *Des Apostels Johannes Lehre vom Logos*, deserves careful perusal, tries to trace the reason of these peculiarities as indicated in the Prologue of the fourth Gospel. Bucher differentiates at great length between the Logos of *Philo* and of the fourth Gospel. He sums up his views by stating that in the Prologue of St. John the Logos is presented as the fulness of Divine Light and Life. This is, so to speak, the theme, while the Gospel history is intended to present the Logos as the *giver* of this Divine Light and Life. While the other Evangelists ascend from the manifestation to the idea of the Son of God, St. John descends from the idea of the Logos, as expressed in the Prologue, to its concrete realization in His history. The latest tractate (at the present writing, 1882) on the Gospel of St. John, by Dr. *Muller*, *Die Johann. Frage*, gives a good summary of the argument on both sides, and deserves the careful attention of students of the question.

^{ft165} I cannot agree with *Weiss* (u. s., p. 122) that the great object of the fourth Gospel was to oppose the rising Gnostic movement, This may have been present to the Apostle's mind, as evidenced in his Epistle, but the object in view could not have been mainly, nor even primarily, negative and controversial.

^{ft166} What charm Egypt had for the Romans may be gathered from so many of their mosaics and frescoes. Comp. *Friedlander*, u. s. vol. 2 pp. 134-136.

^{ft167} This immense lighthouse was square up to the middle, then covered by an octagon, the top being round. The last recorded repairs to this magnificent structure of blocks of marble were made in the year 1303 of our era.

^{ft168} The average passage from Alexandria to Puteoli was twelve days, the ships touching at Malta and in Sicily. It was in such a ship, the 'Castor and Pollux' carrying wheat, that St. Paul sailed from Malta to Puteoli, where it would be among the first arrivals of the season.

- ft169 They bore, painted on the two sides of the prow, the emblems of the gods to whom they were dedicated, and were navigated by Egyptian pilots, the most renowned in the world. One of these vessels is described as 180 by 45 feet and of about 1,575 tons, and is computed to have returned to its owner nearly 3,000*l.* annually. (Comp. *Friedlander*, u.s. vol. 2 p. 131, etc.) And yet these were small ships compared with those built for the conveyance of marble blocks and columns, and especially of obelisks. One of these is said to have carried, besides an obelisk, 1,200 passenger, a freight of paper, nitre, pepper, linen, and a large cargo of wheat.
- ft170 The journey took about three months, either up the Nile, thence by caravan, and again by sea; or else perhaps by the Ptolemy Canal and the Red Sea.
- ft171 It included gold-dust, ivory, and mother-of-pearl from the interior of Africa, spices from Arabia, pearls from the Gulf of Persia, precious stones and byssus from India and silk from China.
- ft172 Instead of the seven-branched golden candlestick there was a golden lamp, suspended from a chain of the same metal.
- ft173 Could there have been any such meaning in laying the Roman cross which Jesus had to bear upon a Cyrenian (St. ~~4236~~ Luke 23:26)? A symbolical meaning it certainly has, as we remember that the last Jewish rebellion (132-135 A.D.), which had Bar Cochba for its Messiah, first broke out in Cyrene. What terrible vengeance was taken on those who followed the false Christ, cannot here be told.
- ft174 Jewish inscriptions have also been found in Mauritania and Algiers.
- ft175 On a tombstone at Capua (*Mommsen*, Inscr. R. Neap. 3,657, apud *Schurer*, p 629). The subject is of great importance as illustrating the rule of the Synagogue in the days of Christ. Another designation on the gravestones πατήρ συναγωγῆς seems to refer solely to age, one being described as 110 years old.
- ft176 *Jost*, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* 1 p. 345.
- ft177 *Marquardt* (*Romans Staatsverwalt.* vol. 1 p. 297). Note 5 suggests that ἔθνος may here mean classes, *ordo*.
- ft178 The office itself would seem to have been continued. (*Jos. Ant.* 19:5.2.)

- ft179 Comp. Wesseling, de Jud. Archont. pp. 63, etc., apud Schurer, pp. 627, 628.
- ft180 Comp. for example, such a trenchant chapter as Baruch 6, or the 2nd Fragm. of the Erythr. Sibyl, vv. 21-33.
- ft181 Comp. *Friedlander*, u. s. 2 p. 155.
- ft182 A very good sketch of Apion is given by *Hausrath*, Neutest. Zeitg. vol. 2 pp. 187-195.
- ft183 *Jos. Ag. Ap.* 2 4, 5, 6.
- ft184 Comp. the quotation of such scenes in the Intro. to the Midrash on Lamentations.
- ft185 *Lutterbeck* (Neutest. Lehrbegr. p. 119), following up the suggestions of *Wieseler* (Chron. d. Apost. Zeitalt. pp. 384, 402, etc.), regards these priests as the accusers of St. Paul, who brought about his martyrdom.
- ft186 Comp., for example, *Mart.* 11:94; *Jos.* Life 3.
- ft187 *Martialis*, u. s. The ‘*Anchialus*’ by whom the poet would have the Jew swear, is a corruption of *Anochi Elohim* (‘I am God’) in ~~Exodus~~ Exodus 20:2. Comp. *Ewald*, Gesch. Isr. vol. 7 p. 27.
- ft188 Described by *Bosio*, but since unknown. Comp. *Friedlander*, u. s. vol. 3 pp. 510, 511.
- ft189 *Sat.* 3:13; 6:542.
- ft190 Comp. *Friedlander*, u. s. vol. 3 p. 510.
- ft191 *Midr. R.* on Exodus 36.
- ft192 Comp. *Cassel*, in *Ersch u. Gruber’s Encyclop.* 2d sect. vol. 27 p. 147.
- ft193 Comp. *Friedlander*, u. s. vol. 2 pp. 17-204 passim.
- ft194 It was probably this unity of Israelitish interests which *Cicero* had in view (*Pro Flacco*, 28) when he took such credit for his boldness in daring to stand up against the Jews — unless, indeed, the orator only meant to make a point in favor of his client.
- ft195 *Schiller* (*Gesch. d. Romans Kaiserreichs*, p. 583) denies that Poppaea was a proselyte. It is, indeed, true, as he argues, that the fact of her entombment affords no absolute evidence of this, if taken by itself; but comp. *Jos. Ant.* 20:8. 11; *Life* 3.
- ft196 The question of Jewish proselytes will be treated in another place.

- ft197 Comp. *Jos. Ant.* 14:10, *passim*, and 16:6. These edicts are collated in *Krebs*. *Decreta Romanor. pro Jud. facta*, with long comments by the author, and by *Levyssohn*.
- ft198 One of these tablets has lately been excavated. Comp. 'The Temple: its Ministry and Services in the Time of Christ,' p. 24.
- ft199 War, 7:3. 3.
- ft200 War, 7:5. 2.
- ft201 Comp. generally *Neubauer*, *Geogr. du Talmud*, pp. 312, 313.
- ft202 Ber. 3:3; Meg. 1:8; Moed K. 3:4; Men. 3:7. Comp. *Jos. Ant.* 4:8. 13; and the tractate *Mezuzah* in *Kirchheim Soetem libri Talmud. parvi Hierosol* pp. 12-17.
- ft203 St. ^{<B15>}Matthew 23:5; Ber. 1:3; Shabb. 6:2; 7:3; 16:1; Er. 10:1, 2; Sheq. 3:2; Meg. 1:8; 4:8; Moed. Q. 3:4; Sanh. 11:3; Men. 3:7; 4:1; Kel. 18:8; Miqv. 10:3; yad. 3:3. Comp. *Kirchheim*, *Tract. Tephillin*, u. s. pp. 18-21.
- ft204 Moed K. 3:4; Eduy. 4:10; Men. 3:7; 4:1. Comp. *Kirchheim*, *Tract. Tsitsith*, u. s. pp. 22-24.
- ft205 The *Tephillin* enclosed a transcript of ^{<B10>}Exodus 13:1-10, 11-16; ^{<B104>}Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21. The *Tsitsith* were worn in obedience to the injunction in ^{<B57>}Numbers 15:37 etc.; ^{<B22>}Deuteronomy 22:12 (comp. St. ^{<B103>}Matthew 9:20; 14:36; St. ^{<B57>}Mark 5:27; St. ^{<B104>}Luke 8:44).
- ft206 It is remarkable that *Aristeas* seems to speak only of the phylacteries on the arm, and *Philo* of those for the head, while the *LXX.* takes the command entirely in a metaphorical sense. This has already been pointed out in that book of gigantic learning, *Spencer*, *De Leg. Hebrews* p. 1213. *Frankel* (*Uber d. Einfl. d. Pal. Exeg.*, pp. 89, 90) tries in vain to controvert the statement. The insufficiency of his arguments has been fully shown by *Herzfeld* (*Gesch. d. Volk. Isr.* vol. 3 p. 224).
- ft207 συναγωγή *Jos. Ant.* 19:6. 3; War, 2:14. 4, 5; 7:3. 3; *Philo*, *Quod omnis probus liber*, ed. Mangey, 2:p. 458; συναγωγήιον *Philo*, *Ad Caj.* 2 p. 591; σαββατεῖον *Jos. Ant.* 16:6. 2; σευκτήριον *Philo*, *Vita Mosis*, lib. 3, 2 p. 168.

- ft208 **προσευχή** *Jos. Ant.* 14:10 23, *Life* 54; *Philo*, *In Flacc.* 2 p. 523; *Ad Caj.* 2 pp. 565, 596; *Epiphan.* *Haer.* 130. 1. *Comp. Juven. Sat.* 3:296: ‘Ede ubi consistas? in qua te quaero proseucha?’
- ft209 *Comp.*, among others, *Ovid*, *Ars Amat.* 1:76; *Juv. Sat.* 16:96, 97; *Hor. Sat.* 1:5. 100; 9. 70; *Suet.* *Aug.* 93.
- ft210 *Persius* 5:180.
- ft211 *Comp. Jos. Ant.* 14:7. 2; 16:6, *passium*; *Philo*, *De Monarchia*, ed. Mangey, 2 p. 224; *Ad Caj.* 2 p. 568; *Contra Flacc.* 2 p. 524.
- ft212 *Philo*, *De Monarchia*, 2 p. 223.
- ft213 *Philo*, in a fragment preserved in *Euseb., Praepar. Ev.* 8:13. What the Temple was in the estimation of Israel,
- ft214 Even Maimonides, in spite of his desire to minimize the Messianic expectancy, admits this.
- ft215 This is the tenth of the eighteen (or rather nineteen) benedictions in the daily prayers. Of these the first and the last three are certainly the oldest. But this tenth also dates from before the destruction of Jerusalem. *Comp. Zunz*, *Gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden*, p. 368.
- ft216 *Comp. Jer. Sanh.* 10:6; *Sanh.* 110 b: *Yalk. Shim.*
- ft217 The suggestion is made by *Castelli*, *Il Messia*, p. 253.
- ft218 Notably in connection with ^{<212>}Exodus 12:42 (both in the *Pseudo-Jon.* and *Jer. Targum*); ^{<213>}Numbers 24:7 (*Jer. Targ.*); ^{<214>}Deuteronomy 30:4 (*Targ. Ps.-Jon.*); ^{<215>}Isaiah 14:29; ^{<216>}Jeremiah 33:13; ^{<217>}Hosea 14:7; ^{<218>}Zechariah 10:6. Dr. *Drummond*, in his ‘Jewish Messiah,’ p. 335, quotes from the Targum on Lamentations. But this dates from long after the Talmudic period.
- ft219 As each sentence which follows would necessitate one or more references to different works, the reader, who may be desirous to verify the statements in the text, is generally referred to *Castelli*, u. s. pp. 251-255.
- ft220 The fiction of two Messiahs, one the Son of David, the other the Son of Joseph, the latter being connected with the restoration of the ten tribes, has been conclusively shown to be the post-Christian date (comp. *Schottgen*, *Horae Hebr.* 1 p. 359; and *Wunsche*, *Leiden d. Mess.* p. 109). Possibly it was invented to find an explanation for ^{<220>}Zechariah 12:10 (comp. *Succ.* 52 a), just as the Socinian doctrine of

the assumption of Christ into heaven at the beginning of His ministry was invented to account for St. ~~«RBI»~~ John 3:13.

ft221 *Maurice Vernes* (Hist. des Idees Messian. pp. 43-119) maintains that the writers of Enoch and Or. Sib. 3 expected this period under the rule of the Maccabees, and regarded one of them as the Messiah. It implies a peculiar reading of history, and a lively imagination, to arrive at such a conclusion.

ft222 The doctrinal part of IV. Esdras may be said to be saturated with the dogma of original sin, which is wholly foreign to the theology alike of Rabbinic and Hellenistic Judaism. Comp. *Vis.* 1 ch. 3:21, 22; 4:30, 38; *Vis.* 3 ch. 6, 18, 19 (ed. Fritzsche, p. 607); 33-41; 7:46-48; 8:34-35.

ft223 It almost seems as if there were a parallelism between this book and the Epistle to the Romans, which in its dogmatic part, seems successively to take up these three subjects, although from quite another point of view. How different the treatment is, need not be told.

ft224 The better reading is 'in tempore diei ejus. (v. 52).'

ft225 In Sanh. 110 *b* we read, 'Our Rabbis teach, that the Ten Tribes have no part in the era to come, because it is written "The Lord drave them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land." "The Lord drave them from their land" — in the present era — "and cast them into another land" — in the era to come.' In curious agreement with this, Pseudo-Baruch writes to the nine and a half tribes to 'prepare their hearts to that which they had formerly believed,' lest they should suffer 'in both eras (ab utroque saeculo),' being led captive in the one, and tormented in the other (Apoc. Bar. 88:8).

ft226 Thus, for example, the assertion that there had been individuals who fulfilled the commandments of God, *Vis.* 1 ch. 3:36; the domain of reason, 4:22; 5:9; general Messianic blessings to the world at large, *Vis.* 1 ch. 4:27, 28; the idea of a law within their minds, like that of which St. Paul speaks in the case of the heathen, *Vis.* 3 ch. 6:45-47 (ed. Fritzsche, p. 609). These are only instances, and we refer besides to the general cast of the reasoning.

ft227 The following cities probably formed the *Decapolis*, though it is difficult to feel quite sure in reference to one or the other of them: Damascus, Philadelphia, Raphana, Scythopolis, Gadara, Hippos Dion,

Pella, Gerasa, and Canatha. On these cities, comp. *Caspari*, Chronol. Geogr. Einl. in d. Leben J. Christ, pp. 83-90.

ft228 Herod rebuilt or built other cities, such as Antipatris, Cypros, Phasaelis, Anthedon, etc. Schurer describes the two first as *built*, but they were only rebuilt or fortified (comp. Ant. 13:15. 1; War 1:21. 8.) by Herod.

ft229 He also rebuilt Sepphoris.

ft230 Comp. on the subject of the civic institutions of the Roman Empire, *Kuhn*, Die Stadt. u. burgerl. Verf. d. Romans Reichs, 2 vols.; and for this part. vol. 2 pp. 336-354, and pp. 370-372.

ft231 A good sketch of the various rites prevailing in different places is given by *Schurer*, Neutest. Zeitg. pp. 378-385.

ft232 Comp. *Weiseler*, Beitr. z richt. Wur dig. d. Evang. pp. 90 91.

ft233 The Actian games took place every fifth year, three years always intervening. The games in Jerusalem were held in the year 28 B.C. (*Jos.* Ant. 15:8. 1); the first games in Caesarea in the year 12 B.C. (Ant. 16:5. 1; comp. War. 1:21. 8).

ft234 For a full statement of the Talmudical views as to images, representations on coins, and the most ancient Jewish coins, see Appendix III.

ft235 Comp. here the interesting tractate of Dr. *Bodek*, 'Marc. Aur. Anton. als Freund u. Zeitgenosse des R. Jehuda ha Nasi.'

ft236 The *Athid labho*, 'saeculum futurum,' to be distinguished from the *Olam habba*, 'the world to come.'

ft237 Ab. Z. 22 *b*. But as in what follows the quotations would be too numerous, they will be omitted. Each statement, however, advanced in the text or notes is derived from part of the Talmudic tractate Abodah Zarah.

ft238 The Talmud declares it only lawful if done to avoid exciting hatred against the Jews.

ft239 There is a well-known story told of a Rabbi who was bitten by a serpent, and about to be cured by the invocation of the name of Jesus by a Jewish Christian, which was, however, interdicted.

ft240 Yet, such is the moral obliquity, that even idolatry is allowed to save life, provided it be done in secret!

ft241 Against this, although somewhat doubtfully, such concessions may be put as that, outside Palestine, Gentiles were not to be considered as idolators, but as observing the customs of their fathers (Chull. 13 *b*), and that the poor of the Gentiles were to be equally supported with those of Israel, their sick visited, and their dead buried; it being, however, significantly added, ‘on account of the arrangements of the world’ (Gitt. 61 *a*). The quotation so often made (Ab. Z. 3 *a*), that a Gentile who occupied himself with the Torah was to be regarded as equal to the High-Priest, proves nothing, since in the case supposed the Gentile acts like a Rabbinic Jew. But, and this is a more serious point, it is difficult to believe that those who make this quotation are not aware, how the Talmud (Ab. Z. 3 *a*) immediately labors to prove that their reward is *not* equal to that of Israelites. A somewhat similar charge of one-sidedness, if not of unfairness, must be brought against *Deutsch* (Lecture on the Talmud, Remains, pp. 146, 147), whose sketch of Judaism should be compared, for example, with the first Perek of the Talmudic tractate Abodah Zarah.

ft242 According to R. Asi, there was a threefold distinction. If wine had been dedicated to an idol, to carry, even on a stick, so much as the weight of an olive of it, defiled a man. Other wine, if prepared by a heathen, was prohibited, whether for personal use or for trading. Lastly, wine prepared by a Jew, but deposited in custody of a Gentile, was prohibited for personal use, but allowed for traffic.

ft243 The title *Rabbon* (*our* Master) occurs first in connection with Gamaliel 1 (Acts 5:34). The N.T. expression *Rabboni* or *Rabbouni* (St. Mark 10:51; St. John 20:16) takes the word *Rabbon* or *Rabban* (here in the absolute sense)= *Rabh*, and adds to it the personal suffix ‘my,’ pronouncing the *Kamez* in the Syriac manner.

ft244 Not 45 *a*, as apud *Derenbourg*. Similarly, his rendering ‘litteralement, “citerne vide”’ seems to me erroneous.

ft245 The distinction between ‘Pharisees’ and ‘Scribes,’ is marked in many passages in the N.T., for example, St. Matthew 23 *passim*; St. Luke 7:30; 14:3; and especially in St. Luke 11:43, comp. with 5:46. The words ‘Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites,’ in ver. 44, are, according to all evidence, spurious.

- ^{ft246} In Ned. 4:3 this is the actual division. Of course, in another sense the Midrash might be considered as the source of both the Halakhah and the Haggadah.
- ^{ft247} Very strange and ungrounded conjectures on this subject have been hazarded, which need not here find a place. Comp. for ex. the two articles of *Gratz* in *Frankel's* Montsschrift for 1857, pp. 31 etc. 61 etc., the main positions of which have, however, been adopted by some learned English writers.
- ^{ft248} The Talmudic notices are often inconsistent. The number as given in them amounts to about 120. But the modern doubts (of *Kuenen* and others) against the institution itself cannot be sustained.
- ^{ft249} Zunz has well pointed out that, if in Ab. 1 4 the first 'couple' is said to have 'received from them' — while only Antigonus is mentioned in the preceding Mishnah, it must imply Antigonus and his unnamed disciples and followers. In general, I may take this opportunity of stating that, except for special reasons, I shall not refer to previous writers on this subject, partly because it would necessitate too many quotations, but chiefly because the line of argument I have taken differs from that of my predecessors.
- ^{ft250} See Appendix IV.: 'Political History of the Jews from the Reign of Alexander to the Accession of Herod.'
- ^{ft251} At the same time some kind of ruling λερουσιᾶ existed earlier than at this period, if we may judge from *Jos. Ant.* 12:3.3. But he uses the term somewhat vaguely, applying it even to the time of Jaddua (*Ant.* 11:8.2).
- ^{ft252} Even *Ber. 48 a* furnishes evidence of this 'enmity.' On the hostile relations between the Pharisaical party and the Maccabees see *Hamburger*, *Real-Enc.* 2 page 367. Comp. *Jer. Traan* 4:5.
- ^{ft253} *Derenbourg* takes a different view, and identifies the tribunal of the Asmoneans with the Sanhedrin. This seems to me, historically, impossible. But his opinion to that effect (u. s. p. 87) is apparently contradicted at p. 93.
- ^{ft254} *Schurer*, following *Wieseler*, supposes the Sanhedrin to have been of Roman institution. But the arguments of *Wieseler* on this point (*Beitr. zur richt. Wurd. d. Evang.* p. 224) are inconclusive.
- ^{ft255} Comp. *Derenbourg*, u. s. p. 95.

ft256 Thus we read: 'The sayings of the elders have more weight than those of the prophets' (Jer. Ber. 1:7); 'an offence against the sayings of the Scribes is worse than one against those of Scripture' (Sanh. 11:3). Compare also Er. 21 *b* The comparison between such claims and those sometimes set up on behalf of 'creeds' and 'articles' (*Kitto's Cyclop.*, 2nd ed., p. 786, col *a*) does not seem to me applicable. In the introduction to the Midr. on Lament. it is inferred from ~~3492~~ Jeremiah 9:12, 13, that to forsake the law, in the Rabbinic sense, was worse than idolatry, uncleanness, or the shedding of blood. See generally that Introduction.

ft257 It is so explained in the *Aruch* (ed *Landau*, vol. 2 p. 529, col *b*).

ft258 Comp. *Hamburger*, u.s. p 343.

ft259 Comp. here especially the detailed description by *Herzfeld* (u. s. vol. 3 pp. 226, 263); also the Introduction of Maimonides, and the very able and learned works (not sufficiently appreciated) by Dr. *H. S. Hirschfeld*, *Halachische Exegese* (Berlin, 1840), and *Hagadische Exegese* (Berlin, 1847). Perhaps I may also take leave to refer to the corresponding chapters in my 'History of the Jewish Nation.'

ft260 Similarly, the expressions in ~~102312~~ Exodus 23:12 were thus explained: 'the tables of stone,' the ten commandments; the 'law', the written Law; the 'commandments,' the Mishnah; 'which I have written,' the Prophets and Hagiographa; 'that thou mayest teach them,' the Talmud — 'which shows that they were all given to Moses on Sinai' (Ber. 5 *a*, lines 11-16).

ft261 Another reason also is, however, mentioned for his prohibition.

ft262 *Hirschfeld*, u. s. pp. 92-99.

ft263 From ~~dms~~ to lean against. At the same time the ordinances, for which an appeal could be made to *Asmakhta*, were better liked than those which rested on tradition alone (Jer. Chag. p. 76, col *d*).

ft264 In connection with this it is very significant that R. Jochanan ben Zaccai, who taught not many years after the Crucifixion of Christ, was wont to say, that, in the future, Halakhahs in regard to purity, which had not the support of Scripture, would be repeated (Sot. 27 *b*, line 16 from top).

ft265 But this is not always.

^{ft266} To elucidate the meaning of Christ, it seemed necessary to submit an avowedly difficult text to fresh criticism. I have taken the word κινεῖν *moveo* in the sense of *ire facio* (*Grimm*, *Clavis N.T.* ed. 2^{da}, p. 241 *a*), but I have not adopted the inference of *Meyer* (*Krit. Exeget. Handb.* p. 455). In classical Greek also κινεῖν is used for ‘to remove, to alter.’ My reasons against what may be called the traditional interpretation of St. ^{421B}Matthew 23:3, 4, are: 1. It seems scarcely possible to suppose that, before such an audience, Christ would have contemplated the possibility of not observing either of the two first classes of Halakhoth, which were regarded as beyond controversy. 2. It could scarcely be truthfully charged against the Scribes and Pharisees, that they did not attempt to keep themselves the ordinances which they imposed upon others. The expression in the parallel passage (St. ^{414B}Luke 11:46) must be explained in accordance with the commentation on St. ^{421B}Matthew 23:4. Nor is there any serious difficulty about it.

^{ft267} For the classification, arrangement, origin, and enumeration of these Halakhoth, see Appendix V.: ‘Rabbinic Theology and literature.’

^{ft268} See the learned remarks of *Levy* about the reasons for the earlier prohibition of writing down the oral law, and the final collection of the Mishnah (*Neuhebr. u. Chald. Worterb.* vol. 2 p. 435).

^{ft269} These collections are enumerated in the Midrash on ^{212B}Ecclesiastes 12:3. They are also distinguished as ‘the former’ and ‘the later’ Mishnah (*Nedar.* 91 *a*).

^{ft270} The first ‘Order’ (*Zeraim*, ‘seeds’) begins with the ordinances concerning ‘benedictions,’ or the time, mode, manner, and character of the prayers prescribed. It then goes on to detail what may be called the religio-agrarian laws (such as tithing, Sabbatical years, first fruits, etc.). The second ‘Order’ (*Moed*, ‘festive time’) discusses all connected with the Sabbath observance and the other festivals. The third ‘Order’ (*Nashim*, ‘women’) treats of all that concerns betrothal, marriage and divorce, but also includes a tractate on the Nasirate. The fourth ‘Order’ (*Neziqin*, ‘damages’) contains the civil and criminal law. Characteristically, it includes all the ordinances concerning idol-worship (in the tractate *Abhodah Zarah*) and ‘the sayings of the Fathers’ (*Abhoth*). The fifth ‘Order’ (*Qodashim*, ‘holy things’) treats of the various classes of sacrifices, offerings, and things belonging (as the first-born), or dedicated, to God, and of all questions which can be grouped under ‘sacred things’ (such as the redemption, exchange, or

alienation of what had been dedicated to God). It also includes the laws concerning the daily morning and evening service (*Tamid*), and a description of the structure and arrangements of the Temple (*Middoth*, 'the measurements'). Finally, the sixth 'Order' (*Toharoth*, 'cleannesses') gives every ordinance connected with the questions of 'clean and unclean,' alike as regards human beings, animals, and inanimate things.

ft271 Comp. the very interesting tractate by Dr. *Brull* (Fremdspr Redensart in d. Talmud), as well as Dr. *Eisler's* Beitrage z. Rabb. u. Alterthumsk., 3 fascic; *Sachs*, Beitr. z. Rabb u. Alterthumsk.

ft272 Comp. the enumeration in *Pinner*, u. s.

ft273 *Talmud*: that which is learned, doctrine. *Gemara*: either the same, or else 'perfection,' 'completion.'

ft274 The following will explain our meaning: On the *first* 'order' we have the Jerusalem Talmud complete, that is, on every tractate (comprising in all 65 folio leaves), while the Babylon Talmud extends only over its first tractate (*Berakhoth*). On the *second* order, the four last chapters of one tractate (*Shabbath*) are wanting in the *Jerusalem*, and one whole tractate (*Sheqalim*) in the *Babylon* Talmud. The *third* order is complete in both Gemaras. On the *fourth* order a chapter is wanting in one tractate (*Makkoth*) in the *Jerusalem*, and two whole tractates (*Eduyoth* and *Abhoth*) in both Gemaras. The *fifth* order is wholly wanting in the *Jerusalem*, and two and a half tractates of it (*Middoth*, *Quinnim*, and half *Talmud*) in the *Babylon* Talmud. Of the sixth order only one tractate (*Niddah*) exists in both Gemaras. The principal Halakhoth were collected in a work (dating from about 800 A.D.) entitled *Halakhoth Gedoloth*. They are arranged to correspond with the weekly lectionary of the Pentateuch in a work entitled *Sheeltoth* ('Questions:' best ed. *Dghernfurth*, 1786). The Jerusalem Talmud extends over 39, the Babylonian over 36 1/2 tractates, 15 1/2 tractates have no Gemara at all.

ft275 The last ten chapters curiously group together events or things under numerals from 10 downwards. The most generally interesting of these is that of the 10 *Nequdoth*, or passages of Scripture in which letters are marked by dots, together with the explanation of their reasons (ch. 34.). The whole Boraitha seems composed of parts of three different

works, and consists of forty (or forty-one) chapters, and occupies ten folio leaves.

ft276 In twenty-one chapters, each containing a number of Halakhahs, and occupying in all four folio leaves.

ft277 In fourteen chapters, occupying rather more than three folio leaves.

ft278 It fills little more than a folio page.

ft279 In eleven chapters, covering about 1 3/4 folio leaves.

ft280 In nine chapters, filling one folio leaf.

ft281 Little more than a folio column.

ft282 Besides these, *Raphael Kirchheim* has published (Frankfort, 1851) the so-called seven smaller tractates, covering altogether, with abundant notes, only forty-four small pages, which treat of the copying of the Bible (*Sepher Torah*, in five chapters), of the *Mezuzah*, or memorial on the doorposts (in two chapters), of *Phylacteries*, (*Tephillin*, in one chapter), of the *Tsitsith*, or memorial-fringes (in one chapter), of *Slaves* (*Abhadim*, in three chapters) of the *Cutheans*, or Samaritans (in two chapters), and, finally, a curious tractate on *Proselytes* (*Gerim*, in four chapters).

ft283 Thus, in B. Mez. 86 *a*, we read of a discussion in the heavenly Academy on the subject of purity, when Rabbah was summoned to heaven by death, although this required a miracle, since he was constantly engaged in sacred study. Shocking to write, it needed the authority of Rabbah to attest the correctness of the Almighty's statement on the Halakhic question discussed.

ft284 Some of these miracles are detailed in B. Mets. 85 *b*. 86 *a*. Thus Resh Lakish when searching for the tomb of R. Chija, found that it was miraculously removed from his eye sight, as being too sacred for ordinary eyes. The same Rabbi claimed such merit, that for his sake the Law should never be forgotten in Israel. Such was the power of the patriarchs that, if they had been raised up together, they would have brought Messiah before His time. When R. Chija prayed, successively a storm arose, the rain descended, and the earth trembled. Again, Rabbah, when about to be arrested, caused the face of the messenger to be turned to his back, and again restored it; next, by his prayer he made a wall burst, and so escaped. In Abhod. Zar. 17 *b*, a miracle is recorded in favor of R. Eleazar, to set him free from his persecutors, or rather, to

attest a false statement which he made in order to escape martyrdom. For further extravagant praises of the Rabbis, comp. Sanh. 101 a.

ft285 Similarly we read in Aboth d. R. Nathan 29: 'He who is master of the Midrash, but knows no Halakhans, is like a hero, but there are no arms in his hand. He that is master of the Halakhoth, but knows nothing of the Midrashim, is a weak person who is provided with both arms. But he that is master of both is both a hero and armed.

ft286 Most of these, of course, are from the Pentateuch. References to any other Old Testament books are generally loosely made, and serve chiefly as *points d'appui* for Rabbinical sayings. Scriptural quotations occur in 51 out of the 63 tractates of the Mishnah, the number of verses quoted being 430. A quotation in the Mishnah is generally introduced by the formula 'as it is said' This in all but sixteen instances where the quotation is prefaced by 'Scripture means to say.' But, in general the difference in the mode of quotation in the Rabbinic writings seems to depend partly on the context, but chiefly on the place and time. Thus, 'as it is written' is a Chaldee mode of quotation. Half the quotations in the Talmud are prefaced by 'it is said' a fifth of them by 'as it is written;' a tenth by 'Scripture means as to say;' and the remaining fifth by various other formulas. Comp. *Pinner's* Introduction to Berakhoth. In the Jerusalem Talmud no *al-tikre* ('read not so, but read so') occurs, for the purposes for textual criticism. In the Talmud a favorite mode of quoting from the Pentateuch made in about 600 passages, is by introducing it as spoken or written by < *anmhr* >. The various modes in which Biblical quotations are made in Jewish writings are enumerated in *Surenhusis* Βιβλος καταλλαγῆς pp. 1-56.

ft287 For details on the Jewish views on the Canon, and historical and mystical theology, see Appendix V.: 'Rabbinic Theology and Literature.'

ft288 I do not here reckon the brief reign of King Agrippa.

ft289 It will be seen that, with the most recent explorers, I locate Mount Zion not on the traditional site, on the western hill of Jerusalem, but on the eastern, south of the Temple area.

ft290 It is, to say the least, doubtful, whether the numeral 50 cubits (75 feet), which Josephus assigns to this rock (War 5:5. 8), applies to its height (comp. *Speiss*, Das Jerus. d. *Jos.*p. 66).

- ft291 I must take leave to refer to the description of Jerusalem, and especially of the Temple, in the 'Temple and its Services at the Time of Jesus Christ.'
- ft292 Dr. *Muhlau*, in Riehm's Handwörterb. Part 8 p. 682 *b*, speaks of the dimensions of the old Sanctuary as little more than those of a village church.
- ft293 It was only finished in 64 A.D., that is, six years before its destruction.
- ft294 See *Conder*, Heth and Moab, p. 94.
- ft295 Such as the Palace of Grapte, and that of Queen Helena of Adiabene.
- ft296 Comp. *Herzfeld's* Handelsgesch.
- ft297 Ancient Jerusalem is supposed to have covered about double the area of the modern city. Comp. Dr. *Schick* in *A.M. Luncz*, 'Jerusalem,' for 1882.
- ft298 Although Jerusalem covered only about 300 acres, yet, from the narrowness of Oriental streets, it would hold a very much larger population than any Western city of the same extent. Besides, we must remember that its ecclesiastical boundaries extended beyond the city.
- ft299 On the question of officially fixing the market-price, diverging opinions are expressed, Baba B. 89 *b*. It was thought that the market-price should leave to the producer a profit of one-sixth on the cost (Baba B. 90 *a*). In general, the laws on these subjects form a most interesting study. *Bloch* (Mos. Talm. Polizeir.) holds, that there were two classes of market-officials. But this is not supported by sufficient evidence, nor, indeed, would such an arrangement seem likely.
- ft300 That of Botnah was the largest, Jer. Ab. Z. 39 *d*.
- ft301 Compare here generally *Unruh*, D. alte Jerusalem.
- ft302 Tradition exaggerates their number as 460 (Jer. Kethub. 35 *c*.) or even 480 (Jer. Meg. 73 *d*). But even the large number (proportionally to the size of the city) mentioned in the text need not surprise us when we remember that *ten* men were sufficient to form a Synagogue, and how many — what may be called 'private' — Synagogues exist at present in every town where there is a large and orthodox Jewish population.
- ft303 The occasion is said to have been, that the Rabbis, in answer to Herod's question, quoted ^{<67/5>}Deuteronomy 17:15. Baba ben Buta

himself is said to have escaped the slaughter, indeed, but to have been deprived of his eyes.

ft304 For a fuller sketch of this history see Appendix IV.

ft305 So *Schurer* in his *Neutestam. Zeitgesch.*

ft306 A table of the Maccabean and Herodian families is given in Appendix VI.

ft307 By dashing out his brains against the prison walls.

ft308 He had previously been married to one Doris, the issue of the marriage being a son, Antipater.

ft309 Comp. the discussion of this question in *Wieseler*, Beitr. pp. 215 etc.

ft310 Even their recorded fundamental principles bear this out. That of Shemajah was: 'Love labor, hate lordship, and do not push forward to the authorities.' That of Abtalion was: 'Ye sages, be careful in your words, lest perchance ye incur banishment, and are exiled to a place of bad waters, and the disciples who follow you drink of them and die, and so in the end the name of God be profaned.'

ft311 On Hillel and Shammai see the article in *Herzog's Real-Encyklop.*; that in *Hamburger's Delitzsch*, Jesus u. Hillel. and books on Jewish history generally.

ft312 A number of points on which the ordinances of Hillel were more severe than those of Shammai are enumerated in Eduj. 4:1-12; 5:1-4; Ber. 36 a, end. Comp. also Ber. R. 1.

ft313 On the chronology of the life of Hillel etc., see also *Schmilg*, Ueb. d. Entsteh. etc. der Megillath Taanith, especially p. 34. Hillel is said to have become Chief of the Sanhedrin in 30 B.C., and to have held the office for forty years. These numbers, however, are no doubt somewhat exaggerated.

ft314 The police laws of the Rabbis might well serve us as a model for all similar legislation.

ft315 At the same time I can scarcely agree with *Delitzsch* and others, that this was the dialect called *Sursi*. The latter was rather Syriac. Comp. *Levy*, ad voc.

ft316 Professor *Roberts* has advocated, with great ingenuity, the view that Christ and His Apostles used the Greek language. See especially his 'Discussions on the Gospels.' The Roman Catholic Church sometimes

maintained, that Jesus and His disciples spoke Latin, and in 1822 a work appeared by *Black* to prove that the N.T. Greek showed a Latin origin.

^{ft317} For a full statement of the arguments on this subject we refer the student to *Bohl*, Forsch. n. e. Volksbibel z. Zeit Jesu, pp. 4-28; to the latter work by the same writer (Aittestam. Citate im N. Test.); to a very interesting article by Professor *Delitzsch* in the 'Daheim' for 1874 (No. 27); to *Buxtorf*, sub Gelil; to *J. D. Goldberg*, 'The Language of Christ'; but especially to *G. de Rossi*, Della lingua prop. di Cristo (Parma 1772).

^{ft318} Thus Hillel was said to have hired a horse, and even an outrunner, for a decayed rich man.

^{ft319} See the Introduction to the Midrash on Lamentations. But some of the descriptions are so painful — even blasphemous — that we do not venture on quotation.

^{ft320} We presume, that the ministration of Zacharias (St. ~~1009~~ Luke 1:9) took place in the morning, as the principal service. But *Meyer* (Komm. 1:2, p. 242) is mistaken in supposing, that this follows from the reference to the lot. It is, indeed, true that, of the four lots for the priestly functions, three took place only in the morning. But that for incensing was repeated in the evening (Yoma 26 a). Even Bishop *Haneberg* (Die Relig. Alterth. p. 609) is not accurate in this respect.

^{ft321} For a description of the details of that service, see 'The Temple and its Services,' etc.

^{ft322} If we reckon the total number in the twenty-four courses of, presumably, the officiating priesthood, at 20,000, according to Josephus (Ag. Ap. 2:8), which is very much below the exaggerated Talmudic computation of 85,000 for the smallest course (Jer. Taan. 69 a), and suppose, that little more than one-third of each course had come up for duty, this would give fifty priests for each week-day, while on the Sabbath the whole course would be on duty. This is, of course, considerably more than the number requisite, since, except for the incensing priest, the lot for the morning also held good for the evening sacrifice.

^{ft323} Yoma 26 a. The designation 'rich' is derived from the promise which, in ~~1591~~ Deuteronomy 33:11, follows on the service referred to in verse 10. But probably a spiritual application was also intended.

- ft324 The so-called *Shema*, consisting of ~~<R04>~~ Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21; ~~<M57>~~ Numbers 15:37-41.
- ft325 The question of this date is, of course, intimately connected with that of the Nativity of Christ, and could therefore not be treated in the text. It is discussed in Appendix VII.: 'On the Date of the Nativity of our Lord.'
- ft326 This was the eighth course in the original arrangement (~~<B40>~~ 1 Chronicles 24:10).
- ft327 According to St. ~~<B00>~~ Luke 1:7, they were both 'well stricken in years.' But from Aboth v. 21 we learn, that sixty years was considered 'the commencement of agedness.'
- ft328 According to tradition, about one-fourth of the priesthood was resident in Jericho. But, even limiting this to those who were in the habit of officiating, the statement seems greatly exaggerated.
- ft329 Comp. Ber. 44 *a*; Pes. 49 *a*; Vayyikra R. 4.
- ft330 **δίκαιος** — of course not in the strict sense in which the word is sometimes used, especially by St. Paul, but as *pious et bonus*. See *Vorstius* (De Hebraism. N.T. pp. etc.). As the account of the Evangelist seems derived from an original Hebrew source, the word must have corresponded to that of *Tsaddiq* in the then popular signification.
- ft331 **ἐντολαὶ** and **δικαλώματα** evidently mark an essential division of the Law at the time. But it is almost impossible to determine their exact Hebrew equivalents. The LXX. render by these two terms not always the same Hebrew words. Comp. ~~<B05>~~ Genesis 26:5 with ~~<R04>~~ Deuteronomy 4:40. They cannot refer to the division of the law into affirmative (248) and prohibitive (365) commandments.
- ft332 There is, perhaps, no point on which the Rabbinic Law is more explicit or stringent than on that of tenderest regard for the feelings of others, especially of the poor.
- ft333 For the prayers offered by the people during the incensing, see 'The Temple,' pp. 139, 140.
- ft334 The following extract from Yalkut (vol. 1 p. 113 *d*, close) affords a curious illustration of this Divine communication from beside the altar of incense: 'From what place did the Shekhinah speak to Moses? R. Nathan said: From the altar of incense, according to ~~<B05>~~ Exodus 30:6. Simeon ben Asai said: From the side of the altar of incense.'

- ft335 According to the Talmud, Ishmael once went into the innermost Sanctuary, when he had a vision of God, Who called upon the priest to pronounce a benediction. The token of God's acceptance had better not be quoted.
- ft336 Instances of an analogous kind frequently occur in the Apocryphal Gospels.
- ft337 On the different classes of Nazarites, see 'The Temple, etc.,' pp. 322-331.
- ft338 The word **fwrh** or 'idiot,' when conjoined with 'priest' ordinarily means a common priest, in distinction to the High priest. But the word unquestionably also signifies vulgar, ignorant, and illiterate. See Jer. Sot. 21 *b*, line 3 from bottom; Sanh. 21 *b*. Comp. also Meg. 12 *b*; Ber. R. 96.
- ft339 According to Sanh. 90 *b*, such an one was not even allowed to get the Terumah.
- ft340 Two other Angels are mentioned, but not named, in ~~<7013>~~ Daniel 10:13, 20.
- ft341 The Jewish ideas and teaching about angels are fully given in Appendix 13: 'Jewish Angelology and Demonology.'
- ft342 All the Rabbinic traditions about 'Elijah as the Forerunner of the Messiah' are collated in Appendix 8.
- ft343 I should, however, remark, that that very curious chapter on Repentance, in the Pirke de R. Elieser (c. 43), closes with these words: 'And Israel will not make great repentance till Elijah, his memory for blessing!, come, as it is said, ~~<3006>~~ Malachi 4:6,' etc. From this isolated and enigmatic sentence, Professor *Delitzsch*'s implied inference (Zeitschr. fur Luther. Theol. 1875, p. 593) seems too sweeping.
- ft344 Terrible as it may sound, it is certainly the teaching of Rabbinism, that God occupied so many hours every day in the study of the Law. Comp. Targ. Ps.-Jonathan on ~~<5304>~~ Deuteronomy 32:4, and Abhod. Z. 3 *b*. Nay, Rabbinism goes farther in its daring, and speaks of the Almighty as arrayed in a white dress, or as occupying himself by day with the study of the Bible, and by night with that of the six tractates of the Mishnah. Comp. also the Targum on Cant. 5:10.
- ft345 The object which the Evangelists had in view was certainly not that of biography, even as the Old Testament contains no biography. The

twofold object of their narratives is indicated by St. ~~ⲓⲛⲁⲓ~~ Luke 1:4, and by St. ~~ⲓⲛⲁⲓ~~ John 20:31.

ft346 The name *Nazareth* may best be regarded as the equivalent of *trxn* 'watch' or 'watcheress.' The name does not occur in the Talmud, nor in those Midrashim which have been preserved. But the elegy of Eleazar ha Kallir, written before the close of the Talmud — in which Nazareth is mentioned as a Priest-center, is based upon an ancient Midrash, now lost (comp. *Neubauer*, Geogr. du Talmud, p. 117, note 5). It is, however, possible, as Dr. Neubauer suggests (u.s. p. 190, note 5), that the name *hnj xn* in Midr. on ~~ⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁⲥⲥⲏⲥ~~ Ecclesiastes 2:8 should read *hnr xn* and refers to Nazareth.

ft347 Comp. the detailed description of these roads, and the references in *Herzog's Real-Encykl.* vol. 15 pp. 160, 161.

ft348 Comp. *Neubauer*, u. s. p. 190. See a detailed account in 'sketches of Jewish Social Life,' etc. p. 36.

ft349 It is strange, that these two circumstances have not been noticed. *Keim* (Jesu von Nazari 1:2, pp. 322, 323) only cursorily refers to the great road which passed through Nazareth.

ft350 The inference, that the expression of Nathanael (St. ~~ⲓⲛⲁⲓ~~ John 1:46) implies a lower state of the people of Nazareth, is unfounded. Even *Keim* points out, that it only marks disbelief that the Messiah would come from such a place.

ft351 Our description of them is derived from notices by *Josephus* (such as War 3:3, 2), and many passages in the Talmud,

ft352 These differences are marked in Pes. 4:5; Keth. 4:12; Ned. 2:4; Chull. 62 *a*; Baba K. 80 *a*; Keth. 12 *a*.

ft353 The reader who wishes to understand what we have only ventured to hint, is referred to the Mishnic tractate Niddah.

ft354 Comp. 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' etc., pp. 152 etc.

ft355 The best defence of this view is that by *Wieseler*, Beitr. zur Wurdig. d. Evang. pp. 133 etc. It is also virtually adopted by *Weiss* (Leben Jesu, vol. 1:1882).

ft356 This view is adopted almost unanimously by modern writers.

ft357 This view is defended with much skill by Mr. *McClellan* in his New Testament, vol. 1 pp. 409-422.

- ft358 So Grotius, Bishop Lord Arthur Hervey, and after him most modern English writers.
- ft359 The Davidic descent of the Virgin-Mother — which is questioned by some even among orthodox interpreters — seems implied in the Gospel (St. ~~<4127>~~ Luke 1:27, 32, 69; 2:4), and an almost necessary inference from such passages as ~~<5108>~~ Romans 1:3; ~~<5108>~~ 2 Timothy 2:8; ~~<5074>~~ Hebrews 7:14. The Davidic descent of Jesus is not only admitted, but elaborately proved — on purely rationalistic grounds — by *Keim* (u. s. pp. 327-329).
- ft360 This is the general view of antiquity.
- ft361 Reference to this union of Levi and Judah in the Messiah is made in the Test. 12 Patriarch., Test. Simeonis 7 (apud *Fabr.* Cod. Pseudepigr. vol. 2 p. 542). Curiously, the great Hillel was also said by some to have descended, through his father and mother, from the tribes of Judah and Levi — all, however, asserting his Davidic origin (comp. Jer. Taan. 4:2; Ber. R. 98 and 33).
- ft362 Comp. *Maimonides*, Yad haChaz Hil. Sanh. 2. The inference would, of course, be the same, whether we suppose Mary's mother to have been the sister-in-law, or the sister, of Elisabeth's father.
- ft363 Comp. 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ,' pp. 143-149. Also the article on 'Marriage' in Cassell's Bible-Educator, vol. 4 pp. 267-270.
- ft364 There was a third mode, by cohabitation; but this was highly disapproved of even by the Rabbis.
- ft365 The assertion of Professor *Wunsche* (Neue Beitr. zur Erlauter. d. Evang. p. 7) that the practice of betrothal was confined exclusively, or almost so, to Judaea, is quite ungrounded. The passages to which he refers (Kethub. 1:5 — not 3 — and especially Keth. 12 *a*) are irrelevant. Keth. 12 *a* marks the simpler and purer customs of Galilee, but does *not* refer to betrothals.
- ft366 I have rendered the Greek χαίρει by the Hebrew שלום ש and for the correctness of it refer the reader to Grimm's remarks on 1 Macc. 10:18 (Exeget. Handb. zu d. Apokryph. 3^{te} Lief. p. 149).
- ft367 *Bengel* aptly remarks, 'Non ut mater gratiae, sed ut filia gratiae.' Even *Jeremy Taylor's* remarks (Life of Christ, ed. Pickering, vol. 1 p. 56)

would here require modification. Following the best critical authorities, I have omitted the words, ‘Blessed art thou among women.’

ft368 We here refer, as an interesting corroboration, to the Targum on ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 45:7 (6 in our A. V.). But this interest is intensely increased when we read it, not as in our editions of the Targum, but as found in a MS. copy of the year 1208 (given by *Levy* in his Targum. Worterb. vol. 1 p. 390 a). Translating it from that reading, the Targum thus renders ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 45:7, ‘Thy throne, O God, in the heaven’ (*Levy* renders, ‘Thy throne from God in heaven,’ but in either case it refers to the throne of the Messiah) ‘is for ever and ever’ (for ‘world without end,’ *yml* [*yml* [‘a rule of righteousness is the rule of Thy kingdom, O Thou King Messiah!’

ft369 In Pirque’ de R. El. c. 11, the same boundless dominion is ascribed to Messiah the King. In that curious passage dominion is ascribed to ‘ten kings,’ the first being God, the ninth the Messiah, and the tenth again God, to Whom the kingdom would be delivered in the end, according to ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 44:6; ~~Zechariah~~ Zechariah 14:9; ~~Ezekiel~~ Ezekiel 34:24, with the result described in ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 52:9.

ft370 Professor *Wunsche*’s quotation is here not exact (u. s. p. 414)

ft371 *Weiss* (Leben Jesu, 1882, vol. 1 p. 213) rightly calls attention to the humility of her self-surrender, when she willingly submitted to what her heart would feel hardest to bear — that of incurring suspicion of her purity in the sight of all.

ft372 So in almost innumerable Rabbinic passages.

ft373 This is answer to the objection, so pertinaciously urged, of inconsistency with the narrative in St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 1:19 etc. It is clear, that Mary went ‘with haste’ to her kinswoman, and that any communication to Joseph *could* only have taken place after that, and after the Angelic prediction was in all its parts confirmed by her visit to Elisabeth. *Jeremy Taylor* (u. s. p. 64) has already arranged the narrative as in the text.

ft374 According to Jewish tradition, the yet unborn infants in their mother’s wombs responded by an Amen to the hymn of praise at the Red Sea. This is supposed to be indicated by the words *larçy rwqmm* (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 68:27; see also the Targum on that verse). Comp. *Keith 7b*

and Sotah 30*b* (last line) and 31*a* through the coarse legendary explanation of R. Tanchuma mars the poetic beauty of the whole.

ft375 The poetic grandeur and the Old Testament cast of the Virgin's hymn (comp. the Song of Hannah, ^{<900>}1 Samuel 2:1-10), need scarcely be pointed out. Perhaps it would read fullest and best by trying to recall what must have been its Hebrew original.

ft376 Weiss, while denying the historical accuracy of much in the Gospel-narrative of it, unhesitatingly accepts the fact of the supernatural birth of Jesus.

ft377 Keim elaborately discusses the origin of what he calls the legend of Christ's supernatural conception. He arrives at the conclusion that it was a *Jewish-Christian* legend — as if a *Jewish* invention of such a 'legend' were not the most unlikely of all possible hypotheses! But negative criticism is at least bound to furnish some historical basis for the origination of such an unlikely legend. Whence was the idea of it first derived? How did it find such ready acceptance in the Church? Weiss has, at considerable length, and very fully, shown the impossibility of its origin either in Jewish or heathen legend.

ft378 I have thus paraphrased the verb παραδειγματίζω rendered in ^{<806>}Hebrews 6:6 'put to an open shame.' Comp. also LXX. ^{<204>}Numbers 25:4; ^{<2432>}Jeremiah 13:22; ^{<2387>}Ezekiel 28:17 (see *Grimm*, *Clavis N.T.* p. 333 b) Archdeacon *Farrar* adopts the reading δειγματίσαι.

ft379 For example, if he had not sufficient witnesses, or if their testimony could be invalidated by any of those provisions in favor of the accused, of which traditionalism had not a few. Thus, as indicated in the text, Joseph might have privately divorced Mary leaving it open to doubt on what ground he had so acted.

ft380 See a former note.

ft381 Thus we read in (*Shocher Tobh*) the Midrash on ^{<1021>}Proverbs 19:21 (closing part; ed. Lemberg. p. 16 *b*) of eight names given to the Messiah, viz. *Yinnon* (^{<927>}Psalm 22:17, 'His name shall sprout [bear sprouts] before the sun;,' comp. also Pirque de R. El. c. 2); *Jehovah*; *Our Righteousness*; *Tsemach* (the Branch, ^{<808>}Zechariah 3:8); *Menachem* (the Comforter, ^{<2508>}Isaiah 51:3); *David* (^{<9850>}Psalm 18:50); *Shiloh* (^{<0490>}Genesis 49:10); *Elijah* (^{<3045>}Malachi 4:5). The Messiah is also called *Anani* (He that cometh in the clouds, ^{<2073>}Daniel 7:13; see

Tanch. Par. Toledo 14); *Chaninah*, with reference to ^{<2463>}Jeremiah 16:13; *the Leprous*, with reference to ^{<2504>}Isaiah 53:4 (Sanh. 96 b). It is a curious instance of the Jewish mode of explaining a meaning by *gimatreya*, or numerical calculation, that they prove *Tsemach* (Branch) and *Menachem* (Comforter) to be the same, because the numerical equivalents of the one word are equal to those of the other: $m=40$ $n=50$ $j=8$ $m=40=138$; $x=90$, $m=40$, $j=8$, $=138$.

^{ft382} Professor *Wunsche* (Erlaut. d. Evang. p. 10) proposes to strike out the words ‘from their sins’ as an un-Jewish interpolation. In answer, it would suffice to point him to the passages on this very subject which he has collated in a previous work: *Die Leiden des Messias*, pp. 63-108. To these I will only add a comment in the Midrash on Cant. 1:14 (ed. Warshau, p. 11 *a* and *b*), where the reference is undoubtedly to the Messiah (in the words of R. Berakhyah, line 8 from bottom; and again in the words of R. Levi, 11 *b*, line 5 from top, etc.). The expression is there explained as meaning ‘He Who makes expiation for the sins of Israel,’ and it is distinctly added that this expiation bears reference to the transgressions and evil deeds of the children of Abraham, for which God provides this Man as the Atonement.

^{ft383} ‘A good king, a fruitful year, and a good dream.’

^{ft384} Rabbi Zera proves this by a reference to ^{<2092>}Proverbs 19:23, the reading *Sabhea* (satisfied) being altered into *Shebha* — both written [bç — while yl y is understood as of spending the night. Ber. 55 *a* to 57 *b* contains a long, and sometimes very coarse, discussion of dreams, giving their various interpretations, rules for avoiding the consequences of evil dreams, etc. The fundamental principle is, that ‘a dream is according to its interpretation’ (Ber. 55 *b*). Such views about dreams would, no doubt, have long been matter of popular belief, before being formally expressed in the Talmud.

^{ft385} The objection, that the account of Joseph and Mary’s immediate marriage is inconsistent with the designation of Mary in St. ^{<005>}Luke 2:5, is sufficiently refuted by the consideration that, in any other case, Jewish custom would not have allowed Mary to travel to Bethlehem in company with Joseph. The expression used in St. ^{<005>}Luke 2:5, must be read in connection with St. ^{<005>}Matthew 1:25.

^{ft386} *Haupt* (Alttestam. Citate in d. vier Evang. pp. 207-215) rightly lays stress on the words, ‘*all this was done.*’ He even extends its reference

to the threefold arrangement of the genealogy by St. Matthew, as implying the ascending splendor of the line of David, its midday glory, and its decline.

ft387 The correct Hebrew equivalent of the expression ‘that it might be fulfilled’ ἵνα πληρωθῇ is not, as *Surenhusius* (Biblos Katallages, p. 151) and other writers have it, *rmanç hm mÿyql* still loss (Wunsche) *bytkr awh arh* but, as Professor Delitzsch renders it, in his new translation of St. Matthew *ta twal ml yy rbd rça*, The difference is important, and Delitzsch’s translation completely established by the similar rendering of the LXX. of ^{<1027>}1 Kings 2:27 and ^{<1872>}2 Chronicles 36:22.

ft388 A critical discussion of ^{<2074>}Isaiah 7:14 would here be out of place; though I have attempted to express my views in the text. (The nearest approach to them is that by *Engelhardt* in the *Zeitschr. für Luth. Theol.* für 1872, Heft iv.). The quotation of St. Matthew follows, with scarcely any variation, the rendering of the LXX. That *they* should have translated the Hebrew *hml* [by *παρθένος*, ‘a Virgin,’ is surely sufficient evidence of the admissibility of such a rendering. The idea that the promised Son was to be either that of Ahaz, or else of the prophet, cannot stand the test of critical investigation (see *Haupt*, u.s., and *Bohl*, *Alttest. Citate im N.T.* pp. 3-6). Our difficulties of interpretation are, in great part, due to the abruptness of Isaiah’s prophetic language, and to our ignorance of surrounding circumstances. *Steinmeyer* ingeniously argues against the mythical theory that, since ^{<2074>}Isaiah 7:14 was *not* interpreted by the ancient Synagogue in a Messianic sense, that passage could not have led to the origination of ‘the legend’ about the ‘Virgin’s Son’ (*Gesch. d. Geb. d. Herrn*, p. 95). We add this further question, *Whence* did it originate?

ft389 Probably the designation of ‘chair’ or ‘throne of Elijah,’ for the chair on which the godparent holding the child sits, and certainly the invocation of Elijah, are of later date. Indeed, the institution of godparents is itself of later origin. Curiously enough, the Council of Terracina, in 1330 had to interdict Christians acting as godparents at circumcision! Even the great Buxtorf acted as godparent in 1619 to a Jewish child, and was condemned to a fine of 100 florins for his offence. See *Low*, *Lebensalter*, p. 86.

ft390 According to *Josephus* (Ag. Ap. 2:26) circumcision was not followed by a feast. But, if this be true, the practice was soon altered, and the feast took place on the eve of circumcision (Jer. Keth. 1:5; B. Kama 80 a; B. Bath. 60 b, etc.). Later Midrashim traced it up to the history of Abraham and the feast at the weaning of Isaac, which they represented as one at circumcision (Pirke d. R. Eliez. 29).

ft391 Wunsche reiterates the groundless objection of Rabbi Low (u. s. p.96), that a family-name was only given in remembrance of the grandfather, *deceased* father, or other member of the family! Strange, that such a statement should ever have been hazarded; stranger still, that it should be repeated after having been fully refuted by Delitzsch. It certainly is contrary to *Josephus* (War 4:3, 9), and to the circumstance that both the father and brother of Josephus bore the name of Mattias. See also Zunz (Z. Gesch. u. Liter. p. 318).

ft392 The reader will find *B. H. Auerbach's* Berith Abraham (with a Hebrew introduction) an interesting tractate on the subject. For another and younger version of these prayers, see *Low*, u. s. p. 102.

ft393 From St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 1:62 we gather, that Zacharias was what the Rabbis understood by, **çrr** — one deaf as well as dumb. Accordingly they communicated with him by **syzmr** 'signs' — as *Delitzsch* correctly renders it: **wykaAl a wzmryw**

ft394 Although almost all modern authorities are against me, I cannot persuade myself that the expression (St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 1:78) rendered 'dayspring' in our A. V. is here not the equivalent of the Hebrew **j mx** 'Branch.' The LXX at any rate rendered **j mx** in ~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah 23:5; ~~Ezekiel~~ Ezekiel 16:7; 17:10; ~~Zechariah~~ Zechariah 3:8; 6:12, by **ἀνατολή** .

ft395 The italics mark the points of correspondence with the hymn of Zacharias. Comp. the best edition of the Jewish Prayer Book (Frankfort, 5601). The Eighteen Eulogies are given in full in the *History of the Jewish Nation*, pp. 363-367.

ft396 The insertion **γάρ** of seems critically established, and gives the fuller meaning.

ft397 In this respect there is deep significance in the Jewish legend (frequently introduced; see, for example, Tanch. 2:99 a; Deb. R. 1), that all the miracles which God had shown to Israel in the wilderness would be done again to redeemed Zion in the 'latter days.'

- ^{ft398} See Appendix IX., where a detailed list is given of all the Old Testament passages which the ancient Synagogue applied Messianically, together with the references to the Rabbinic works where they are quoted.
- ^{ft399} Large as this number is, I do not present the list as complete. Thus, out of the thirty-seven Parashahs constituting the Midrash on Leviticus, no fewer than twenty-five close with an outlook on Messianic times. The same may be said of the close of many of the Parashahs in the Midrashim known as *Pesiqta* and *Tanchuma* (*Zunz*, u.s. pp. 181, 234). Besides, the oldest portions of the Jewish liturgy are full of Messianic aspirations
- ^{ft400} For these, see Appendix IX.
- ^{ft401} This is the view expressed by *all* Jewish dogmatic writers. See also Weber, *Altsynag.* Theol. p. 217.
- ^{ft402} Comp. on the subject. Ber. R. 12-16.
- ^{ft403} In Ber. R., however, it has seemed to me, as if sometimes a mystical and symbolical view of the history of the Fall were insinuated — evil concupiscence being the occasion of it.
- ^{ft404} They are: the shining splendor of his person, even his heels being like suns; his gigantic size, from east to west, from earth to heaven; the spontaneous splendid products of the ground, and of all fruit-trees; an infinitely greater measure of light on the part of the heavenly bodies; and, finally, endless duration of life (Ber. R. 12, ed. Warsh. p. 24 *b*; Ber. R. 21; Sanh. 38 *b*; Chag. 12 *a*; and for their restoration by the Messiah, Bem. R. 13).
- ^{ft405} By a most ingenious theological artifice the sin of the golden calf, and that of David are made matter for thanksgiving; the one as showing that, even if the whole people sinned, God was willing to forgive; the other as proving, that God graciously condescended to each individual sinner, and that to each the door of repentance was open.
- ^{ft406} In the Talmud (Shabb. 55 *a* and *b*) each view is supported in discussion, the one by a reference to ^{<3630>}Ezekiel 18:20, the other to ^{<2002>}Ecclesiastes 9:2 (comp. also Siphre on ^{<1534>}Deuteronomy 32:49). The final conclusion, however, greatly inclines towards the connection between death and the fall (see especially the clear statement in Debar. R. 9, ed. Warsh., p. 20 *a*). This view is also supported by such passages

in the Apocrypha as Wisdom 2:23, 24; 3:1, etc.; while, on the other hand, Eccus. 15:11-17 seems rather to point in a different direction.

ft407 There can be no question that, despite its strong polemical tendency against Christianity, the Fourth Book of Esdras (II. Esdras in our Apocrypha), written at the close of the first century of our era, is deeply tinged with Christian doctrine. Of course, the first two and the last two chapters in our Apocryphal II. Esdras are later spurious additions of Christian authorship. But in proof of the influence of the Christian teaching on the writer of the Fourth Book of Esdras we may call attention, besides the adoption of the doctrine of original sin, to the remarkable application to Israel of such N.T. expressions as the 'firstborn,' the 'only-begotten,' and the 'Well-beloved' (IV. Esdras 6:58, in our Apocr. II. Esdras 4:58).

ft408 This is *the* Pesiqta, not that which is generally quoted either as *Rabbathi* or *Sutarta*.

ft409 This in very many Rabbinical passages. Comp. *Castelli*, II Messia, p. 176, note 4.

ft410 In proof they appeal to such passages as ^{<4716>}2 Chronicles 7:16; ^{<4704>}Psalm 3:4; Cant. 2:9, proving it even from the decree of Cyrus (^{<5003>}Ezra 1:3, 4), in which God is spoken of as still in desolate Jerusalem.

ft411 The passage from Yalkut on ^{<2801>}Isaiah 60:1 is quoted in full in Appendix IX.

ft412 The reader will find these discussions summarized at the close of Appendix IX.

ft413 See, on the whole subject, also Debar. R. 2.

ft414 We put aside, as universally repudiated, the opinion expressed by one Rabbi, that Israel's Messianic era was past, the promises having been fulfilled in King Hezekiah (Sanh. 98 *b*; 99 *a*).

ft415 See, in Appendix IX. the extracts from Sanh.

ft416 Pirque de R. El. 28. The reasoning by which this duration of the monarchies is derived from Lament. 1:13 and ^{<3847>}Zechariah 14:7, is a very curious specimen of Rabbinic argumentation.

ft417 Comp. *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. p. 277.

ft418 See Appendix IX.

- ^{ft419} Solitary opinions, however, place the future redemption in the month Tishri (Tanch. on ~~<1237>~~ Exodus 12:37, ed. Warsh. p. 81 *b*, line 2 from bottom).
- ^{ft420} See the telling remarks of Oehler in *Herzog's Real-Encykl.*, vol. 9 p. 417. We would add, that there is always a 'hereafter' of further development in the history of the individual believer, as in that of the Church, growing brighter and brighter, with increased spiritual communication and knowledge, till at last the perfect light is reached.
- ^{ft421} No reasonable doubt can be left on the mind, that the LXX. translators have here the Messiah in view.
- ^{ft422} The criticism of Mr. Drummond on these three passages (Jewish Messiah, pp. 290, 291) cannot be supported on critical grounds.
- ^{ft423} Three, if not four, different renderings of the Targum on Isaiah 9 are possible. But the *minimum* conveyed to my mind implies the premundane existence, the eternal continuance, and the superhuman dignity of the Messiah. (See also the Targum on ~~<3182>~~ Micah 5:2.)
- ^{ft424} This is the view of *Grimm*, and more fully carried out by *Oehler*. The argument of Hengstenberg, that the mention of such a Messiah was restrained from fear of the heathen, does not deserve serious refutation.
- ^{ft425} These exceptions are, according to *Friedlieb* (*Die Sibyllin. Weissag.*) vv. 1-45, vv. 47-96 (dating from 40-31 before Christ), and vv. 818-828. On the subject generally, see our previous remarks in Book 1.
- ^{ft426} Mr. Drummond defends (at pp. d 274, 275) Holtzmann's view, that the expression applies to Simon the Maccabee, although on p. 291 he argues on the opposite supposition that the text refers to the Messiah. It is difficult to understand, how on reading the whole passage the hypothesis of Holtzmann could be entertained. While referring to the 3rd Book of the Sib. Or., another point of considerable interest deserves notice. According to the theory which places the authorship of Daniel in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes — or say about 165 B.C. — the 'fourth kingdom' of Daniel must be the Grecian. But, on the other hand, such certainly was *not* the view entertained by Apocalypsts of the year 165, since the 3d Book of the Sib. Or., *which dates from precisely that period*, not only takes notice of the rising power of Rome, but anticipates the destruction of the Grecian Empire by Rome, which in turn is to be vanquished by Israel (vv. 175-195; 520-544; 638-807).

This most important fact would require to be accounted for by the opponents of the authenticity of Daniel.

^{ft427} I have purposely omitted all references to controverted passages. But see *Langen*, D. Judenth. in Palest. pp. 401 etc.

^{ft428} The next oldest portion, consisting of the so-called Similitudes (chapters 37-71) excepting what are termed 'the Noachic parts, dates from about the time of Herod the Great.

^{ft429} *Schurer* (Lehrb. d. Neutest. Zitg. pp. 534, 535) has, I think, conclusively shown that this portion of the Book of Enoch is of *Jewish* authorship, and *pre-Christian* date. If so, it were deeply interesting to follow its account of the Messiah. He appears by the side of the Ancient of Days, His face like appearance of a man, and yet so lovely, like that of one of the holy Angels. This 'Son of Man' has, and with Him dwells, all righteousness; He reveals the treasures of all that is hidden, being chosen by the Lord, is superior to all, and destined to subdue and destroy all the powers and kingdoms of wickedness (ch. 46). Although only revealed at the last, His Name had been named before God, before sun or stars were created. He is the staff on which the righteous lean, the light of nations, and the hope of all who mourn in spirit. All are to bow down before Him, and adore Him, and for this He was chosen and hidden with God before the world was created, and will continue before Him for ever (ch. 48). This 'Elect One' is to sit on the throne of glory, and dwell among His saints. Heaven and earth would abide on the and only the saints would abide on the renewed earth (ch. 45). He is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness, and unrighteousness would flee as a shadow, because His glory lasted from eternity to eternity, and 'is power from generation to generation (ch. 49). Then would the earth, Hades, and hell give up their dead, and Messiah, sitting on His throne, would select and own the just, and open up all secrets of wisdom, amidst the universal joy of ransomed earth (ch. 51, 61-62).

^{ft430} In illustration of this tendency we may quote the following evidently polemical saying, of R. Abbahu. 'If any man saith to thee, "I am God" he is a liar; "I am the Son of Man," he will at last repent of it; "I go up to heaven," hath he said, and shall he not do it? [or, he hath said, and shall not make it good] (Jer. Taan. p. 65 *b*. line 7 from bottom). This R. Abbahu (279-320 of our era) seems to have largely engaged in controversy with Jewish Christians. Thus he sought to argue against

the Sonship of Christ, by commenting, as follows, on ^{<2340>}Isaiah 44:6: “I am the first” —because He has no father; “I am the last”, because He has no Son; “and beside me there is no God”, because He has no brother (equal)’ (Shem. R. 29, ed. Warsh. vol. 2 p. 41 a, line 8 from bottom).}

^{ft431} It is, to say the least, a pity that Mr. Drummond should have imagined that the question could be so easily settled on the premises which he presents.

^{ft432} The 4th Book of Esdras (in our Apocr. II. Esdras) dates from the end of the first century of our era — and so does the Apocalypse of Baruch.

^{ft433} These are: the Throne of Glory, Messiah the King, the Torah, (ideal) Israel, the Temple, repentance, and Gehenna.

^{ft434} In Pirqu de R. El. and the other authorities these seven things are: the Torah, Gehenna, Paradise, the Throne of Glory, the Temple, repentance, and the Name of the Messiah.

^{ft435} In Ber. R. six things are mentioned: two actually created (the Torah and the Throne of Glory), and four which came into His Mind to create them (the Fathers, Israel, the Temple, and the Name of the Messiah).

^{ft436} In Tanch. seven things are enumerated (the six as in Ber. R., with the addition of repentance), and some say: also Paradise and Gehenna.’

^{ft437} In that passage the time of messiah’s concealment is calculated at forty-five days, from a comparison of ^{<2721>}Daniel 12:11 with verse 12.

^{ft438} The comment on this passage is curiously mystical, but clearly implies not only the pre-existence, but the super-human character of the messiah.

^{ft439} The whole of this very remarkable passage is given in Appendix IX., in the notes on ^{<2338>}Isaiah 25:8; 60:1; 64:4; ^{<2408>}Jeremiah 31:8.

^{ft440} This is the more noteworthy as, according Sotah 9 *b*, none in Israel was so great as Moses, who was only inferior to the Almighty.

^{ft441} I am, of course, aware that certain Rabbinites explain the expression ‘Seed from another place,’ as referring to the descent of the Messiah from Ruth — a non-Israelite. But if this explanation could be offered in reference to the daughters of Lot, it is difficult to see its meaning in reference to Eve and the birth of Seth. The connection there with the

words (^{<0025>}Genesis 4:25), 'God hath appointed me another Seed,' would be the very loosest.

^{ft442} I am surprised, that *Castelli* (u. s. p. 207) should have contended, that the reading in Ber. R. 8 and Vay. R. 14 should be 'the Spirit of Adam.' For (1) the attempted correction gives neither sense, nor proper meaning. (2) The passage Ber. R. 1 is not impugned; yet that passage is the basis of the other two. (3) Ber. R. 8 must read, 'The Spirit of God moved on the deep — that is, the Spirit of Messiah the King,' because the proof-passages is immediately added, 'and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him,' which is a Messianic passage; and because, only two lines before the impugned passage, we are told, that ^{<0026>}Genesis 1:26, 1st clause, refers to the 'spirit of the first man.' The latter remark applies also to Vayyikra R. 14, where the context equally forbids the proposed correction.

^{ft443} It would be very interesting to compare with this the statements of Philo as to the agency of the *Logos* in Creation. The subject is very well treated by *Riehm* (Lehrbegr. d. Hebr. Br. pp. 414-420), although I cannot agree with all his conclusions.

^{ft444} The whole of this passage, beginning at p. 147 *b*, is very curious and deeply interesting. It would lead too far to quote it, or other parallel passages which might be adduced. The passage in the Midrash on Lament. 1:16 is also extremely interesting. After the statement quoted in the text, there follows a discussion on the names of the Messidah, and then the curious story about the Messiah having already been born in Bethlehem.

^{ft445} It will be noticed, that the cumulative argument presented in the foregoing pages follows closely that in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews; only, that the latter carries it up to its final conclusion, that the Messiah was truly the Son of God, while it has been our purpose simply to state, *what was the expectation of the ancient Synagogue*, not what it *should have been* according to the Old Testament.

^{ft446} The advocates of the mythical theory have not answered, not even faced or understood, what to us seems, on their hypothesis, an insuperable difficulty. Granting, that Jewish expectancy would suggest the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, why invent such circumstances to bring Mary to Bethlehem? *Keim* may be right in saying: 'The belief in the

birth at Bethlehem originated very simply (Leben Jesu 1:2, p. 393); but all the more complicated and inexplicable is the origination of the legend, which accounts for the journey thither of Mary and Joseph.

ft447 In evidence of these feelings, we have the account of *Josephus* of the consequences of the taxation of Cyrenius (Ant. 18:1. 1. Comp. ~~Acts~~ Acts 5:37).

ft448 The arguments on what may be called the orthodox side have, from different points of view, been so often and well stated — latterly by Wieseler, Huschke, Zumpt, and Steinmeyer — and on the other side almost *ad nauseam* by negative critics of every school, that it seems unnecessary to go again over them. The reader will find the whole subject stated by Canon Cook, whose views we substantially adopt, in the ‘Speaker’s Commentary’ (N.T. 1 pp. 326-329). The reasoning of *Mommsen* (Res gestae D. Aug. pp. 175, 176) does not seem to me to affect the view taken in the text.

ft449 For the textual explanation we again refer to Canon *Cook*, only we would mark, with Steinmeyer, that the meaning of the expression ἐγένετο, in St. ~~Acts~~ Luke 2:2, is determined by the similar use of it in ~~Acts~~ Acts 11:28, where what was predicted is said to have actually taken place ἐγένετο at the time of Claudius Caesar.

ft450 Comp. *Huschke*. Ueber d. z. Zeit d. Geb. J. C. gehalt. Census pp. 119, 120. Most critics have written very confusedly on this point.

ft451 The reader will now be able to appreciate the value of *Keim’s* objections against such a Census, as involving a ‘wahre Volkswanderung’ (!), and being ‘eine Sache der Unmöglichkeit.’

ft452 This, of course, is only a conjecture; but I call it ‘probable,’ partly because one would naturally so arrange a journey of several days, to make its stages as slow and easy as possible, and partly from the circumstance, that, on their arrival, they found the khan full, which would scarcely have been the case had they reached Bethlehem early in the day.

ft453 Comp. the account of the roads, inns, etc. in the ‘History of the Jewish Nation,’ p. 275; and the chapter on Travelling in Palestine,’ in ‘Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ.’

ft454 The almond is called, in Hebrew **רֹקֵץ**, ‘the waker,’ from the word ‘to be awake.’ It is quite possible, that many of the earliest spring flowers already made the landscape bright.

ft455 Dr. Geikie indeed ‘*feels sure*’ that the **κατάλυμα** was *not* an inn, but a guest-chamber, because the word is used in that sense in St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 14:14, ~~Luke~~ Luke 22:11. But this inference is critically untenable. The Greek word is of very wide application, and means (as Schleusner puts it) ‘*omnis locus quieti aptus*.’ In the LXX. **Κατάλυμα** is the equivalent of not less than five Hebrew words, which have widely different meanings. In the LXX. rendering of ~~Exodus~~ Exodus 4:24 it is used for the Hebrew **וַיִּלֵּךְ** **מ** which certainly cannot mean a guest-chamber, but an inn. No one could imagine that. If private hospitality had been extended to the Virgin-Mother, she would have been left in such circumstances in a stable. The same term occurs in Aramaic form, in Rabbinic writings, as **מַלְיָא** **פָּא** or **זַלְיָא** **פָּא** **זַלְיָא** **פָּא** **κατάλυμα** an inn. *Delitzsch*, in his Hebrew N.T., uses the more common **וַיִּלֵּךְ** **מ** Bazaars and markets were also held in those hostleries; animals killed, and meat sold there; also wine and cider; so that they were a much more public place of resort than might at first be imagined. Comp. Herzfeld. *Handelsgesch.* p. 325.

ft456 Perhaps the best authenticated of all local traditions is that which fixes on this cave as the place of the Nativity. The evidence in its favor is well given by Dr. *Farrar* in his ‘*Life of Christ*.’ Dean Stanley, however, and others, have questioned it.

ft457 In the curious story of His birth, related in the Jer. Talmud (Ber. 2:3), He is said to have been born in ‘the royal castle of Bethlehem;’ while in the parallel narrative in the Midr. on Lament. 1:16, ed. W. p. 64 *b*) the somewhat mysterious expression is used **אַבְרָם** **טְרַיְבָא**. But we must keep in view the Rabbinic statement that, even if a castle falls down, it is still called a castle (Yalkut, vol. 2 p. 60 *b*).

ft458 In fact the Mishnah (Baba K. 7:7) expressly forbids the keeping of flocks throughout the land of Israel, except in the wilderness — and the only flocks otherwise kept, would be those for the Temple-services (Baba K. 80 *a*).

ft459 This disposes of an inapt quotation (from Delitzsch) by Dr. Geikie. No one could imagine, that the Talmudic passages in question could apply to such shepherds as these.

^{ft460} The mean of 22 seasons in Jerusalem amounted to 4.718 inches in December, 5.479 in January, and 5.207 in February (see a very interesting paper by Dr. *Chaplin* in Quart. Stat. of Pal. Explor. Fund, January, 1883). For 1876-77 we have these startling figures: mean for December, .490; for January, 1.595; for February, 8.750, and, similarly, in other years. And so we read: 'Good the year in which Tebheth (December) is without rain' (Taan. 6 b). Those who have copied Lightfoot's quotations about the flocks not lying out during the winter months ought, at least, to have known that the reference in the Talmudic passages is *expressly* to the flocks which pastured in 'the wilderness' *twyrbrm ḥ wl a*. But even so, the statement, as so many others of the kind, is not accurate. For, in the Talmud two opinions are expressed. According to one, the 'Midbariyoth,' or 'animals of the wilderness,' are those which go to the open at the Passover time, and return at the first rains (about November); while, on the other hand, Rabbi maintains, and, as it seems, more authoritatively, that the *wilderness-flocks remain in the open alike in the hottest days and in the rainy season — i.e. all the year round* (Bezah 40 a). Comp. also Tosephta Bezah 4:6. A somewhat different explanation is given in Jer. Bezah 63 b.

^{ft461} There is no adequate reason for questioning the historical accuracy of this date. The objections generally made rest on grounds, which seem to me historically untenable. The subject has been fully discussed in an article by *Cassel* in Herzog's Real. Ency. 17 pp. 588-594. But a curious piece of evidence comes to us from a Jewish source. In the addition to the Megillath Taanith (ed. Warsh. p. 20 a), the 9th Tebheth is marked as a fast day, and it is added, that the reason for this is not stated. Now, Jewish chronologists have fixed on that day as that of Christ's birth, and it is remarkable that, between the years 500 and 816 A.D. the 25th of December fell no less than twelve times on the 9th Tebheth. If the 9th Tebheth, or 25th December, was regarded as the birthday of Christ, we can understand the concealment about it. Comp. *Zunz*, Ritus d. Synag. Gottesd. p. 126.

^{ft462} In illustration we may here quote Shem. R. 2 (ed. W. vol. 2 p. 8 a), where it is said that, wherever Michael appears, there also is the glory of the Shekhinah. In the same section we read, in reference to the appearance in the bush, that, 'at first only one Angel came,' who stood in the burning bush, and after that the Shekhinah came, and spoke to

Moses from out the bush. (It is a curious illustration of ~~Acts~~ Acts 9:7, that Moses alone is said in Jewish tradition to have seen the vision. but not the men who were with him.) Wetstein gives an erroneous reference to a Talmudic statement, to the effect that, at the birth of Moses, the room was filled with heavenly light. The statement really occurs in Sotah 12 *a*; Shem. R. 1; Yalkut 1:51 *c*. This must be the foundation of the Christian legend, that the cave, in which Christ was born, was filled with heavenly light. Similarly, the Romish legend about the Virgin Mother not feeling the pangs of maternity is derived from the Jewish legend, which asserts the same of the mother of Moses. The same authority maintains, that the birth of Moses remained unknown for three months, because he was a child of seven months. There are other legends about the sinlessness of Moses' father, and the maidenhood of his mother (at 103 years), which remind us of Christian traditions.

ft463 According to tradition, the three blasts symbolically proclaimed the Kingdom of God, the providence of God, and the final judgment.

ft464 Curiously enough, the word στρατιά is Hebraised in the same connection hl [m l ç ayfrfsa See Yalkut on Psalm 45 (vol. 2 p. 105 *a*, about the middle).

ft465 I have unhesitatingly retained the reading of the *textus receptus*. The arguments in its favor are sufficiently set forth by Canon Cook in his 'Revised Version of the First Three Gospels,' pp. 27,32.

ft466 This appears to me implied in the emphatic statement, that Mary — as I gather, herself — 'wrapped Him in swaddling clothes' (St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 2:7, 12). Otherwise the remark would seem needless and meaningless.

ft467 It seems difficult to understand how, on Dr. Geikie's theory, the shepherds could have found the Infant-Saviour, since, manifestly, they could not during that night have roused every household in Bethlehem, to inquire whether any child had been born among their guests.

ft468 The term διαγνώριζω implies more than to 'make known abroad.' Wahl renders it '*ultro citroquenarroh*'; Schleusner: '*divulgo aliquid ut aliis innotescat, spargo rumorem.*'

ft469 This may have prepared not only those who welcomed Jesus on His presentation in the Temple, but filled many others with expectancy.

^{ft470} The following remarkable extract from the Jerusalem Targum on
^{<122>}Exodus 12:42 may interest the reader: —

It is a night to be observed and exalted.... Four nights are there written in the Book of Memorial. Night first: when the Memra of Jehovah was revealed upon the world for its creation; when the world was without form and void, and darkness was spread upon the face of the deep, and the Memra of Jehovah illuminated and made it light; and He called it the first night. Night second: when the Memra of Jehovah was revealed unto Abraham between the divided pieces; when Abraham was a hundred years, and Sarah was ninety years, and to confirm thereby that which the Scripture saith, Abraham a hundred years, can he beget? and Sarah, ninety years old, can she bear? Was not our father Isaac thirty-seven years old at the time he was offered upon the altar? Then the heavens were bowed down and brought low, and Isaac saw their foundations, and his eyes were blinded owing to that sight; and He called it the second night. The third night: when the Memra of Jehovah was revealed upon the Egyptians, at the dividing of the night; His right hand slew the first-born of the Egyptians, and His right hand spared the first-born of Israel; to fulfil what the Scripture hath said, Israel is My first-born well-beloved son. And He called it the third night. Night the fourth: when the end of the world will be accomplished, that it might be dissolved, the bands of wickedness destroyed, and the iron yoke broken. Moses came forth from the midst of the desert, and the King Messiah from the midst of Rome. This one shall lead at the head of a Cloud, and that one shall lead at the head of a Cloud; and the Memra of Jehovah will lead between both, and they two shall come as one (*Cachada*).’ (For explan. see vol. 2 p. 100, note.)

^{ft471} So *Lundius*, *Jud. Alterth.* p.621, and *Buxtorf*, *Lex. Talmud.* p. 1699. But I am bound to say, that this seems contrary to the sayings of the Rabbis.

^{ft472} This disposes of the idea, that the Virgin-Mother was of direct Aaronic or Levitic descent.

^{ft473} Archdeacon Farrar is mistaken in supposing, that the ‘thirty-three days’ were counted ‘after the circumcision.’ The idea must have arisen from a misunderstanding of the English version of ^{<122>}Leviticus 12:4. There was no connection between the time of the circumcision of the child, and that of the purification of his mother. In certain circumstances circumcision might have to be delayed for days — in case of sickness,

till recovery. It is equally a mistake to suppose, that a Jewish mother could not leave the house till *after* the forty days of her purification.

ft474 Comp. Kerith. 1:7.

ft475 Jer. Sheq. 50 *b*.

ft476 There is no ground whatever for the objection which Rabbi Low (Lebensalter, p. 112) raises against the account of St. Luke. Jewish documents only prove, that a mother *need* not personally attend in the Temple; not that they *did* not do so, when attendance was possible. The contrary impression is conveyed to us by Jewish notices.

ft477 The expression τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν cannot refer to the Purification of the Virgin and *her Babe* (Farrar), nor to that of the Virgin and Joseph (Meyer), because neither the Babe nor Joseph needed, nor were they included in, the purification. It can only refer to 'their' (i.e. the Jews') purification. But this does not imply any Romish inferences (*Sepp*, *Leben Jesu*, 2:1, p. 131) as to the superhuman condition or origin of the Blessed Virgin; on the contrary, the offering of the sin-offering points in the other direction.

ft478 Comp. the rubric and the prayers in *Maimonides*, *Yad haChaz*. Hilch. Bicur. 11:5.

ft479 So Dr. Geikie.

ft480 So Dr. Geikie, taking his account from *Herzog's Real-Encykl*. The mistake about the mother being sprinkled with sacrificial blood originated with Lightfoot (*Horae Hebr.* on St. ~~4172~~ Luke 2:22). Later writers have followed the lead. *Tamid* 5:6, quoted by Lightfoot, refers only to the cleansing of the leper. The 'prayers' supposed to be spoken, and the pronouncing clean by the priests, are the embellishments of later writers, for which Lightfoot is not responsible.

ft481 According to *Sifra* (Par. Tazria, Per. 4:3): 'Whenever the sin-offering is changed, it precedes [as on ordinary occasions the burnt offering: but when the burnt offering is changed [as on this occasion it precedes the sin-offering.]

ft482 But this precise spot was not matter of absolute necessity (*Seb.* 6:2). Directions are given as to the manner in which the priest was to perform the sacrificial act.

ft483 *Kinnim* 1:1. If the sin-offering was a four-footed animal, the blood was sprinkled *above* the red line.

ft484 Comp. St. ~~4162~~ Matthew 6:2. See 'The Temple and its Services,' etc. pp. 26, 27.

ft485 Comp. Shekal. 6:5, the Commentaries, and Jer. Shek. 50 *b*.

ft486 According to Dr. Geikie, 'the Golden Gate at the head of the long flight of steps that led to the valley of the Kedron opened into the Court of the Women.' But there was no Golden Gate, neither was there any flight of steps into the valley of the Kedron, while between the Court of the Women and any outer gate (such as *could* have led into Kedron), the Court of the Gentiles and a colonnade must have intervened.

ft487 Or else, 'the gate of the firstlings.' Comp. generally, 'The Temple, its Ministry and Services.'

ft488 This they could not have done from the elevated platform on which they commonly worshipped.

ft489 This is stated by the Rabbis to have been the object of the burnt-offering. That suggested for the sin-offering is too ridiculous to mention. The language used about the burnt-offering reminds us of that in the exhortation in the office for the 'Churching of Women': 'that she might be stirred up to give thanks to Almighty God, Who has delivered her from the pains and perils of childbirth (*hrl wy yl kj m hl yxhc*), which is matter of miracle.' (Comp. *Hottingerus*, *Juris Hebr. Leges*, ed. Tiguri, p. 233.)

ft490 Comp. *Josephus*, *Ant.* 12:2. 5.

ft491 The expression, *εὐλαβής* unquestionably refers to 'fear of God.' Comp. *Delitzsch*, *Hebr. Br.* pp. 191, 192; and *Grimm*, *Clavis N. T.* p.180 *b*.

ft492 The expression *hmj n* 'consolation,' for the great Messianic hope — whence the Messianic title of *Menachem* — is of very frequent occurrence (so in the Targum on Isaiah and Jeremiah, and in many Rabbinical passages). Curiously enough, it is several times put into the mouth of a *Simeon* (*Chag.* 16 *b*; *Macc.* *b*; *Shev.* 34 *a*) — although, of course, not the one mentioned by St. Luke. The suggestion, that the latter was the son of the great Hillel and the father of Gamaliel, St. Paul's teacher, though not impossible as regards time, is unsupported, though it does seem strange that the Mishnah has nothing to say about him: '*lo niscar bamishnah.*'

- ft493 The mention of the ‘Holy Spirit,’ as speaking to individuals, is frequent in Rabbinic writings. This, of course, does not imply their belief in the Personality of the Holy Spirit (comp. Bemidb. R. 15; 20; Midr. on ~~<800>~~Ruth 2:9; Yalkut, vol. 1 pp. 221 *b* and 265 *d*).
- ft494 The Talmud (Ber. last page) has a curious conceit, to the effect that, in taking leave of a person, one ought to say: ‘Go *to* peace,’ not ‘*in* peace’ (מלל ~~<1048>~~ץל not מלל ~~<1048>~~צק), the former having been said by Jethro to Moses (~~<1048>~~Exodus 4:18), on which he prospered; the latter by David to Absalom (~~<1048>~~2 Samuel 15:9), on which he perished. On the other hand, on taking leave of a dead friend, we are to say ‘Go *in* peace,’ according to ~~<1048>~~Genesis 15:15, and *not* ‘Go *to* peace.’
- ft495 The expression, ἀπολύειν *absolvere, liberare, demittere*, is most graphic. It corresponds to the Hebrew רפּ, which is also used of death; as in regard to Simeon the Just, Menach. 109 *b*; comp. Ber. 17 *a*; Targum on Cant. 1:7.
- ft496 *Godet* seems to strain the meaning of σωτήριον, when he renders it by the neuter of the adjective. It is frequently used in the LXX. For h[wcy.
- ft497 διαλογισμός, generally used in an evil sense.
- ft498 The verb ἀνθομολεῖσθαι may mean responsive praise, or simply praise (hrwh) which in this case, however, would equally be ‘in response’ to that of Simeon, whether responsive in form or not.
- ft499 The whole subject of ‘genealogies’ is briefly, but well treated by *Hamburger*, Real Encykl., section 2 pp. 291 etc. It is a pity, that *Hamburger* so often treats his subject from a Judaeo-apologetic standpoint.
- ft500 It is scarcely necessary to discuss the curious suggestion, that Anna actually *lived* in the Temple. No one, least of all a woman, permanently resided in the Temple, though the High Priest had chambers there.
- ft501 It is scarcely necessary to point out, how evidential this is of the truthfulness of the Gospel-narrative. In this respect also the so-called Apocryphal Gospels, with their gross and often repulsive legendary adornments, form a striking contrast. I have purposely abstained from reproducing any of these narratives, partly because previous writers have done so, and partly because the only object served by repeating, what must so deeply shock the Christian mind, would be to point the

contrast between the canonical and the Apocryphal Gospels. But this can, I think, be as well done by a single sentence, as by pages of quotations.

ft502 The evidence on this point is furnished by *J. G. Miller* in Herzog's Real-Enc., vol. 8 p. 682. The whole subject of the visit of the Magi is treated with the greatest ability and learning (as against *Strauss*) by Dr. *Mill* ('On the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels,' part 2 pp. 275 etc.).

ft503 They are variously stated as twelve (Aug. Chrysost.) and three, the latter on account of the number of the gifts. Other legends on the subject need not be repeated.

ft504 *Mill*, u. s., p. 303.

ft505 There is no historical evidence that at the time of Christ there was among the nations any widespread expectancy of the Advent of a Messiah in Palestine. Where the knowledge of such a hope existed, it must have been entirely derived from Jewish sources. The allusions to it by *Tacitus* (Hist. 5:13) and *Suetonius* (Vesp. are evidently derived from Josephus, and admittedly refer to the Flavian dynasty, and to a period seventy years or more after the Advent of Christ. 'The splendid vaticination in the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil,' which Archdeacon Farrar regards as among the 'unconscious prophecies of heathendom,' is confessedly derived from the Cumaean Sibyl, and based on the Sibylline Oracles, book 3 lines 784-794 (ed. *Friedlieb*, p. 86; see Einl. p. 39). Almost the whole of book 3, inclusive of these verses, is of *Jewish* authorship, and dates probably from about 160 B.C. Archdeacon Farrar holds that, *besides the above references*, 'there is ample proof, both in Jewish and Pagan writings, that a guilty and weary world was dimly expecting the advent of its Deliverer.' But he offers no evidence of it, either from Jewish or Pagan writings.

ft506 Comp. *Mill*, u.s., p. 308, note 66. The *grounds* adduced by some are such references as to ^{<23806>}Isaiah 8:4; ^{<197210>}Psalms 72:10, etc.; and the character of the gifts.

ft507 Comp. the account of this Jewish monarchy in the 'History of the Jewish Nation,' pp. 67-71; also *Remond's* Vers. e. Gesch. d. Ausbreit. d. Judenth. pp. 81 etc.; and *Jost*, Gesch. d. Isr. vol. 5 pp. 236 etc.

- ft508 This is the correct rendering, and not, as in A.V., ‘in the East,’ the latter being expressed by the plural of, in 5, 1, while in vv. 2 and 9 the word is used in the singular.
- ft509 *Schleusner* has abundantly proved that the word, ἄστηρ though primarily meaning a *star*, is also used of constellations, meteors, and comets — in short, has the widest application: ‘omne designare, quod aliquem splendorem habet et emitit’ (Lex. in N.T., t. 1 pp. 390, 391).
- ft510 Not, as in the A.V., ‘to worship,’ which at this stage of the history would seem most incongruous, but as an equivalent of the Hebrew **hwhthch**, as in ~~<orig>~~Genesis 19:1. So often in the LXX. and by profane writers (comp. *Schleusner*, u. s., t. 2 pp. 749, 750, and *Vorstius*, De Hebraismis N.T. pp. 637-641).
- ft511 This is the view generally, but as I think erroneously, entertained. Any Jew would have told them, that the Messiah was not to be born in Jerusalem. Besides, the question of the Magi implies their ignorance of the ‘where’ of the Messiah.
- ft512 Christian writers on these subjects have generally conjoined the so-called ‘woes of the Messiah’ with His first appearance. It seems not to have occurred to them, that, if such had been the Jewish expectation, a preliminary objection would have lain against the claims of Jesus from their absence.
- ft513 Their feelings on this matter would be represented, *mutatis mutandis*, by the expressions in the Sanhedrin, recorded in St. ~~<orig>~~John 11:47-50.
- ft514 Both Meyer and Weiss have shown, that this was not a meeting of the Sanhedrin, if, indeed, that body had anything more than a shadowy existence during the reign of Herod.
- ft515 The question propounded by Herod (v. 4), ‘where Christ should be born,’ is put neither in the past nor in the future, but in the *present* tense. In other words, he laid before them a *case* — a theological problem — but not a *fact*, either past or future.
- ft516 In point of fact, the Talmud expressly lays it down, that ‘whosoever targums a verse in its closely literal form [without due regard to its meaning is a liar.’ (Kidd. 49 a; comp. on the subject *Deutch’s* ‘Literacy Remains,’ p. 327).
- ft517 The general principle, that St. Matthew rendered ~~<orig>~~Micah 5:2 *targumically*, would, it seems, cover all the differences between his

quotation and the Hebrew text. But it may be worth while, in this instance at least, to examine the differences in detail. *Two* of them are trivial, viz., ‘Bethlehem, land of Juda,’ instead of ‘Ephratah;’ ‘princes’ instead of ‘thousands,’ though St. Matthew may, *possibly*, have pointed **ypēaB]** (‘princes’), instead of **ypēāp]** as in *our* Hebrew text. Perhaps he rendered the word more correctly than we do, since **āl a**, means not only a ‘thousand’ but also a part of a tribe (^{<2812>}Isaiah 60:22), a clan, or Beth Abh (^{<0065>}Judges 6:15); comp. also ^{<0016>}Numbers 1:16; 10:4, 36; ^{<6317>}Deuteronomy 33:17; ^{<6221>}Joshua 22:21, 30; ^{<0009>}1 Samuel 10:19; 23 in which case the personification of these ‘thousands’ (= our ‘hundreds’) by their chieftains or ‘princes’ would be a very apt Targumic rendering. Two other of the divergences are more important, viz., (1) ‘Art not the least,’ instead of ‘though thou be little.’ But the Hebrew words have also been otherwise rendered: in the Syriac *interrogatively* (‘art thou little?’), which suggests the rendering of St. Matthew; and in the Arabic just as by St. Matthew (vide *Pocock*, *Porta Mosis*, *Notae*, c. 2; but *Pocock* does not give the Targum accurately). *Credner* ingeniously suggested, that the rendering of St. Matthew may have been caused by a Targumic rendering of the Hebrew **ry[ki** by **ry[zb** but he does not seem to have noticed, that this is the *actual* rendering in the Targum Jon. on the passage. As for the second and more serious divergence in the latter part of the verse, it may be best here simply to give for comparison the rendering of the passage in the Targum Jonathan: ‘Out of thee shall come forth before Me Messiah to exercise rule over Israel.’

^{ft518} Not *necessarily* by *night*, as most writers suppose.

^{ft519} So correctly, and not ‘in the East,’ as in A.V.

^{ft520} Proof of this is abundantly furnished by *Wetstein*, *Nov. Test. t.* 1 pp. 247 and 248

^{ft521} In this seems to lie the strongest condemnation of Romish and Romancing tendencies, that they ever seek to present — or, perhaps, rather obtrude — the external circumstances. It is not thus that the Gospel most fully presents to us the spiritual, nor yet thus that the deepest and holiest impressions are made. True religion is ever objectivistic, sensuous subjectivistic.

^{ft522} Archdeacon Farrar.

- ^{ft523} *Strauss* (Leben Jesu, 1 pp. 224-249) finds a legendary basis for the Evangelic account in ^{<Q247>}Numbers 24:17, and also appeals to the legendary stories of profane writers about stars appearing at the birth of great men.
- ^{ft524} *Keim* (Jesu von Nazara, 1:2, p. 377) drops the appeal to legends of profane writers, ascribes only a secondary influence to ^{<Q247>}Numbers 24:17, and lays the main stress of 'the legend' on Isaiah lx., with what success the reader may judge.
- ^{ft525} Can it be imagined that any person would invent such a 'legend' on the strength of ^{<Q246>}Isaiah 60:6? On the other hand, if the event really took place, it is easy to understand how Christian symbolism would, though uncritically, have seen an adumbration of it in that prophecy.
- ^{ft526} The 'multitude of camels and dromedaries,' the 'flocks of Kedar and the rams of Nebaioth' (v. 7), and 'the isles,' and 'the ships of Tarshish' (v. 9).
- ^{ft527} The subject of Jewish astrology is well treated by Dr. *Hamburger*, both in the first and second volumes of his Real-Encykl. The ablest summary, though brief, is that in Dr. *Gideon Brecher's* book, 'Das Transcendentale im Talmud.' *Gfrorer* is, as usually, one-sided, and not always trustworthy in his translations. A curious brochure by Rabbi Thein (Der Talmud, od. das Prinzip d. planet. Elinfl.) is one of the boldest attempts at special pleading, to the ignoration of palpable facts on the other side. *Hausrath's* dicta on this subject are, as on many others, assertions unsupported by historical evidence.
- ^{ft528} I cannot, however, see that Buxtorf charges so many Rabbis with giving themselves to astrology as Dr. Geikie imputes to him — nor how *Humboldt* can be quoted as corroborating the Chinese record of the appearance of a new star in 750 (see the passage in the *Cosmos*, Engl. transl. vol. 1 pp. 92, 93).
- ^{ft529} Jewish astronomy distinguishes the seven planets (called 'wandering stars'); the twelve signs of the Zodiac, *Mazzaloth* (Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces) — arranged by astrologers into four trigons: that of fire (1, 5, 9); of earth (2, 6, 10); of air (3, 7, 11); and of water (4, 8, 12); and the stars. The Kabbalistic book *Raziel* (dating from the eleventh century) arranges them into three quadrons. The comets, which are called arrows or star-rods, proved a great difficulty to

students. The planets (in their order) were: *Shabbathai* (the Sabbatic, Saturn); *Tsedeq* (righteousness, Jupiter); *Maadim* (the red, blood-colored, Mars); *Chammah* (the Sun); *Nogah* (splendor, Venus); *Cokhabh* (the star, Mercury); *Lebhanah* (the Moon). Kabbalistic works depict our system as a circle, the lower arc consisting of *Oceanos*, and the upper filled by the sphere of the earth; next comes that of the surrounding atmosphere; then successively the seven semicircles of the planets, each fitting on the other — to use the Kabbalistic illustration — like the successive layers in an onion (see Sepher Raziël, ed. Lemb. 1873, pp. 9 *b*, 10 *a*). Day and night were divided each into twelve hours (from 6 A.M. to 6 P.M., and from 6 P.M. to 6 A.M.). Each hour was under the influence of successive planets: thus, *Sunday*, 7 A.M., the Sun; 8 A.M., Venus; 9 A.M., Mercury; 10 A.M., Moon; 11 A.M., Saturn; 12 A.M., Jupiter, and so on. Similarly, we have for *Monday*, 7 A.M., the Moon, etc.; for *Tuesday*, 7 A.M., Mars; for *Wednesday*, 7 A.M., Mercury; for *Thursday*, 7 A.M., Jupiter; for *Friday*, 7 A.M., Venus; and for *Saturday*, 7 A.M., Saturn. Most important were the *Tequphoth*, in which the Sun entered respectively Aries (Tek. Nisan, spring-equinox, ‘harvest’), Cancer (Tek. *Tammuz*, summer solstice, ‘warmth’), Libra (Tek. *Tishri*, autumn-equinox, seed-time), Capricornus (Tek. *Tebheth*, winter-solstice, ‘cold’). Comp. Targ. Pseudo-Jon. on ^{Q182}Genesis 8:22. From one *Tequphah* to the other were 91 days 71/2 hours. By a beautiful figure the sundust is called ‘filings of the day’ (as the word ξύσμα that which falls off from the sunwheel as it turns (Yoma 20 *b*)).

^{ft530} ‘Der Stern der Weisen, ‘Copenhagen, 1827. The tractate, though so frequently quoted, seems scarcely to have been sufficiently studied, most writers having apparently rather read the references to it in *Ideler*’s Handb. d. Math. u techn. Chronol. *Munter*’s work contains much that is interesting and important.

^{ft531} To form an adequate conception of the untrustworthiness of such a testimony, it is necessary to study the history of the astronomical and astrological pursuits of the Jews during that period, of which a masterly summary is given in *Steinschneider*’s History of Jewish Literature (Ersch u. *Gruber*, Encykl. vol. 27). Comp. also *Sachs*, Relig. Poes. d. Juden in Spanien, pp. 230 etc.

^{ft532} By Dr. *Jellinek*, in a work in six parts, entitled ‘Beth ha-Midrash,’ Leipz, and Vienna, 1853-1878.

- ft533 It would, of course, be possible to argue, that the Evangelic account arose from this Jewish tradition about the appearance of a star two years before the birth of the Messiah. But it has been already shown, that the hypothesis of a Jewish legendary origin is utterly untenable. Besides, if St. Matthew 2 had been derived from this tradition, the narrative would have been quite differently shaped, and more especially the two years' interval between the rising of the star and the Advent of the Messiah would have been emphasized, instead of being, as now, rather matter of inference.
- ft534 The chief writers on the subject have been: *Munter* (u.s.), *Ideler* (u.s.) and *Wieseler* (*Chronol. Synopse d. 4 Evang.* (1843), and again in *Herzog's Real-Enc.* vol. 21 p. 544, and finally in his *Beitr. z. Wurd. d. Ev.* 1869). In our own country, writers have, since the appearance of Professor *Pritchard's* art. ('Star of the Wise Men') in Dr. *Smith's Bible Dict.* vol. 3, generally given up the astronomical argument, without, however, clearly indicating whether they regard the star as a *miraculous* guidance. I do not, of course, presume to enter on an astronomical discussion with Professor Pritchard; but as his reasoning proceeds on the idea that the planetary conjunction of 747 A.U.C., is regarded as 'the Star of the Magi,' his arguments do not apply either to the view presented in the text nor even to that of Wieseler. Besides, I must guard myself against accepting his interpretation of the narrative in St. Matthew.
- ft535 By the astronomer, Dr. Goldschmidt. (See *Wieseler*, *Chron. Syn.* p. 72.).
- ft536 A somewhat different view is presented in the laborious and learned edition of the New Testament by Mr. *Brown McClellan* (vol. 1 pp. 400-402).
- ft537 Our A.V. curiously translates in v. 11, 'treasures,' instead of 'treasury-cases.' The expression is exactly the same as in ~~Deut~~ Deuteronomy 28:12, for which the LXX. use the same words as the Evangelist. The expression is also used in this sense in the Apocr. and by profane writers. Comp. *Wetstein* and *Meyer* ad locum. Jewish tradition also expresses the expectancy that the nations of the world would offer gifts unto the Messiah. (Comp. *Pes.* 118 b; *Ber. R.* 78.).

- ft538 So not only in ancient hymns (by *Sedulius*, *Juvenus*, and *Claudian*), but by the Fathers and later writers. (Comp. *Sepp*, *Leben Jesu*, 2:1, pp. 102, 103.).
- ft539 So Archdeacon Farrar rightly computes it.
- ft540 An illustrative instance of the ruthless destruction of whole families on suspicion that his crown was in danger, occurs in Ant. 15:8. 4. But the suggestion that Bagoas had suffered at the hands of Herod for Messianic predictions is entirely an invention of *Keim*. (*Schenkel*, *Bibel Lex.*, vol. 3 p. 37. Comp. Ant. 17:2. 4.).
- ft541 There are, in Josephus' history of Herod, besides omissions, inconsistencies of narrative, such as about the execution of Mariamme (Ant. 15:3, 5-9 etc.; comp. War 1:22. 3, 4), and of chronology (as War 1:18. 2, comp. 5:9. 4; Ant. 14:16. 2, comp. 15:1. 2, and others.)
- ft542 Comp. on article on Josephus in *Smith and Wace's* Dict. of Christian Biogr.
- ft543 See the evidence for it summarized in 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ,' p. 60.
- ft544 In point of fact the ancient Synagogue *did* actually apply to the Messiah ^{<1042>}Exodus 4:22, on which the words of Hosea are based. See the Midrash on ^{<1917>}Psalms 2:7. The quotation is given in full in our remarks on ^{<1917>}Psalms 2:7 in Appendix IX.
- ft545 And yet *Keim* speaks of his *Hochherzigkeit* and *natürlicher Edelsinn*! (*Leben Jesu*, 1:1. p. 184.) A much truer estimate is that of *Schurer*, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* pp. 197, 198.
- ft546 See the horrible description of his living death in *Jos.* Ant. 17:6. 5.
- ft547 See the calculation in *Wieseler's* Synopse, pp. 56 and 444. The 'Dissertatio de Herode Magno, by *J.A. van der Chijs* (Leyden, 1855), is very clear and accurate. Dr. Geikie adopts the manifest mistake of Caspari, that Herod died in January, 753, and holds that the Holy Family spent three years in Egypt. The repeated statement of Josephus that Herod died close upon the Passover should have sufficed to show the impossibility of that hypothesis. Indeed, there is scarcely any historical date on which competent writers are more agreed than that of Herod's death. See *Schurer*, *Neutest. Zeitg.*, pp. 222, 223.
- ft548 The Megillath Taanith itself, or 'Roll of Fasts,' does not mention the death of Herod. But the commentator adds to the dates 7th *Kislev*

(Nov.) and 2nd *Shebhat* (Jan.), both manifestly incorrect, the notice that Herod had died, on the 2nd *Shebhat*, Jannai also — at the same time telling a story about the incarceration and liberation of ‘seventy of the Elders of Israel,’ evidently a modification of Josephus’ account of what passed in the Hippodrome of Jericho. Accordingly, *Gratz* (Gesch. vol. 3 p. 427) and *Derenbourg* (pp. 101, 164) have regarded the 1st of *Shebhat* as really that of Herod’s death. But this is impossible; and we know enough of the historical inaccuracy of the Rabbis not to attach any serious importance to their precise dates.

ft549 Herod had married no less than ten times. See his genealogical table.

ft550 Batanaea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Panias.

ft551 I cannot conceive on what ground *Keim* (both in *Schenkel’s* Bibel Lex, and in his ‘Jesu von Nazara’) speaks of him as a pretender to the throne.

ft552 This may have been the historical basis of the parable of our Lord in St. ~~2092~~ Luke 19:12-27.

ft553 The revenues of Antipas were 200 talents, and those of Philip 100 talents.

ft554 This is admitted even by *Braun* (Sohne d. Herodes, p. 8). Despite its pretentiousness this tractate is untrustworthy, being written in a party spirit (Jewish).

ft555 We gather this from the expression, ‘When he heard that Archelaus did reign.’ Evidently Joseph had *not* heard who was Herod’s successor, when he left Egypt. Archdeacon Farrar suggests, that the expression ‘reigned’ (‘as a king, βασιλεύει — St. ~~4122~~ Matthew 2:22) refers to the period before Augustus had changed his title from ‘King’ to Ethnarch. But this can scarcely be pressed, the word being used of other rule than that of a king, not only in the New Testament and in the Apocrypha, but by Josephus, and even by classical writers.

ft556 The language of St. Matthew (2:22, 23) seems to imply express Divine direction not to enter the territory of Judaea. In that case he would travel along the coast-line till he passed into Galilee. The impression left is, that the settlement at Nazareth was not of his own choice.

ft557 *Yeled*, the newborn babe, as in ~~2306~~ Isaiah 9:6; *Yoneq*, the suckling, ~~2308~~ Isaiah 11:8; *Olel*, the suckling beginning to ask for food, ~~2304~~ Lamentations 4:4; *Gamul*, the weaned child, ~~2309~~ Isaiah 28:9; *Taph*,

the child clinging to its mother, ^{<2417>}Jeremiah 40:7; *Elem*, a child becoming firm; *Naar*, the lad, literally, ‘one who shakes himself free; and *Bachur*, the ripened one. (See ‘Sketches of Jewish Social Life,’ pp. 103. 104.)

^{ft558} This is still the common, almost universal, designation of Christ among the Jews.

^{ft559} Comp. ch. 4 of this book.

^{ft560} See Appendix IX.

^{ft561} Comp. *Buxtorf*, Lexicon Talm. p. 1383.

^{ft562} All this becomes more evident by *Delitzsch*’s ingenious suggestion (*Zeitschr. fur luther. Theol.* 1876, part 3 p. 402), that the real meaning, though not the literal rendering, of the words of St. Matthew, would be, wmc rxn yk — ‘for Nezer [‘branch’] is His Name.

^{ft563} One of the most absurdly curious illustrations of this is the following: ‘He who blows his nose in the presence of his Rabbi is worthy of death’ (*Erub*, 99 a, line 11 from bottom). The *dictum* is supported by an alteration in the reading of ^{<2185>}Proverbs 8:36.

^{ft564} Galilee covered the ancient possessions of Issachar, Zebulun, Naphtali, and Asher. ‘In the time of Christ it stretched northwards to the possessions of Tyre on the one side, and to Syria on the other. On the south it was bounded by Samaria — Mount Carmel on the Western, and the district of Scythopolis on the eastern side, being here landmarks; while the Jordan and the Lake of Gennesaret formed the general eastern boundary line.’ (*Sketches of Jewish Soc. Life.* p. 33.) It was divided into Upper and Lower Galilee, the former beginning ‘where sycomores (*not* our sycamores) cease to grow.’ Fishing in the Lake of Galilee was free to all (*Baba K.* 81 *b*).

^{ft565} Of which Jochanan, the son of Nuri, may here be regarded as the exponent.

^{ft566} As in the relation between bridegroom and bride, the cessation of work the day before the Passover, etc.

^{ft567} As in regard to animals lawful to be eaten, vows, etc.

^{ft568} The doctrinal, or rather Halakhic, differences between Galilee and Judaea are partially noted by *Lightfoot* (*Chronoger. Matth. praem.* 86), and by *Hamburger* (*Real-Enc.* 1:p. 395).

ft569 See *Deutsch's Remains*, p. 358.

ft570 The differences of pronunciation and language are indicated by *Lightfoot* (u.s. 87), and by *Deutsch* (u. s. pp. 357, 358). Several instances of ridiculous mistakes arising from it are recorded. Thus, a woman cooked for her husband two lentils yj pl f instead of two feet (of an animal, ypl f as desired (*Nedar.* 66 b). On another occasion a woman malpronounced 'Come, I will give thee milk,' into 'Companion, butter devour thee!' (*Erub.* 53 b). In the same connection other similar stories are told. Comp. also *Neubauer*, *Geogr. du Talmud*, p. 184, *G. de Rossi*, *della lingua prop. di Cristo*, *Dissert. I. passim*.

ft571 The Rabbi asked: *What road leads to Lydda?*, using four words. The woman pointed out that, since it was not lawful to multiply speech with a woman, he should have asked: *Whither to Lydda?* — in two words.

ft572 In fact, only four great Galilean Rabbis are mentioned. The Galileans are said to have inclined towards mystical (Kabbalistic?) pursuits.

ft573 *Gelpke*, *Jugendgesch. des Herrn*, has, at least in our days, little value beyond its title.

ft574 The words 'in spirit' are of doubtful authority. But their omission can be of no consequence, since the 'waxing strong' evidently refers to the mental development, as the subsequent clause shows.

ft575 See the notice of these rites at the circumcision of John the Baptist, in ch. 4 of his Book.

ft576 Comp. 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' pp. 86-160, the literature there quoted: *Duschak*, *Schulgesetzgebung d. alten Isr.*; and Dr. *Marcus*, *Paedagog. d. Isr. Volkes*.

ft577 The counterpart is in *Ecclus.* 30.

ft578 Besides the holy women who are named in the Gospels, we would refer to the mothers of Zebedee's children and of Mark, to Dorcas, Lydia, Lois, Eunice, Priscilla, St. John's 'elect lady,' and others.

ft579 Some of its customs almost remind us of our 5th of November.

ft580 The word βρέφος has no other meaning than that of 'infant' or 'babe.'

ft581 The *Shema*.

ft582 Comp. 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' pp. 159 etc. The enigmatic mode of wording and writing was very common. Thus, the year is marked by a verse, generally from Scripture, which contains the letters

that give the numerical value of the year. These letters are indicated by marks above them.

- ft583 He was succeeded by Matthias, the son of Theophilos, under whose Pontificate the war against Rome began.
- ft584 Among the names by which the schools are designated there is also that of *Ischoli*, with its various derivations, evidently from the Greek σχολή *schola*.
- ft585 The proof-passages from the Talmud are collated by Dr. *Marcus* (Paedagog. d. Isr. Volkes, 2 pp. 16, 17).
- ft586 *Altingius* (Academic. Dissert. p. 335) curiously suggests, that this was done to teach a child its guilt and the need of justification. The Rabbinical interpretation (Vayyikra R. 7) is at least equally far-fetched: that, as children are pure and sacrifices pure, it is fitting that the pure should busy themselves with the pure. The obvious reason seems, that Leviticus treated of the ordinances with which every Jew ought to have been acquainted.
- ft587 *Herzfeld* (Gesch. d. V. Isr. 3 p. 267, note) strangely misquotes and misinterprets this matter. Comp. Dr. *Muller*, Massech. Sofer. p. 75.
- ft588 The most painful instances of these are the legendary accounts of the early history of Christ in the Apocryphal Gospels (well collated by *Keim*, 1:2, pp. 413-468, *passim*). But later writers are unfortunately not wholly free from the charge.
- ft589 I must here protest against the introduction of imaginary 'Evening Scenes in Nazareth,' when, according to Dr. Geikie, 'friends or neighbors of Joseph's circle would meet for an hour's quiet gossip.' Dr. Geikie here introduces as specimens of this 'quiet gossip' a number of Rabbinic quotations from the German translation in *Dukes*' 'Rabbinische Blumenlese.' To this it is sufficient answer: 1. There were no such learned Rabbis in Nazareth. 2. If there had been, they would not have been visitors in the house of Joseph. 3. If they had been visitors there, they would not have spoken what Dr. Geikie quotes from *Dukes*, since some of the extracts are from mediaeval books, and only one a proverbial expression. 4. Even if they had so spoken, it would at least have been in the words which *Dukes* has translated, without the changes and additions which Dr. Geikie has introduced in some instances.
- ft590 See Book III., the chapter on 'The Synagogue of Nazareth.'

- ft591 This may be gathered even from such an expression as ‘One iota, or one little hook,’ — not ‘tittle’ as in the A.V.
- ft592 Comp. also *Maimonides*, Hilkh. Chag. 2 The common statement, that Jesus went to the Temple because He was ‘a Son of the Commandment,’ is obviously erroneous. All the more remarkable, on the other hand, is St. Luke’s accurate knowledge of Jewish customs, and all the more antithetic to the mythical theory the circumstance, that he places this remarkable event in the twelfth year of Jesus’ life, and not when He became ‘a Son of the Law.’
- ft593 We take as the more correct reading that which puts the participle in the present tense (ἄναβαινόντων), and not in the aorist.
- ft594 The Romans were tolerant of the religion of all subject nations, — excepting only Gaul and Carthage. This for reasons which cannot here be discussed. But what rendered Rome so obnoxious to Palestine was the *cultus* of the Emperor, as the symbol and impersonation of Imperial Rome. On this *cultus* Rome insisted in all countries, not perhaps so much on religious grounds as on political, as being the expression of loyalty to the empire. But in Judaea this *cultus* necessarily met resistance to the death. (Comp. *Schneckenburger*, Neutest. Zeitgesch. pp. 40-61.)
- ft595 This view, for which there is no historic foundation, is urged by those whose interest it is to deny the possibility of a census during the reign of Herod.
- ft596 That these were the sole grounds of resistance to the census, appears from *Jos. Ant.* 18:1. 1, 6.
- ft597 As unquestionably they did.
- ft598 The Talmud is never to be trusted as to historical details. Often it seems purposely to alter, when it intends the experienced student to read between the lines, while at other times it presents a story in what may be called an allegorical form.
- ft599 The designation ‘Lebanon’ is often applied in Talmudic writings to the Temple.
- ft600 This celebrated meeting, of which, however, but scant and incoherent notices are left us (*Shabb.* 1:7 and specially in the *Jer. Talmud* on the passage p. 3 *c, d*; and *Shabb.* 17 *a*; *Tos. Shabb.* 1:2), took place in the house of Chananyah, ben Chizqiyah, ben Garon, a noted Shammaite.

On arriving, many of the Hillelites were killed in the lower room, and then a majority of Shammaites carried the so-called *eighteen decrees*. The first twelve forbade the purchase of the most necessary articles of diet from Gentiles; the next five forbade the learning of their language, declared their testimony invalid, and their offerings unlawful, and interdicted all intercourse with them; while the last referred to first fruits. It was on the ground of these decrees that the hitherto customary burnt-offering for the Emperor was intermitted, which was really a declaration of war against Rome. The date of these decrees was probably about four years before the destruction of the Temple (See *Gratz*, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vol. 3 pp. 494-502). These decrees were carried by the influence of R. Eleazar, son of Chananyah the High-Priest, a very wealthy man, whose father and brother belonged to the opposite or peace party. It was on the proposal of this strict Shammaite that the offering for the Emperor was intermitted (*Jos. Jew. War* 2:17. 2, 3). Indeed, it is impossible to over-estimate the influence of these Shammaite decrees on the great war with Rome. Eleazar, though opposed to the extreme party, one of whose chiefs he took and killed, was one of the leaders of the national party in the war (*War* 2:17. 9, 10). There is, however, some confusion about various persons who bore the same name. It is impossible in this place to mention the various Shammaites who took part in the last Jewish war. Suffice it to indicate the tendency of that School.

^{ft601} See the list of High-Priests in Appendix VI.

^{ft602} The Boethusians furnished no fewer than four High-Priest during the period between the reign of Herod and that of Agrippa I. (41 A. D.).

^{ft603} It seems, however, that the Feast of Pentecost would see even more pilgrims — at least from a distance — in Jerusalem, than that of the Passover (comp. ~~411D~~ Acts 2:9-11).

^{ft604} So according to the Rabbis; Josephus does not mention it. In general, the account here given is according to the Rabbis.

^{ft605} These tunnels were divided by colonnades respectively into three and into two, the double colonnade being probably used by the priests, since its place of exit was close to the entrance into the Court of the Priests.

- ^{ft606} The question what was sold in this ‘market’) and its relation to ‘the bazaar’ of the family of Annas (the *Chanuyoth beney Chanan*) will be discussed in a later part.
- ^{ft607} The question as to their names and arrangement is not without difficulty. The subject is fully treated in ‘The Temple and its Services.’ Although I have followed in the text the arrangements of the Rabbis, I must express my grave doubts as to their historical trustworthiness. It seems to me that the Rabbis always give rather the *ideal* than the *real* — what, according to their theory, should have been, rather than what actually was.
- ^{ft608} For a full description, I must refer to ‘The Temple, its Ministry and Services at the time of Jesus Christ.’ Some repetition of what had been alluded to in previous chapters has been unavoidable in the present description of the Temple.
- ^{ft609} Although comparatively few really great authorities in Jewish Canon Law lived at that time, more than a dozen names could be given of Rabbis celebrated in Jewish literature, who must have been His contemporaries at one or another period of His life.
- ^{ft610} In fact, an attentive consideration of what in the tractate Moed K. (comp. also Chag. 17 b), is declared to be lawful occupation during the half-holydays, leads us to infer that a very large proportion must have returned to their homes.
- ^{ft611} For a full discussion of this important question, see Appendix X.: ‘The Supposed Temple-Synagogue.’
- ^{ft612} The expression σύνεσις means originally *concursum*, and (as *Schleusner* rightly puts it) *intelligentia* in the sense of *perspicacia quae res probe cognitae subtiliter ac diligenter a se invicem discernuntur*. The LXX. render by it no less than eight different Hebrew terms.
- ^{ft613} The primary meaning of the verb, from which the word is derived, is *secerno, discerno*.
- ^{ft614} According to Jer. Ab. Z. 44 d, the soil, the fountains, the houses, and the roads of Samaria were ‘clean.’
- ^{ft615} This is implied in the use of the present participle.
- ^{ft616} The first day would be that of missing Him, the second that of the return, and the third that of the search in Jerusalem.

- ^{ft617} The expression ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός may be equally rendered, or rather supplemented, by ‘in My Father’s house,’ and ‘about My Father’s business.’ The former is adopted by most modern commentators. But (1) it does not accord with the word that must be supplemented in the two analogous passages in the LXX. Neither in ~~409~~ Esther 7:9, nor in Ecclus. 42:10, is it strictly ‘the house.’ (2) It seems unaccountable how the word ‘house’ could have been left out in the Greek rendering of the Aramaean words of Christ — but quite natural, if the word to be supplemented was ‘things’ or ‘business.’ (3) A reference to the Temple as His Father’s *house* could not have seemed so strange on the lips of Jesus — nor, indeed, of any Jewish child — as to fill Joseph and Mary with astonishment.
- ^{ft618} The voluntariness of His submission is implied by the present part. mid. of the verb.
- ^{ft619} The Authorized Version renders ‘sayings.’ But I think the expression is clearly equivalent to the Hebrew מְרִבֵּי כָּל אֵלֶּיךָ נִי all these things. St. Luke uses the word רְבִי in that sense in ~~405~~ Luke 1:65; 2:15, 19, 51; ~~412~~ Acts 5:32; 10:37; 13:42.
- ^{ft620} Comp. *Philo* in Flacc. ed. Fcf. p. 977 etc.
- ^{ft621} For details as to dress, food, and manners in Palestine, I must refer to other parts of this book.
- ^{ft622} The question of the real relationship of Christ to His ‘brothers’ has been so often discussed in the various Cyclopaedias that it seems unnecessary here to enter upon the matter in detail. See also *Dr. Lightfoot’s* Dissertation in his Comment. on Galatians pp. 282-291.
- ^{ft623} I regard this Simon (Zelotes) as the son of Clopas (brother of Joseph, the Virgin’s husband) and of Mary. For the reasons of this view, see Book III. ch. 17 and Book V. ch. 15.
- ^{ft624} On the maternal side. We read St. ~~6125~~ John 19:25 as indicating four women, His Mother’s sister being Salome, according to St. ~~4150~~ Mark 15:40.
- ^{ft625} See the chapter on ‘Trades and Tradesmen,’ in the ‘Sketches of Jewish Social Life.’
- ^{ft626} Comp. this subject in *Dollinger*, ‘Heidenthum u. Judenthum,’ in regard to the Greeks, p. 692; in regard to the Romans, pp. 716-722: in regard to education and its abominations, pp. 723-726. Nothing can cast a

more lurid light on the need for Christianity, if the world was not to perish of utter rottenness, than a study of ancient Hellas and Rome, as presented by Dollinger in his admirable work.

^{ft627} Even the poetic conception of the painter can only furnish his own ideal, and that of one special mood. Speaking as one who has no claim to knowledge of art, only one picture of Christ ever really impressed me. It was that of an 'Ecce Homo,' by Carlo Dolci, in the Pitti Gallery at Florence. For an account of the early pictorial representations, comp. *Gieseler*. Kirchengesch. 1 pp. 85, 86.

^{ft628} Of these there are, alas! only too many. The reader interested in the matter will find a good summary in *Keim*, 1:2, pp. 460-463. One of the few noteworthy remarks recorded is this description of Christ, in the spurious Epistle of *Lentulus*, 'Who was never seen to laugh, but often to weep.'

^{ft629} Instead of detailed quotations I would here generally refer to works on Roman history, especially to *Friedlander's* Sittengeschichte Roms, and to *Dollinger's* exhaustive work, Heidenthum and Judenthum.

^{ft630} The only thorough resistance to this worship came from hated Judaea, and, we may add, from Britain (*Dollinger*, p. 611).

^{ft631} From the time of Caesar to that of Diocletian, fifty-three such apotheoses took place, including those of fifteen women belonging to the Imperial families.

^{ft632} One of the most painful, and to the Christian almost incredible, manifestations of religious decay was the unblushing manner in which the priests practised imposture upon the people. Numerous and terrible instances of this could be given. The evidence of this is not only derived from the Fathers, but a work has been preserved in which formal instructions are given, how temples and altars are to be constructed in order to produce false miracles, and by what means impostures of this kind may be successfully practised. (Comp. 'The Pneumatics of Hero,' translated by *B. Woodcroft*.) The worst was, that this kind of imposture on the ignorant populace was openly approved by the educated. (*Dollinger*,)

^{ft633} This seems the full meaning of the word, St. ~~✠~~ Luke 1:80. Comp. ~~✠~~ Acts 1:24 (in the A. V. 'show').

^{ft634} The plural indicates that St. John was not always in the same 'wilderness.' The plural form in regard to the 'wildernesses which are

in the land of Israel,' is common in Rabbinic writings (comp. Baba K. 7:7 and the Gemaras on the passage). On the fulfillment by the Baptist of ²⁴¹⁸Isaiah 40:3, see the discussion of that passage in Appendix 11.

^{ft635} *Godet* has, in a few forcible sentences, traced what may be called not merely the difference, but the contrast between the teaching and aims of the Essenes and those of John.

^{ft636} Till quite lately, those who impugn the veracity of the Gospels — *Strauss*, and even *Keim* — have pointed to this notice of Lysanias as an instance of the unhistorical character of St. Luke's Gospel. But it is now admitted on all hands that the notice of St. Luke is strictly correct; and that, besides the other Lysanias, one of the same name had reigned over Abilene at the time of Christ. Comp. *Wieseler*, Beitr. pp. 196-204, and Schurer in *Riehm's Handwörterb.* p. 931.

^{ft637} The Procurators were Imperial financial officers, with absolute power of government in smaller territories. The office was generally in the hands of the Roman knights, which chiefly consisted of financial men, bankers, chief publicans, etc. The order of knighthood had sunk to a low state, and the exactions of such a rule, especially in Judea, can better be imagined than described. Comp. on the whole subject, *Friedlander*, Sittenges. Rom, vol. 1 p. 268 etc.

^{ft638} Annas, either *Chanan* ^{^nj}, or else *Chana* or *Channa*, a common name. Professor *Delitzsch* has rightly shown that the Hebrew equivalent for Caiaphas is not *Keypha* ^{apjKe} Peter, but *Kayapha* ^{apYqi} or perhaps rather, according to the reading, ^{Καΐφας} ^{aPyh} Kaipha, or Kaiphah. The name occurs in the Mishnah as *Kayaph* [so, and not *Kuph*, correctly] (Parah 3:5). Professor *Delitzsch* does not venture to explain its meaning. Would it be too bold to suggest a derivation from ^{apq} and the meaning to be: He who is 'at the top'?

^{ft639} If we may take a statement in the Talmud, where the same word occurs, as a commentary.

^{ft640} I do not, however, feel sure that the word 'high-priests' in this passage should be closely pressed. It is just one of those instances in which it would suit Josephus to give such a grandiose title to those who joined the Romans.

^{ft641} This only in St. Luke.

- ft642 Wieseler has, I think, satisfactorily established this. Comp. Beitr. pp. 191-194.
- ft643 St. Luke speaks of Christ being 'about thirty years old' at the time of His baptism. If John began His public ministry in the autumn, and some months elapsed before Jesus was baptized, our Lord would have just passed His thirtieth year when He appeared at Bethabara. We have positive evidence that the expression 'about' before a numeral meant either a little more or a little less than that exact number. See Midr. on Ruth 14 ed. Warsh. p. 39 b.
- ft644 Here tradition, though evidently falsely, locates the Baptism of Jesus.
- ft645 In reference not only to this point, but in general, I would refer to Bishop *Lightfoot's* masterly essay on the Essenes in his Appendix to his Commentary on Colossians (especially here, pp. 388, 400). It is a remarkable confirmation of the fact that, if John had been an Essene, his food could not have been 'locusts' that the Gospel of the Ebionites, who, like the Essenes, abstained from animal food, omits the mention of the 'locusts,' of St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 3:4. (see Mr. *Nicholson's* 'The Gospel of the Hebrews,' pp. 34, 35). But proof positive is derived from Jer. Nedar. 40 b, where, in case of a vow of abstinence from flesh, fish and locusts are interdicted.
- ft646 Our A.V. wrongly translates 'a hairy man,' instead of a man with a hairy (camel's hair) raiment.' This seems afterwards to have become the distinctive dress of the prophets (comp. ~~Zechariah~~ Zechariah 13:4).
- ft647 *Keim* beautifully designates it: *Das Lieblingswort Jesu*.
- ft648 If, indeed, in the preliminary dispensation these two can be well separated.
- ft649 I confess myself utterly unable to understand, how anyone writing a History of the Jewish Church can apparently eliminate from it what even *Keim* designates as the 'treibenden Gedanken des Alten Testaments' — those of the Kingdom and the King. A Kingdom of God without a King; a Theocracy without the rule of God; a perpetual Davidic Kingdom without a 'Son of David' — these are *antinomies* (to borrow the term of *Kant*) of which neither the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigraphic writings, nor Rabbinism were guilty.
- ft650 'And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and His Name one.'

- ^{ft651} 'I saw in the night visions, and behold, One like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.'
- ^{ft652} Occasionally we find, instead of *Malkhuth Shamayim* (Kingdom of Heaven) *Malkhutha direqiya* (Kingdom of the firmament) as in Ber. 58 *a*, Shebhu 35 *b*. But in the former passage, at least, it seems to apply rather to God's Providential government than to His moral reign.
- ^{ft653} The Talmud (Shebhu. 35 *b*) analyses the various passages of Scripture in which it is used in a sacred and in the common sense.
- ^{ft654} In St. Matthew the expression occurs thirty-two times; six times that of 'the Kingdom;' five times that of 'Kingdom of God.'
- ^{ft655} The distinction between the *Olam habba* (the world to come), and the *Athid labho* (the age to come), is important. It will be more fully referred to by-and-by. In the meantime, suffice it, that the *Athid labho* is the more specific designation of Messianic times. The two terms are expressly distinguished, for example, in Mechilta (ed. Weiss), p. 74 *a*, lines 2, 3.
- ^{ft656} This will be more fully explained and shown in the sequel. For the present we refer only to Yalkut, vol. 2 p. 75 *d*, and the Midr. on ~~Ruth~~ Ruth 2:14.
- ^{ft657} The whole subject is fully treated in Book V. ch. vi.
- ^{ft658} The *Shema*, which was repeated twice every day, was regarded as distinctive of Jewish profession (Ber. 3:3).
- ^{ft659} In Ber. 14 *b*, last line, and 15 *a*, first line, there is a shocking definition of what constitutes the Kingdom of Heaven in its completeness. For the sake of those who would derive Christianity from Rabbinism. I would have quoted it, but am restrained by its profanity.
- ^{ft660} The same passage is similarly referred to in the Midr. on Song. 2:12, where the words 'the time of the singing has come,' are paraphrased; 'the time of the Kingdom of Heaven that it shall be manifested, hath come' (in *R. Martini Pugio Fidei*, p.
- ^{ft661} As in Shabb. 63 *a*, where at least three differences between them are mentioned. For, while all prophecy pointed to the days of the Messiah,

concerning the world to come we are told (~~2304~~ Isaiah 64:4) that ‘eye hath not seen, etc.’; in the days of the Messiah weapons would be borne, but not in the world to come; and while ~~2301~~ Isaiah 24 applied to the days of the Messiah, the seemingly contradictory passage, ~~2306~~ Isaiah 30:26, referred to the world to come. In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on ~~1276~~ Exodus 17:16, we read of three generations: that of this world, that of the Messiah, and that of the world to come (Aram: Alma deathey=*olam habba*). Comp. Ar. 13 *b*, and Midr. on ~~1380~~ Psalm 81:2 (3 in A.V.), ed. Warsh. p. 63 *a*, where the harp of the Sanctuary is described as of seven strings (according to ~~1386~~ Psalm 119:164); in the days of the Messiah as of eight strings (according to the inscription of Psalm 12); and in the world to come (here *Athid labho*) as of ten strings (according to ~~1918~~ Psalm 92:3). The references of *Gfrorer* (Jahrh. d. Heils, vol. 2 p. 213) contain, as not unfrequently, mistakes. I may here say that *Rhenferdius* carries the argument about the *Olam habba*, as distinguished from the days of the Messiah, beyond what I believe to be established. See his Dissertation in *Meuschen*, Nov. Test. pp. 1116 etc.

^{ft662} It is difficult to conceive, how the idea of the identity of the Kingdom of God with the Church could have originated. Such parables as those about the Sower, and about the Net (St. ~~4038~~ Matthew 13:3-9; 47, 48), and such admonitions as those of Christ to His disciples in St. ~~4092~~ Matthew 19:12; 6:33; and 6:10, are utterly inconsistent with it.

^{ft663} The passage which seems to me most fully to explain the import of baptism, in its *subjective* bearing, is 1 Peter, 3:21, which I would thus render: ‘which (water) also, as the antitype, now saves you, even baptism; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the inquiry (the searching, *perhaps* the entreaty), for a good conscience towards God, through the resurrection of Christ.’ It is in this sense that baptism is designated in ~~5185~~ Titus 3:5, as the ‘washing,’ or ‘bath of regeneration,’ the baptized person stepping out of the waters of baptism with this openly spoken new search after a good conscience towards God; and in this sense also that baptism — not the act of baptizing, nor yet that of being baptized — saves us, but this through the Resurrection of Christ. And this leads us up to the objective aspect of baptism. This consists in the *promise* and the *gift* on the part of the Risen Savior, Who, by and with His Holy Spirit, is ever present with his Church. These remarks leave, of course, aside the question of

Infant-Baptism, which rests on another and, in my view most solid basis.

- ft664 In this view the expression occurs thirty-four times, viz: St.
~~4063~~ Matthew 6:33; ~~4028~~ 12:28; ~~4038~~ 13:38; ~~4064~~ 19:24; ~~4023~~ 21:31; St.
~~4004~~ Mark 1:14; ~~4005~~ 10:15, 23, 24, 25; ~~4024~~ 12:34; St. ~~4003~~ Luke 1:33;
~~4046~~ 4:43; 9:11; ~~4009~~ 10:9, 11; 11:20; ~~4023~~ 12:31; ~~4070~~ 17:20, 21; 18:17, 24,
 25, 29; St. ~~4008~~ John 3:3; ~~4008~~ Acts 1:3; 8:12; ~~4025~~ 20:25; ~~4083~~ 28:31;
~~4047~~ Romans 14:17; ~~4001~~ 1 Corinthians 4:20; ~~5041~~ Colossians 4:11; ~~5022~~ 1
 Thessalonians 2:12; ~~6009~~ Revelation 1:9.
- ft665 As in the following seventeen passages, viz.: St. ~~4002~~ Matthew 3:2;
~~4047~~ 4:17, 23; ~~4008~~ 5:3, 10; ~~4025~~ 9:35; 10:7; St. ~~4005~~ Mark 1:15; ~~4000~~ 11:10; St.
~~4006~~ Luke 8:1; 9:2; ~~4046~~ 16:16; ~~4092~~ 19:12, 15; ~~4008~~ Acts 1:3; ~~4083~~ 28:23;
~~6009~~ Revelation 1:9.
- ft666 As in the following eleven passages: St. ~~4001~~ Matthew 11:11; ~~4034~~ 13:41;
 16:19; ~~4080~~ 18:1; ~~4043~~ 21:43; ~~4023~~ 23:13; St. ~~4078~~ Luke 7:28; St. ~~4005~~ John 3:5;
~~4008~~ Acts 1:3; ~~5003~~ Colossians 1:13; ~~6009~~ Revelation 1:9.
- ft667 As in the following twenty-four passages: St. ~~4012~~ Matthew 11:12;
~~4031~~ 13:11, 19, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52; ~~4083~~ 18:23; ~~4000~~ 20:1; 22:2; 25:1,
 14; St. ~~4041~~ Mark 4:11, 26, 30; St. ~~4080~~ Luke 8:10; 9:62; ~~4038~~ 13:18, 20;
~~4008~~ Acts 1:3; ~~6009~~ Revelation 1:9.
- ft668 As in the following twelve passages: St. ~~4042~~ Mark 16:28; St. ~~4006~~ Mark
 9:1; 15:43; St. ~~4027~~ Luke 9:27; 19:11; ~~4023~~ 21:31; 22:16, 18; ~~4008~~ Acts 1:3;
~~5040~~ 2 Timothy 4:1; ~~5028~~ Hebrews 12:28; ~~6009~~ Revelation 1:9.
- ft669 As in the following thirty-one passages: St. ~~4059~~ Matthew 5:19, 20; 7:21;
~~4081~~ 8:11; ~~4034~~ 13:43; ~~4083~~ 18:3; ~~4054~~ 25:34; ~~4029~~ 26:29; St. ~~4047~~ Mark 9:47;
~~4004~~ 10:14; ~~4025~~ 14:25; St. ~~4060~~ Luke 6:20; 12:32; 13:28, 29; 14:15; 18:16;
 22:29; ~~4008~~ Acts 1:3; 14:22; ~~4009~~ 1 Corinthians 6:9, 10; ~~4054~~ 15:24, 50;
~~4062~~ Galatians 5:21; ~~4075~~ Ephesians 5:5; ~~5005~~ 2 Thessalonians 1:5; St.
~~5005~~ James 2:5; ~~6001~~ 2 Peter 1:11; ~~6009~~ Revelation 1:9; ~~6020~~ 12:10.
- ft670 The term ‘repentance’ includes faith in Christ, as in St. ~~4047~~ Luke 24:47;
~~4083~~ Acts 5:31.
- ft671 I cannot, with *Schottgen* and others, regard the expression ‘generation
 of vipers’ as an allusion to the filthy legend about the children of Eve
 and the serpent, but believe that it refers to such passages as ~~4080~~ Psalm
 58:4.

- ^{ft672} In proof that such was the common view, I shall here refer to only a few passages, and these exclusively from the Targumum: Jer. Targ. on ^{<1491>}Genesis 49:11; Targ. on ^{<3104>}Isaiah 11:4; Targ. on ^{<3091>}Amos 9:11; Targ. on ^{<3006>}Nahum 1:6; on ^{<3808>}Zechariah 10:3, 4. See also Ab. Z. 2 *b*, Yalkut 1 p. 64 *a*; also 56 *b* (where it is shown how plagues exactly corresponding to those of Egypt were to come upon Rome).
- ^{ft673} ‘Everything comes to Israel on account of the merits of the fathers’ (Siphre on Deuteronomy p. 108 *b*). In the same category we place the extraordinary attempts to show that the sins of Biblical personages were not sins at all, as in Shabb. 55 *b*, and the idea of Israel’s merits as works of supererogation (as in Baba B. 10 *a*).
- ^{ft674} I will not mention the profane device by which apostate and wicked Jews are at that time to be converted into non-Jews.
- ^{ft675} Professor *Wunsche* quotes an inapt passage from Shabb. 89 *b*, but ignores, or is ignorant of the evidence above given.
- ^{ft676} *Lightfoot* aptly points out a play on the words ‘children’ — *banim* — and ‘stones’ — *abhanim*. Both words are derived from *bana*, to build, which is also used by the Rabbis in a moral sense like our own ‘upbuilding,’ and in that of the gift of adoption of children. It is not necessary, indeed almost detracts from the general impression, to see in the stones an allusion to the Gentiles.
- ^{ft677} Thus the view that charity delivered from Gehenna was very commonly entertained (see, for example, Baba B. 10 *a*). Similarly, it was the main charge against the publicans that they exacted more than their due (see, for example, Baba K. 113 *a*). The Greek, ὁφώνοιν or wage of the soldiers, has its Rabbinic equivalent of *Afsanya* (a similar word also in the Syriac).
- ^{ft678} *Volkmar* is mistaken in regarding this as the duty of the house-porter towards arriving guests. It is expressly mentioned as one of the characteristic duties of slaves in Pes. 4 *a*; Jer Kidd. 1:3; Kidd. 22 *b*. In Kethub. 96 *a* it is described as also the duty of a disciple towards his teacher. In Mechilta on ^{<1210>}Exodus 21:2 (ed. *Weiss*, p. 82 *a*) it is qualified as only lawful for a teacher so to employ his disciple, while, lastly, in Pesiqta 10 it is described as the common practice.
- ^{ft679} *Godet* aptly calls attention to the use of the preposition in here, while as regards the baptism of water no preposition is used, as denoting merely an instrumentality.

ft680 The same writer points out that the want of the preposition before ‘fire’ shows that it cannot refer to the fire of judgment, but must be a further enlargement of the word ‘Spirit.’ Probably it denotes the negative or purgative effect of this baptism, as the word ‘holy’ indicates its positive and sanctifying effect.

ft681 The expression ‘baptism of fire’ was certainly not unknown to the Jews. In Sanh. 39 *a* (last lines) we read of an immersion of God in fire, based on ~~27615~~ Isaiah 66:15. An immersion or baptism of fire is proved from ~~46123~~ Numbers 31:23. More apt, perhaps, as illustration is the statement, Jer. Sot. 22 *d*, that the Torah (the Law) its parchment was white fire, the writing black fire, itself fire mixed with fire, hewn out of fire, and given by fire, according to ~~46312~~ Deuteronomy 33:2.

ft682 This is the meaning of **ἀσβεστος**. The word occurs only in St. ~~41012~~ Matthew 3:12; St. ~~41017~~ Luke 3:17; St. ~~41043~~ Mark 9:43, 45 (?), but frequently in the classics. The question of ‘eternal punishment’ will be discussed in another place. The simile of the fan and the garner is derived from the Eastern practice of threshing out the corn in the open by means of oxen, after which, what of the straw had been trampled under foot (not merely the *chaff*, as in the A.V.) was burned. This use of the straw for fire is referred to in the Mishnah, as in Shabb. 3:1; Par. 4:3. But in that case the Hebrew equivalent for it is (*Qash*), as in the above passages, and not *Tebhen* (*Meyer*), nor even as Professor *Delitzsch* renders it in his Hebrew N.T.: *Mots*. The three terms are, however, combined in a curiously illustrative parable (Ber. R. 83), referring to the destruction of Rome and the preservation of Israel, when the grain refers the straw, stubble, and chaff, in their dispute for whose sake the field existed, to the time when the owner would gather the corn into his barn, but burn the straw, stubble, and chaff.

ft683 For a full discussion of the question of the baptism of proselytes, see Appendix XII.

ft684 The following very significant passage may here be quoted: ‘A man who is guilty of sin, and makes confession, and does not turn from it, to whom is he like? To a man who has in his hand a defiling reptile, who, even if he immerses in all the waters of the world, his baptism avails him nothing; but let him cast it from his hand, and if he immerses in only forty seah of water, immediately his baptism avails him.’ On the same page of the Talmud there are some very apt and beautiful remarks on the subject of repentance (Taan. 16 *a*, towards the end).

ft685 It is remarkable, that *Maimonides* traces even the practice of baptizing proselytes to ^{<1290>}Exodus 19:10, 14 (Hilc Issurey Biah 13:3; Yad haCh. vol. 2 p. 142 b). He also gives reasons for the ‘baptism’ of Israel before entering into covenant with God. In Kerith, 9 a ‘the baptism’ of Israel is proved from ^{<1245>}Exodus 24:5, since every sprinkling of blood was supposed to be preceded by immersion. In Siphre on Numbers (ed. Weiss, p. 30 b) we are also distinctly told of ‘baptism’ as one of the three things by which Israel was admitted into the Covenant.

ft686 This may help us, even at this stage, to understand why our Lord, in the fulfilment of all righteousness, submitted to baptism. It seems also to explain why, after the coming of Christ, the baptism of John was alike unavailing and even meaningless (^{<490>}Acts 19:3-5). Lastly, it also shows how he that is least in the Kingdom of God is really greater than John himself (St. ^{<172>}Luke 7:28).

ft687 It may be said that the fundamental tendency of Rabbinism was anti-sacrificial, as regarded the value of sacrifices in commending the offerer to God. After the destruction of the Temple it was, of course, the task of Rabbinism to show that sacrifices had no intrinsic importance, and that their place was taken by prayer, penitence, and good works. So against objectors on the ground of ^{<2318>}Jeremiah 33:18, but see the answer in Yalkut on the passage (vol. 2 p. 67 a, towards the end) dogmatically (Bab. B. 10 b; Vayyikra R. 7, ed. Warsh. vol. 3 p. 12 a): ‘he that doeth repentance, it is imputed to him as if he went up to Jerusalem, built the Temple and altar, and wrought all the sacrifices in the Law’; and in view of the cessation of sacrifices in the ‘Athid-labho’ (Vay, u.s.; Tanch. on Par. Shemini). Soon, prayer or study were put even above sacrifices (Ber. 32 b; Men. 110 a), and an isolated teacher went so far as to regard the introduction of sacrificial worship as merely intended to preserve Israel from conforming to heathen worship (Vayyikra R. 22, u. s. p. 34 b, close). On the other hand, individuals seemed to have offered sacrifices even after the destruction of the Temple (Eduy. 8:6; Mechilta on ^{<1827>}Exodus 18:27, ed. Weiss, p. 68 b).

ft688 Comp. ^{<952>}1 Samuel 15:22; ^{<946>}Psalms 40:6-8; ^{<507>}51:7, 17; ^{<2011>}Isaiah 1:11-13; ^{<3472>}Jeremiah 7:22, 23; ^{<1021>}Amos 5:21, 22; Ecclus. 7:9; 34:18, 19; 35:1, 7.

ft689 Hebr. 9:13, 9; 10:1; 8:6, 13. On this subject we refer to the classical work of *Riehm* (Lehrbegriff des Hebraerbriefes, 1867).

ft690 Ancient commentators supposed that they came from hostile motives; later writers that curiosity prompted them. Neither of these views is admissible, nor does St. ^{<4173>}Luke 7:30 imply, that all the Pharisees who come to him rejected his baptism.

ft691 Comp. St. ^{<4215>}Matthew 23:5. The *Tsitsith* (*plural, Tsitsiyoth*), or borders (corners, 'wings') of the garments, or rather the fringes fastened to them. The observance was based on ^{<4158>}Numbers 15:38-41, and the Jewish practice of it is indicated not only in the N.T. (u. s., comp. also St. ^{<4191>}Matthew 9:20; 14:36) but in the Targumim on ^{<4158>}Numbers 15:38, 39 (comp. also Targ. Pseudo-Jon. on ^{<4161>}Numbers 16:1, 2, where the peculiar color of the *Tsitsith* is represented as the cause of the controversy between Moses and Korah. But see the version of this story in Jer. Sanh. 10 p. 27 d, end). The *Tsitsith* were originally directed to be of white threads, with one thread of deep blue in each fringe. According to tradition, each of these white fringes is to consist of eight threads, one of them wound round the others: first, *seven times* with a double knot; then *eight times* with a double knot (7 + 8 numerically = **hy**) ; then *eleven times* with a double knot (11 numerically = **hw**;) and lastly, *thirteen times* (13 numerically = **rj a**; or, altogether **rj a hw hy**, *Jehovah One*). Again, it is pointed out that as *Tsitsith* is numerically equal to 600 (**tyxyx**), this, with the eight threads and five knots, gives the number 613, which is that of the Commandments. At present the *Tsitsith* are worn as a special undergarment (the **twpnk [bra]**) or on the *Tallith* or prayer-mantle, but anciently they seem to have been worn on the outer garment itself. In Bemidbar R. 17, end (ed. Warsh, vol. 4 p. 69 a), the blue is represented as emblematic of the sky, and the latter as of the throne of God (^{<4240>}Exodus 24:10). Hence to look upon the *Tsitsith* was like looking at the throne of glory (*Schurer* is mistaken in supposing that the tractate *Tsitsith* in the Septem Libri Talmud. par. pp. 22, 23, contains much information on the subject).

ft692 Such certainly was John the Baptist's. Some locusts were lawful to be eaten, ^{<4112>}Leviticus 11:22. Comp. Terum. 59 a; and, on the various species, Chull. 65.

ft693 Deeply as we appreciate the beauty of *Keim's* remarks about the character and views of John, we feel only the more that such a man *could* not have taken the public position nor made such public

proclamation of the Kingdom as at hand, without a direct and objective call to it from God. The treatment of John's earlier history by *Keim* is, of course, without historical basis.

ft694 The year from Tishri (autumn) 779 to *Tishri* 780 was a Sabbatic year. Comp. the evidence in *Wieseler*, Synopse d. Evang. pp. 204, 205.

ft695 We read of three places where John baptized: 'the wilderness of Judaea' — probably the traditional site near Jericho; Aenon, near Salim, on the boundary between Samaria and Judaea (*Conder's Handbook of the Bible*, p. 320); and Beth-Abara, the modern Abarah, 'one of the main Jordan fords, a little north of Beisan' (u. s.).

ft696 It is one of the merits of Lieut. *Conder* to have identified the site of Beth-Abara. The word probably means 'the house of passage' (fords), but may also mean 'the house of shipping,' the word Abarah in Hebrew meaning 'ferryboat,' ~~<1098>~~ 2 Samuel 19:18. The reading *Bethania* instead of *Bethabara* seems undoubtedly the original one, only the word must not be derived (as by Mr. *Conder*, whose explanations and comments are often untenable), from the province *Batanea*, but explained as *Beth-Oniyah*, the 'house of shipping.' (See *Lucke*, Comment. u. d. Evang. Joh. 1 pp. 392. 393.).

ft697 Considerable probability attaches to the tradition of the Basilideans, that our Lord's Baptism took place on the 6th or 10th of January. (See Bp. *Ellicott's* Histor. Lect. on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ, p. 105, note 2.

ft698 The superficial objection on the supposed discrepancy between St. ~~<1084>~~ Matthew 3:14 and St. ~~<1013>~~ John 1:33 has been well put aside by Bp. *Ellicott* (u. s. p. 107, note).

ft699 Comp. *Nicholson*, Gospel according to the Hebrews, pp. 38, 92, 93.

ft700 It would occupy too much space to give the names of the authors of these theories. The views of *Godet* come nearest to what we regard as the true explanation.

ft701 I must here, once for all, express my astonishment that a book so frivolous and fantastic in its treatment of the Life of Jesus, and so superficial and often inaccurate, should have excited so much public attention.

ft702 But the latter must be firmly upheld.

- ft703 The account by St. Luke seems to me to include both. The common objection on the score of the supposed divergence between St. John and the Synoptists is thus met.
- ft704 The expression διεκώλυνεν (St. ^{<4084>}Matthew 3:14: 'John forbade Him') implies earnest resistance (comp. *Meyer* ad locum).
- ft705 It seems to me that the prayer which the Lord taught His disciples must have had its root in, and taken its start from, His own inner Life. At the same time it is adapted to our wants. Much in that prayer has, of course, no application to Him, but is His application of the doctrine of the Kingdom to our state and wants.
- ft706 Whether or not we adopt the reading εἰς αὐτόν in St. ^{<4000>}Mark 1:10, the *remaining* of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus is clearly expressed in St. ^{<4002>}John 1:32.
- ft707 Here the Targum on ^{<4907>}Psalms 2:7, which is evidently intended to weaken the Messianic interpretation, gives us welcome help. It paraphrases: 'Beloved as a son to his father art Thou to Me.' *Keim* regards the words, 'Thou art my beloved Son,' etc., as a mixture of ^{<3401>}Isaiah 42:1 and ^{<4907>}Psalms 2:7. I cannot agree with this view, though this history is the fulfilment of the prediction in Isaiah.
- ft708 Dr. *Wunsche's* Rabbinic notes on the Bath-Qol (Neue Beitr. pp. 22, 23) are taken from *Hamburger's* Real-Encykl. (Abth. 2 pp. 92 etc.).
- ft709 *Hamburger*, indeed maintains, on the ground of Macc. 23 *b*, that occasionally it was identified with the Holy Spirit. But carefully read, neither this passage, nor the other, in which the same mistranslation, and profane misinterpretation of the words 'She has been more righteous' (^{<0136>}Genesis 38:26) occur (Jer. Sot. 9:7), at all bears out this suggestion. It is quite untenable in view of the distinct statements (Jer. Sot. 9:14; Sot. 48 *b*; and Sanh. 11 *a*), that after the cessation of the Holy Spirit the Bath-Qol took His place.
- ft710 Comp. on the subject *Pinner* in his Introduction to the tractate Berakhoth.
- ft711 In the Targum Onkelos it is not at all mentioned. In the Targum Pseudo-Jon. It occurs four times (^{<0136>}Genesis 38:26; ^{<0206>}Numbers 21:6; ^{<0585>}Deuteronomy 28:15; 34:5), and four times in the Targum on the Hagiographa (twice in Ecclesiastes, once in Lamentations, and once in Esther). In Mechilta and Siphra it does not occur at all, and in Siphre only once, in the absurd legend that the Bath-Qol was heard at a distance

of twelve times twelve miles proclaiming the death of Moses (ed. *Friedmann*, p. 149 b). In the Mishnah it is only twice mentioned (Yeb. 16:6, where the sound of a Bath-Qol is supposed to be sufficient attestation of a man's death to enable his wife to marry again; and in Abhoth 6:2, where it is impossible to understand the language otherwise than figuratively). In the Jerusalem Talmud the Bath-Qol is referred to twenty times, and in the Babylon Talmud sixty-nine times. Sometimes the Bath-Qol gives sentence in favor of a popular Rabbi, sometimes it attempts to decide controversies, or bears witness; or else it is said every day to proclaim: Such an one's daughter is destined for such an one (Moed Kat. 18 *b*; Sot. 2 *a*; Sanh. 22 *a*). Occasionally it utters curious or profane interpretations of Scripture (as in Yoma 22 *b*; Sot. 10 *b*), or silly legends, as in regard to the insect *Yattush* which was to torture Titus (Gitt. 56 *b*), or as warning against a place where a hatchet had fallen into the water, descending for seven years without reaching the bottom. Indeed, so strong became the feeling against this superstition, that the more rational Rabbis protested against any appeal to the Bath-Qol (Baba Metsia 59 *b*).

^{ft712} The force of *Gfroerer's* attacks upon the Gospels lies in his cumulative attempts to prove that the individual miraculous facts recorded in the Gospels are based upon Jewish notions. It is, therefore, necessary to examine each of them separately, and such examination, if careful and conscientious, shows that his quotations are often untrustworthy, and his conclusions fallacies. None the less taking are they to those who are imperfectly acquainted with Rabbinic literature. *Wunsche's* Talmudic and Midrashic Notes on the N.T. (Gottingen, 1878) are also too often misleading.

^{ft713} The saying in Chag. 15 *a* is of *Ben Soma*, who is described in Rabbinic literature as tainted with Christian views, and whose belief in the possibility of the supernatural birth of the Messiah is so coarsely satirized in the Talmud. Rabbi *Low* (Lebensalter. p. 58) suggests that in *Ben Soma's* figure of the dove there may have been a Christian reminiscence.

^{ft714} No other terms would correctly describe the book of *Keim* to which I specially refer. How widely it differs, not only from the superficial trivialities of a Renan, but from the stale arguments of Strauss, or the picturesque inaccuracies of a Hausrath, no serious student need be told. Perhaps on that ground it is only the more dangerous.

- ^{ft715} On the temptations of Abraham see Book of Jubilees, ch. 17; Sanh. 89 *b* (and differently but not less blasphemously in Pirke de R. Elies. 31); Pirke de R. Elies. 26, 31, 32 (where also about Satan's temptation of Sarah, who dies in consequence of his tidings); Ab. de R. N. 33; Ber. R. 32, 56; Yalkut, 1 c. 98, p. 28 *b*; and Tanchuma, where the story is related with most repulsive details. As to Moses, see for example Shabb. 89 *a*; and especially the truly horrible story of the death of Moses in Debar R. 11 (ed. *Warsh.* 3 p. 22 *a* and *b*). But I am not aware of any *temptation* of Moses by Satan.
- ^{ft716} Thus *Gfrorer* can only hope that some Jewish parallelism may yet be discovered (!); while *Keim* suggests, of course without a title of evidence, additions by the early Jewish Christians. But *whence* and *why* these imaginary additions?
- ^{ft717} *Keim* (Jesu von Naz. 1 *b*, p. 564) seems not to have perused the whole passage, and, quoting it at second-hand, has misapplied it. The passage (Yalkut on ~~<240>~~ Isaiah 60:1) has been given before.
- ^{ft718} The number is thus reached: as there are *seventy* nations, and *ten* of each are to take hold on each of the *four* corners of a Jew's garment, we have $70 \times 10 \times 4 = 2,800$.
- ^{ft719} The Rabbis have it, that a man must accommodate himself to the ways of the place where he is. When Moses was on the Mount he lived of 'the bread of the Torah' (Shem. R. 47).
- ^{ft720} The quotation in ~~<408>~~ Ephesians 4:8 resembles the rendering of the Targum (see Delitzsch Comm. u. d. Psalter, vol. 1 p. 503).
- ^{ft721} We refrain from naming the individual writers who have broached these and other equally untenable hypotheses.
- ^{ft722} The former notably in St. ~~<425>~~ Matthew 12:25-28. St. ~~<2117>~~ Luke 11:17 etc. The import of this, as looking back upon the history of the Temptation, has not always been sufficiently recognized. In regard to Satan and his power many passages will occur to the reader, such as St. ~~<1163>~~ Matthew 6:13; ~~<4122>~~ 12:22; 13:19, 25, 39; ~~<1541>~~ 26:41; St. ~~<2108>~~ Luke 10:18; ~~<2218>~~ 22:3, 28, 31; St. ~~<1844>~~ John 8:44; ~~<1231>~~ 12:31; ~~<1327>~~ 13:27; ~~<1440>~~ 14:30; ~~<1611>~~ 16:11.
- ^{ft723} So Bishop *Ellicott*, *Histor. Lectures*, p. 111.
- ^{ft724} Professor *Godet's* views on this subject are very far from satisfactory, whether exegetically or dogmatically. Happily, they fall far short of the

notion of any internal solicitation to sin in the case of Jesus, which Bishop Ellicott so justly denounces in strongest language.

ft725 U. s. p. 110, note 2.

ft726 According to Siphre (ed. *Friedmann* p. 149 *a* and *b*), God showed to Moses Israel in its happiness, wars, and misfortunes; the whole world from the Day of Creation to that of the Resurrection; Paradise, and Gehenna.

ft727 The heresy which represents the Body of Christ as only apparent, not real.

ft728 Comp. *Riehm*, *Lehrbegr.* d. Hebr. Br. p. 364. But I cannot agree with the views which this learned theologian expresses. Indeed, it seems to me that he does not meet the real difficulties of the question; on the contrary, rather aggravates them. They lie in this: How could One Who (according to *Riehm*) stood on the same level with us in regard to all temptations have been exempt from sin?

ft729 The latter was already sin. Yet ‘temptation’ means more than mere ‘assault.’ There may be conditional mental *assensus* without moral *consensus* — and so temptation without sin. See p. 301, *note*.

ft730 The heresy which unduly separated the two Natures.

ft731 This is evident even from the terms used by St. Matthew ἀνέχθη and St. Luke ἤγετο. I cannot agree with *Godet*, that Jesus would have been inclined to return to Galilee and begin teaching. Jesus had no inclination save this — to do the Will of His Father. And yet the expression ‘driven’ used by St. Mark seems to imply some human shrinking on His part — at least at the outset.

ft732 The place of the Temptation could not, of course, have been the traditional ‘Quarantania,’ but must have been near Bethabara. See also *Stanley’s* *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 308.

ft733 It was this which would make the ‘assault’ a ‘temptation’ by vividly setting before the mind the reality and rationality of these considerations — a mental *assensus* — without implying any inward *consensus* to the manner in which the Enemy proposed to have them set aside.

ft734 All the assaults of Satan were really directed against Christ’s absolute submission to the Will of God, which was His Perfectness. Hence, by

every one of these temptations, as *Weiss* says in regard to the first, ‘*ruttelt er an Seiner Vollkommenheit.*’

- ft735 I regard the memory as affording the basis for the Temptation. What was so vividly in Christ’s memory at that moment, that was flashed before Him as in a mirror under the dazzling light of temptation.
- ft736 Satan’s ‘if’ was rather a taunt than a doubt. Nor could it have been intended to call in question His ability to do miracles. Doubt on that point would already have been a fall.
- ft737 The supply of the manna was only an exemplification and application of the general principle, that man really lives by the Word of God.
- ft738 It cannot be regarded as certain, that the πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ was, as commentators generally suppose, the Tower at the southeastern angle of the Temple Cloisters, where the Royal (southern) and Solomon’s (the eastern) Porch met, and whence the view into the Kedron Valley beneath was to the stupendous depth of 450 feet. Would this angle be called ‘a wing’ πτερύγιον ? Nor can I agree with Delitzsch, that it was the ‘roof’ of the Sanctuary, where indeed there would scarcely have been standing-room. It certainly formed the watch-post of the Priest. Possibly it may have been the extreme corner of the ‘wing-like’ porch, or *ulam*, which led into the Sanctuary. Thence a Priest could easily have communicated with his brethren in the court beneath. To this there is, however, the objection that in that case it should have been τοῦ ναοῦ. At p. 244, the ordinary view of this locality has been taken.
- ft739 Comp. ‘The Temple, its Ministry and Services,’ p. 132.
- ft740 *Bengel*: ‘Scriptura per Scripturam interpretanda et concilianda.’ This is also a Rabbinic canon. The Rabbis frequently insist on the duty of not exposing oneself to danger, in presumptuous expectation of miraculous deliverance. It is a curious saying: Do not stand over against an ox when he comes from the fodder; Satan jumps out from between his horns. (Pes. 112 *b.*) David had been presumptuous in ^{<19812>}Psalm 26:2, and failed. (Sanh. 107 *a.*) But the most apt illustration is this: On one occasion the child of a Rabbi was asked by R. Jochanan to quote a verse. The child quoted ^{<15142>}Deuteronomy 14:22, at the same time propounding the question, why the second clause virtually repeated the first. The Rabbi replied, ‘To teach us that the giving of tithes maketh rich.’ ‘How do you know it?’ asked the child. ‘By experience,’

answered the Rabbi. ‘But,’ said the child, ‘such experiment is not lawful, since we are not to tempt the Lord our God.’ (See the very curious book of Rabbi *So oweyczgk*, Die Bibel, d. Talm. u. d. Evang.).

ft741 Sin always intensifies in the coarseness of its assaults.

ft742 For the Jewish views on Angelology and Demonology, see Appendix XIII.: ‘Jewish Angelology and Demonology.’

ft743 This quotation of the Doxology leaves, of course, the critical question undetermined, whether the words were part of the ‘Lord’s Prayer’ in its original form.

ft744 This chapter contains, among other matter, a detailed and critical examination of the great Jewish Sects, such as was necessary in a work on ‘The Times.’ as well as ‘The Life,’ of Christ.

ft745 This point is fully discussed by *Lucke*, Evang. Joh., vol. 1 pp. 396- 398.

ft746 So Professor *Westcott*, in his Commentary on the passage (Speaker’s Comment., N.T., vol. 2 p. 18), where he notes that the expression in St. ~~<400>~~ John 8:3 is unauthentic.

ft747 Of this the Sanhedrin must have been perfectly aware. Comp. St. ~~<400>~~ Matthew 3:7; St. ~~<400>~~ Luke 3:15 etc.

ft748 Comp. ‘The Temple, its Ministry and Services,’ p. 75. Dr. *Geiger* (Urschr. u. Uebersetz. d. Bibel, pp. 113, 114) ascribes to them, however, a much wider jurisdiction. Some of his inferences (such as at pp. 115, 116) seem to me historically unsupported.

ft749 Comp. Book I. ch. 8.

ft750 I use the term metaphysical here in the sense of all that is above the natural, not merely the speculative, but the supersensuous generally.

ft751 The word αἵρεσις has received its present meaning chiefly from the adjective attaching to it in ~~<400>~~ 2 Peter 2:1. In ~~<400>~~ Acts 24:28:22, it is vituperatively applied to Christians; in ~~<400>~~ 1 Corinthians 11:19, ~~<400>~~ Galatians 5:20, it seems to apply to diverging practices of a sinful kind; in ~~<400>~~ Titus 3:10, the ‘heretic’ seems one who held or taught diverging opinions or practices. Besides, it occurs in the N.T. once to mark the Sadducees, and twice the Pharisees (~~<400>~~ Acts 5:17; ~~<400>~~ 15:5, and ~~<400>~~ 26:5).

ft752 I mean on historical, not theological grounds.

- ^{ft753} I here refer to the following passages: Jewish War 2:8. 14; Ant. 13:5. 9; 10. 5, 6; 17:2. 4; 18:1, 2, 3, 4.
- ^{ft754} For a full discussion of the character and writings of Josephus, I would refer to the article in Dr. *Smith's* Dict. of Chr. Biogr. vol. 3.
- ^{ft755} Abba Saul would also have freed all students from that formality.
- ^{ft756} Comp. the suggestion as to the significant time when this alteration was introduced, in 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' pp. 228, 229.
- ^{ft757} Erub. 54 *a*. I give the latter clause, not as in our edition of the Talmud, but according to a more correct reading (*Levy*, Neuhebr. Worterb. vol. 2 p. 102).
- ^{ft758} It could serve no good purpose to give instances. They are readily accessible to those who have taste or curiosity in that direction.
- ^{ft759} So, erroneously, *Wellhausen*, in his treatise 'Pharisaer u. Sadduc.'; and partially, as it seems to me, even *Schurer* (Neutest. Zeitgesch.). In other respects also these two learned men seem too much under the influence of *Geiger* and *Kuenen*.
- ^{ft760} *Wellhausen* has carried his criticisms and doubts of the Hebrew *Scholion* on the Megill. Taan. (or 'Roll of Fasts') too far.
- ^{ft761} Even such a book as the Meg. Taan. does not accuse them of absolute ignorance, but only of being unable to prove their *dicta* from Scripture (comp. Pereq 10 p. 15 *b*, which may well mark the extreme of Anti-Sadduceeism).
- ^{ft762} Some traditional explanation of the Law of Moses was absolutely necessary, if it was to be applied to existing circumstances. It would be a great historical inaccuracy to imagine that the Sadducees rejected the whole παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (St. ~~Quesd~~ Matthew 15:2) from Ezra downwards.
- ^{ft763} This is the meaning of Ant. 13:10. 6, and clearly implied in 18:1, 3, 4, and War 2:8. 14.
- ^{ft764} M. *Derenbourg* (Hist. de la Palest., p. 122, note) rightly remarks, that the Rabbinic equivalent for Josephus' ἀκριβεία is *armj*h heaviness, and that the Pharisees were the *ryrmj m* or 'makers heavy.' What a commentary this on the charge of Jesus about 'the heavy burdens' of the Pharisees! St. Paul uses the same term as Josephus to describe the Pharisaic system, where our A.V. renders 'the perfect manner'

(^{<421B>}Acts 22:3). Comp. also ^{<401B>}Acts 26:5: **κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν.**

^{ft765} The subject is discussed at length in Jer. Ber. 1:7 (p. 3 *b*), where the superiority of the Scribe over the Prophet is shown (1) from ^{<311B>}Micah 2:6 (without the words in *italics*), the one class being the Prophets ('prophecy not'), the other the Scribes ('prophecy'); (2) from the fact that the Prophets needed the attestation of miracles. (^{<611D>}Deuteronomy 13:2), but not the Scribes (^{<6171>}Deuteronomy 17:11).

^{ft766} This is admitted even by *Geiger* (Urschr. u. Uebers. p. 130, note), though in the passage above referred to he would emendate: 'Scribes of the Samaritans.' The passage, however, implies that these were *Sadducean Scribes*, and that they were both willing and able to enter into theological controversy with their opponents.

^{ft767} Rabbi Gamaliel's proof was taken from ^{<610B>}Deuteronomy 1:8: 'Which Jehovah swore unto your fathers to give unto them.' It is not said 'unto you,' but unto '*them*,' which implies the resurrection of the dead. The argument is kindred in character, but far inferior in solemnity and weight, to that employed by our Lord, St. ^{<412D>}Matthew 22:32, from which it is evidently taken. (See book 5 ch. 4, the remarks on that passage.)

^{ft768} It is a curious circumstance in connection with the question of the Sadducees, that it raised another point in controversy between the Pharisees and the 'Samaritans,' or, as I would read it, the Sadducees, since 'the Samaritans' (Sadducees?) only allowed marriage with the *betrothed*, not the actually *wedded* wife of a deceased childless brother (Jer Yebam. 1 6, p. 3 *a*). The Sadducees in the Gospel argue on the Pharisaic theory, apparently for the twofold object of casting ridicule on the doctrine of the Resurrection, and on the Pharisaic practice of marriage with the espoused wife of a deceased brother.

^{ft769} The expression is used in the heathen (philosophical) sense of *fate* by *Philo*, De Incorrpt. Mundi. section 10. ed. Mangey, vol. 2 p. 496 (ed. Frcf. p. 947).

^{ft770} The following curious instance of this is given. On one occasion King Solomon, when attended by his two Scribes, Elihoreph and Ahiah (both supposed to have been Ethiopians), suddenly perceived the Angel of Death. As he looked so sad, Solomon ascertained as its reason, that the two Scribes had been demanded at his hands. On this Solomon

transported them by magic into the land of *Luz*, where, according to legend, no man ever died. Next morning Solomon again perceived the Angel of Death, but this time laughing, because, as he said. Solomon had sent these men to the very place whence he had been ordered to fetch them (Sukk, 53 *a*).

ft771 Those who understand the character of Josephus' writings will be at no loss for his reasons in this. It would suit his purpose to speak often of the fatalism of the Pharisees, and to represent them as a philosophical sect like the Stoics. The latter, indeed, he does in so many words.

ft772 For details comp. *Hamburger*, Real-Encykl. 2 pp. 103-106 — though there is some tendency to 'coloring' in this as in other articles of the work.

ft773 The Pharisees replied by asking on what ground the bones of a High-Priest 'defiled,' but not those of a donkey. And when the Sadducees ascribed it to the great value of the former, lest a man should profane the bones of his parents by making spoons of them, the Pharisees pointed out that the same argument applied to defilement by the Holy Scriptures. In general, it seems that the Pharisees were afraid of the satirical comments of the Sadducees on their doings (comp. Parah 3:3).

ft774 *Wellhausen* rightly denounces the strained interpretation of *Geiger*, who would find here — as in other points — hidden political allusions.

ft775 Comp. 'The Temple, its Ministry and Services,' pp. 309, 312. The rubrics are in the Mishnic tractate Parah, and in Tos. Par.

ft776 The Mishnic passage is difficult, but I believe I have given the sense correctly.

ft777 This difference, which is more intricate than appears at first sight, requires a longer discussion than can be given in this place.

ft778 For details about the observances on this festival I must refer to 'The Temple, its Ministry and Services.'

ft779 Other differences, which rest merely on the authority of the Hebrew Commentary on 'The Roll of Fasts,' I have discarded as unsupported by historical evidence. I am sorry to have in this respect, and on some other aspect of the question, to differ from the learned Article on 'The Sadducees,' in *Kitto's Bibl. Encycl.*

- ^{ft780} *Geiger*, and even *Derenbourg*, see in these things deep political allusions, these things deep political allusions — which, as it seems to me, have no other existence than in the ingenuity of these writers.
- ^{ft781} So *Wellhausen*, u. s.
- ^{ft782} So *Geiger*, u. s.
- ^{ft783} Tseduqim and Tsadduqim mark different transliterations of the name Sadducees.
- ^{ft784} This theory, defended with ingenuity by *Geiger*, had been of late adopted by most writers, and even by *Schurer*. But not a few of the statements hazarded by Dr. *Geiger* seem to me to have no historical foundation, and the passages quoted in support either do not convey such meaning, or else are of no authority.
- ^{ft785} So Dr. *Low*, as quoted in Dr. *Ginsburg*'s article.
- ^{ft786} The argument as against the derivation of the term *Sadducee* would, of course, hold equally good, even if each party had assumed, not received from the other, its characteristic name.
- ^{ft787} Comp. generally, 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' pp. 230, 231.
- ^{ft788} Here it deserves special notice that the Old Testament term *Chasid*, which the Pharisees arrogated to themselves, is rendered in the Peshito by *Zaddiq*. Thus, as it were, the opponents of Pharisaism would play off the equivalent *Tsaddiq* against the Pharisaic arrogation of *Chasid*.
- ^{ft789} Such by-names, by a play on a word, are not unfrequent. Thus, in *Shem. R.* 5 (ed. *Warsh.* p. 14 a, lines 7 and 8 from top), Pharaoh's charge that the Israelites were ⲙⲣⲓⲛⲓ 'idle,' is, by a transposition of letters, made to mean that they were ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲓ.
- ^{ft790} It seems strange, that so accurate a scholar as *Schurer* should have regarded the 'national party' as merely an offshoot from the Pharisees (*Neutest. Zeitgesch.* p. 431), and appealed in proof to a passage in *Josephus* (*Ant.* 18:1.6), which expressly calls the Nationalists a *fourth* party, by the side of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. That in practice they would carry out the strict Judaism of the Pharisees, does not make them Pharisees.
- ^{ft791} They are also mentioned by *Pliny* (*Hist. Natur.* 5:16).
- ^{ft792} This may be inferred from *Josephus*' *Life*, c. 2.

^{ft793} This point is conclusively disposed of by Bishop *Lightfoot* in the third Dissertation appended to his Commentary on the Colossians (pp. 397-419). In general, the masterly discussion of the whole subject by Bishop *Lightfoot*, alike in the body of the Commentary and in the three Dissertations appended, may be said to form a new era in the treatment of the whole question, the points on which we would venture to express dissent being few and unimportant. The reader who wishes to see a statement of the supposed analogy between Essenism and the teaching of Christ will find it in Dr. *Ginsburg's* Article 'Essenes,' in *Smith and Wace's* Dictionary of Christian Biography. The same line of argument has been followed by *Frankel* and *Gartz*. The reasons for the opposite view are set forth in the text.

^{ft794} Compare *Josephus*, Ant. 13:5, 9; 15:10. 4, 5; 18:1. 5; Jewish War, 2:8, 2-13; *Philo*, Quod omnis probus liber, 12, 13 (ed. *Mangey*, 2:457-459; ed. Par. and Frcf. pp. 876-879; ed. *Richter*, vol. 5 pp. 285-288); *Pliny*, N. H. 5:16, 17. For references in the Fathers see Bp. *Lightfoot* on Colossians, pp. 83, 84 (note). Comp. the literature there and in *Schurer* (Neutest. Zeitgesch. p. 599), to which I would add Dr. *Ginsburg's* Art. 'Essenes' in *Smith's* and *Wace's* Dict. of Chr. Biogr., vol. 2.

^{ft795} The distinction is *Schurer's*, although he is disposed to minimize this point. More on this in the sequel.

^{ft796} *Schurer* regards these children as forming the first of the four 'classes' or 'grades' into which the Essenes were arranged. But this is contrary to the express statement of *Philo*, that only adults were admitted into the order, and hence only such could have formed a 'grade' or 'class' of the community. (Comp. ed. *Mangey*, 2 p. 632, from *Eusebius' Praepar. Evang. lib. 8 cap. 8*.) I have adopted the view of Bishop *Lightfoot* on the subject. Even the marrying order of the Essenes, however, only admitted of wedlock under great restrictions, and as a necessary evil (War, u. s. sections 13). Bishop *Lightfoot* suggests, that these were not Essenes in the strict sense, but only 'like the third order of a Benedictine or Franciscan brotherhood.'

^{ft797} Can this possibly have any connection in the mind of *Josephus* with the later Nationalist movement? This would agree with his insistence on their respect for those in authority. Otherwise the emphasis laid on abstinence from robbery seems strange in such a sect.

- ft798 I venture to think that even Bishop *Lightfoot* lays too much stress on the affinity to Pharisaism. I can discover few, if any, traces of Pharisaism in the distinctive sense of the term. Even their frequent washings had a different object from those of the Pharisees.
- ft799 For a similar reason, and in order ‘not to affront the Divine rays of light’ — the light as symbol, if not outcome, of the Deity — they covered themselves, in such circumstances, with the mantle which was their ordinary dress in winter.
- ft800 There can be no question that these Essene cures were magical, and their knowledge of remedies esoteric.
- ft801 Bishop *Lightfoot* refers to a part of the Sibylline books which seems of Christian authorship.
- ft802 Comp. *Lucius*, Essenismus, p. 109. This brochure, the latest on the subject, (though interesting, adds little to our knowledge.
- ft803 See Appendix XIII. on the Angelology, Satanology, and Demonology of the Jews.
- ft804 Only after writing the above I have noticed, that *Jellinek* arrives at the same conclusion as to the Essene character of the Book of Jubilees (Beth ha-Midr. 3 p. 34, 35), and of the Book of Enoch (u.s. 2 p. 30).
- ft805 So *Zeller*, Philosophie d. Griechen, ed. 1881, 3 pp. 277-337.
- ft806 So Bishop *Lightfoot*, in his masterly treatment of the whole subject in his Commentary on the Ep. to the Colossians.
- ft807 By Bishop *Lightfoot*, u.s. pp. 382-396 In general, I prefer on many points — such as the connection between Essenism and Gnosticism etc., simply to refer readers to the classic work of Bishop *Lightfoot*.
- ft808 As regards any connection between the Essenes and the *Therapeutai*, *Lucius* has denied the existence of such a sect and the Philonic authorship of *de V. cont.* The latter we have sought to defend in the Art. *Philo* (*Smith and Wace’s* Dict. of Chr. Biogr. 4), and to show that the Therapeutes were not a ‘sect’ but an esoteric circle of Alexandrian Jews.
- ft809 As other instances may be quoted such as Istagioth *twygf̄sai*= *στέγη*, roof; Istuli *yl Wf̄s̄h̄i*= *στήλη*, a pillar; Dikhsumini *ygym̄skY*= *δεξαμενη*, cistern.

- ^{ft810} The practice of beginning prayers before, and ending them as the sun had just risen, seems to have passed from the Essenes to a party in the Synagogue itself, and is pointedly alluded to as a characteristic of the so-called *Vethikin*, Ber. 9 *b*; 25 *b*; 26 *a*. But another peculiarity about them, noticed in Rosh haSh. 32 *b* (the repetition of all the verses in the Pentateuch containing the record of God in the so-called *Malkhiyoth*, *Zikhronoth*, and *Shophroth*), shows that they were not Essenes, since such Rabbinic practices must have been alien to their system.
- ^{ft811} In Sanh. 100 *b* they are explained as ‘the writings of the Sadducees,’ and by another Rabbi as ‘the Book of Sirach’ (Ecclus. in the Apocrypha). *Hamburger*, as sometimes, makes assertions on this point which cannot be supported (Real-Wörterb. 2 p. 70). Jer. Sanh. 28 *a* explains, ‘Such as the books of Ben Sirach and of Ben La’nah’ — the latter apparently also an Apocryphal book, for which the Midr. Kohel. (ed. *Warsh*. 3 p. 106 *b*) has ‘the book of Ben Tagla’ ‘La’nah’ and ‘Tagla’ could scarcely be symbolic names. On the other hand, I cannot agree with *Furst* (Kanon d. A.T. p. 99), who identifies them with Apollonius of Tyana and Empedocles. Dr. *Neubauer* suggests that Ben La’nah may be a corruption of *Sibylline* Oracles.
- ^{ft812} The ‘Epicureans,’ or ‘freethinkers,’ are explained to be such as speak contemptuously of the Scriptures, or of the Rabbis (Jer. Sanh. 27 *d*). In Sanh. 38 *b* a distinction is made between ‘stranger’ (heathen) Epicureans, and Israelitish Epicureans. With the latter it is unwise to enter into argument.
- ^{ft813} Both in the Jer. and Bab. Talm. it is conjoined with ‘spitting,’ which was a mode of healing, usual at the time. The Talmud forbids the magical formula, only in connection with this ‘spitting’ — and then for the curious reason that the Divine Name is not to be recorded while ‘spitting.’ But, while in the Bab. Talm. the prohibition bears against such ‘spitting’ *before* pronouncing the formula, in the Jer. Talm. it is *after* uttering it.
- ^{ft814} Bishop *Lightfoot* has shown that the Essene cures were magical (u. s. pp. 91 etc. and p. 377).
- ^{ft815} St. ~~John~~ John 1:33.
- ^{ft816} This is insisted upon by *Keim*, in his beautiful sketch of the Baptist. Would that he had known the Master in the glory of His Divinity, as he understood the Forerunner in the beauty of his humanity! To show how

the whole teaching of the Baptist was, so to speak, saturated with Isaiah-language and thoughts, comp. not only ^{<230B>}Isaiah 40:3, as the burden of his mission, but as to his imagery (after *Keim*): *Generation of vipers*, ^{<230F>}Isaiah 59:5; *planting of the Lord*, ^{<230E>}Isaiah 5:7; *trees*, ^{<236B>}6:13; ^{<230C>}10:15, 18, 33; ^{<230B>}40:24; *fire*, ^{<230B>}1:31; ^{<230B>}9:18; 10:17; ^{<236B>}5:24; ^{<230F>}47:14; *floor and fan*, 21:10; 27:27 etc.; ^{<230B>}30:24; ^{<230B>}40:24; 41:15 etc.; *bread and coat to the poor*, 58:7; *the garner*, 21:10. Besides these, the Isaiah reference in his Baptism (^{<230B>}Isaiah 52:15; ^{<230C>}1:16), and that to the Lamb of God — indeed many others of a more indirect character, will readily occur to the reader. Similarly, when our Lord would afterwards instruct him in his hour of darkness (St. ^{<230C>}Matthew 11:2), He points for the solution of his doubts to the well-remembered prophecies of Isaiah (^{<230B>}Isaiah 35:5, 6; ^{<230B>}61:1; ^{<230B>}8:14, 15).

ft817 I cannot agree with Mr. *Cheyne* (*Prophecies of Isaiah* vol. 1 p. 183), that there is no Messianic reference here. It may not be in the most literal sense ‘personally Messianic;’ but surely this ideal presentation of Israel in the perfectness of its kingdom, and the glory of its happiness, is one of the fullest Messianic picture (comp. vv. 17 to end).

ft818 This is well pointed out by *Keim*.

ft819 We have in a previous chapter suggested that the baptism of Jesus had taken place at Bethabara, that is, the furthest northern point of his activity, and probably at the close of his *baptismal* ministry. It is not possible in this place to detail the reasons for this view. But the learned reader will find remarks on it in *Keim*, 1:2, p. 524.

ft820 This, of course, on the supposition that the Baptism of Jesus took place at Bethabara, and hence that the ‘wilderness’ into which He was driven, was close by. It is difficult to see why, on any other supposition, Jesus returned to Bethabara, since evidently it was not for the sake of any personal intercourse with John.

ft821 This is most beautifully suggested by Canon Westcott in his *Commentary on the passage*.

ft822 ‘He confessed, and denied not’ (St. ^{<230B>}John 1:20). Canon *Westcott* points out, that ‘the combination of a positive and negative’ is intended to ‘express the fulness of truth,’ and that ‘the first term marks the readiness of his testimony, the second its completeness.’

- ft823 See Appendix VIII: ‘Rabbinic Traditions about Elijah, the Forerunner of the Messiah.’
- ft824 Can the reference in St. Stephen’s speech (~~4073~~ Acts 7:37) apply to this expected alteration of the Law? At any rate St. Stephen is on his defence for teaching the abolition by Jesus of the Old Testament economy. It is remarkable that he does not deny the charge, and that his contention is, that the Jews wickedly resisted the authority of Jesus (vv. 51-53).
- ft825 For the Jewish views on the Law in Messianic times, see Appendix XIV.: ‘The Law in Messianic Days.’
- ft826 The words within quotations are those of Archdeacon *Watkins*, in his Commentary on St. John.
- ft827 Manifestly, whatever interpretation is made of ~~2183~~ Isaiah 3:13-53, it applies to Messianic *times*, even if the sufferer were, as the Synagogue now contends, Israel. On the whole subject comp. the most learned and exhaustive discussions by Dr. *Pusey* in his introduction to the catena of Jewish Interpretations of Isaiah 53.
- ft828 To those persons who deny to the people of God under the Old Testament the designation *Church*, we commend the use of that term by St. Stephen in ~~4078~~ Acts 7:38.
- ft829 This appears more clearly in the Hebrew, where both words (‘lambs’ and ‘suppressors’) are written exactly the same, מַשְׁכִּים. In Hillel’s derivation it is identified with the root שָׁכַח = שָׁחַח.
- ft830 This meets the objection of *Keim* (i. 2, p.552), which proceeds on the assumption that the words of the Baptist imply that he knew not merely *that*, but *how*, Jesus would take away the sin of the world. But his words certainly do not oblige us to think, that he had the Cross in view. But, surely, it is a most strange idea of *Godet*, that at His Baptism Jesus, like all others, made confession of sins; that, as He had none of His own, He set before the Baptist the picture of the sin of Israel and of the world; and that this had led to the designation: ‘The Lamb of God. Which taketh away the sin of the world.’
- ft831 For the reasons of this, comp. ‘Sketches of Jewish Social Life,’ p. 151.
- ft832 This may be regarded as another of the undesigned evidences of the Hebraic origin of the fourth Gospel. Indeed, it might also be almost called an evidence of the truth of the whole narrative.

^{ft833} Yet *Renan* speaks of the first chapters of St. John's Gospel as scattered notices, without chronological order!

^{ft834} This reticence seems another undesigned evidence of Johannine authorship.

^{ft835} The Greek has it: 'John was standing, and from among his disciples two.'

^{ft836} The word implies earnest, penetrating gaze.

^{ft837} The precise date of the origin of this designation is not quite clear. We find it in threefold development: *Rab*, *Rabbi*, and *Rabban*, — 'amplitudo,' 'amplitudo mea,' 'amplitudo nostra,' which mark successive stages. As the *last* of these titles was borne by the grandson of Hillel (A.D. 30- 50), it is only reasonable to suppose that the two preceding ones were current a generation and more before that. Again, we have to distinguish the original and earlier use of the title when it only applied to *teachers*, and the later usage when, like the word '*Doctor*,' it was given indiscriminately to men of supposed learning. When Jesus is so addressed it is in the sense of 'my Teacher.' Nor can there be any reasonable doubt, that thus it was generally current in and before the time noted in the Gospels. A still higher title than any of these three seems to have been *Beribbi*, or *Berabbi*, by which Rabban Gamaliel is designated in Shabb. 115 *a*. It literally means 'belonging to the house of a Rabbi,' — as we would say, a Rabbi of Rabbis. On the other hand, the expression 'Come and see' is among the most common Rabbinic formulas, although generally connected with the acquisition of special and important information.

^{ft838} Comp. Canon *Westcott's* note.

^{ft839} The common supposition is, that the time must be computed according to the Jewish method, in which case the tenth hour would represent 4 P.M. But remembering that the Jewish day ended with sunset, it could, in that case, have been scarcely marked, that 'they abode with Him that day.' The correct interpretation would therefore point in this, as in the other passages of St. John, to the Asiatic numeration of hours, corresponding to our own. Comp. J. B. McLellan's *New Testament*, pp. 740-742.

^{ft840} This appears from the word 'first,' used as an adjective here, 5:41 (although the reading is doubtful), and from the implied reference to some one else later on.

- ft841 On the reading of the Aramaic *Meshicha* by Messias, see *Delitzsch* in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* for 1876, p. 603 Of course, both Messias and Christ mean 'the Anointed.'
- ft842 The same word as that used in regard to the Baptist looking upon Jesus.
- ft843 So according to the best text, and not *Jona*.
- ft844 'Hereafter thou shalt win the name.' *Westcott*.
- ft845 So in the Greek, of which the English interpretation is 'a stone' — *Keyph*, or *Keypha*, 'a rock.'
- ft846 The evidence for the great historic difference between this call to personal attachment, and that to the Apostolate, is shown — I should think beyond the power of cavil — by *Godet*, and especially by Canon *Westcott*. To these and other commentators the reader must be referred on this and many points, which it would be out of place to discuss at length in this book.
- ft847 Corroborative and illustrative passages are here too numerous, perhaps also not sufficiently important, to be quoted in detail.
- ft848 *Ewald* imagines that this 'fig-tree' had been in the garden of Nathanael's house at Cana, and Archdeacon *Watkins* seems to adopt this view, but, as it seems to me, without historical ground.
- ft849 This, as it would seem, needless addition (if the narrative were fictitious) is of the highest evidential value. In an Ephesian Gospel of the end of the second century it would have been well-nigh impossible.
- ft850 So, at least, most probably. Comp. St. ~~John~~ John 21:2, and the various commentaries.
- ft851 For a full discussion of that most important and significant appellation 'Son of Man,' comp. *Lucke*, u. s. pp. 459-466; *Godet* (German transl.) pp. 104-108; and especially *Westcott*, pp. 33-35. The main point is here first to ascertain the Old Testament import of the title, and then to view it as present to later Jewish thinking in the Pseudepigraphic writings (Book of Enoch). Finally, its full realization must be studied in the Gospel-history.
- ft852 We may, however, here again notice that, if this narrative had been fictitious, it would seem most clumsily put together. To introduce the Forerunner with fasting, and as an ascetic, and Him to Whom he pointed with a marriage-feast, is an incongruity which no writer of a

legend would have perpetrated. But the writer of the fourth Gospel does not seem conscious of any incongruity, and this because he has no ideal story nor characters to introduce. In this sense it may be said, that the introduction of the story of the marriage-feast of Cana is in itself the best proof of its truthfulness, and of the miracle which it records.

ft853 The Biblical proofs adduced for attaching this benefit to a sage, a bridegroom, and a prince on entering on their new state, are certainly peculiar. In the case of a bridegroom it is based on the name of Esau's bride, Machalath (^{<01289>}Genesis 28:9), a name which is derived from the Rabbinic 'Machal,' to forgive. In Jer. Biccure. 3 p. 65 d, where this is also related, it is pointed out that the original name of Esau's wife had been Basemath (^{<01318>}Genesis 36:3), the name Machalath, therefore, having been given when Esau married.

ft854 In Yalcut on ^{<2310>}Isaiah 61:10 (vol. 2p. 57 d) Israel is said to have been ten times called in Scripture 'bride' (six times in Canticles, three times in Isaiah, and once in Jeremiah). Attention is also called to the 'ten garments' with which successively the Holy One arrayed Himself; to the symbolic priestly dignity of the bridegroom, etc.

ft855 Everything, even a funeral, had to give way to a marriage-procession.

ft856 For details I must refer to the Encyclopaedias, to the article in *Cassell's 'Bible Educator,'* and to the corresponding chapters in 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life.'

ft857 Pesiq. R. 15 applies the first clause of ^{<01312>}Proverbs 13:12 to a long engagement, the second to a short one.

ft858 The reader who is curious to see these and other legal documents *in extenso*, is referred to Dr. *Sammter's* ed. of the tractate Baba Metsia (notes at the end, fol. pp. 144-148).

ft859 Some of these joyous demonstrations, such as the wearing of crowns, and even the bridal music, were for a time prohibited after the destruction of Jerusalem, in token of national mourning (Sot. 9:14). On these crowns comp. *Wagenseil*, Sota, pp. 965-967.

ft860 I quote the very words of the formula, which, it will be noticed, closely agree with those in our own Marriage Service.

ft861 If the *Zuz* be reckoned at 7d., about 5l. 16s. 8d.

ft862 This, of course, represents only the *minimum*. In the case of a priest's daughter the ordinary legal minimum was doubled.

- ^{ft863} The Talmud (Tos. Kethub.) here puts the not inapt question, ‘How if the bridegroom has no goods and chattels?’ but ultimately comforts itself with the thought that every man has some property, if it were only the six feet of ground in which he is to be buried.
- ^{ft864} Not a few such instances of riotous merriment, and even dubious jokes, on the part of the greatest Rabbis are mentioned, to check which some were wont to adopt the curious device of breaking valuable vases, etc.
- ^{ft865} This, and the other great differences in favor of morality and decency which distinguished the customs of Galilee from those of the rest of Palestine, are enumerated in Jer. Kethub. 1:1, p. 25 *a*, about the middle.
- ^{ft866} Two such sites have been proposed — that by Dr. Robinson being very unlikely to represent the ancient ‘Cana of Galilee.’
- ^{ft867} Comp. the memoir on the subject by *Zeller* in the Quarterly Report of the Palestine Explor. Fund (for 1869, No. 3, and for April 1878, by Mr. *Hepworth Dixon*); and Lieut. *Conder*, Tent-Work in Palestine, vol. 1 pp. 150-155. *Zeller* makes it five miles from Nazareth, *Conder* only three and three-quarters.
- ^{ft868} The whole Mishnah is divided into six *Sedarim* (Orders), of which the last is the *Seder Tohoroth*, treating of ‘purifications.’ It consists of twelve tractates (*Massikhtoth*), 126 chapters (*Peraqim*), and contains no fewer than 1001 separate *Mishnayoth* (the next largest *Seder* — *Neziqin* — contains 689 *Mishnayoth*). The first tractate in this ‘Order of Purifications’ treats of the purification of vessels (*Kelim*), and contains no fewer than thirty chapters; ‘*Yadayim*’ (‘hands’) is the eleventh tractate, and contains four chapters.
- ^{ft869} Comp. St. ^{<1172>}Mark 7:2-5; St. ^{<1225>}Matthew 23:25, 26; St. ^{<2113>}Luke 11:38, 39.
- ^{ft870} These ‘stone-vessels’ (*Keley Abhanim*) are often spoken of (for example, Chel. 10:1). In Yaday. 1:2 they are expressly mentioned for the purification of the hands.
- ^{ft871} For further details we refer to the *excursus* on Palestinian money, weights, and measures, in *Herzfeld’s* *Handelsgesch. d. Juden*, pp. 171-185.
- ^{ft872} The *Teraqlin*, from which the other side-rooms opened (Jer. Rosh haSh. 59 *b*; Yoma 15 *b*). From Baba B. 6:4 we learn, that such an

apartment was at least 15 feet square and 15 feet high. Height of ceiling was characteristic of Palestinian houses. It was always half the breadth and length put together. Thus, in a small house consisting of one room: length, 12 feet, breadth, 9 feet, the height would be 10 1/2 feet. In a large house: length, 15 feet, breadth, 12 feet, the height would be 13 1/2 feet. From Jer. Kethub. p. 28 *d* we learn, that the bride was considered as actually married the moment she had entered the *Teraqlin*, before she had actually gone to the *Chuppah*.

ft873 Thus it was customary, and deemed meritorious, to sing and perform a kind of play with myrtle branches (Jer. Peah 15 *d*); although one Rabbi was visited with sudden death for excess in this respect.

ft874 St. ~~John~~ John 2:3, A.V.: 'when they wanted wine.'

ft875 This is the view of many commentators, ancient and modern.

ft876 *Tholuck* and *Lucke*, however, hold the opposite view.

ft877 *Luthardt* rightly calls it the commencement of a very painful education, of which the next stage is marked in St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 8:19, and the last in St. ~~John~~ John 19:26.

ft878 This meets the objection of *Strauss* and others, that Mary could not have expected a miracle. It is scarcely conceivable, how *Calvin* could have imagined that Mary had intended Jesus to deliver an address with the view of turning away thought from the want of wine; or *Bengel*, that she intended to give a hint that the company should break up.

ft879 *Godet* aptly says. 'His motto henceforth is: My Father and I.'

ft880 Comp. the passages from the classics quoted by *Wetstein* in his Commentary.

ft881 On the omission of certain parts of St. John's narrative by the Synoptists, and vice versa, and on the supposed differences, I can do no better than refer the reader to the admirable remarks of Canon *Westcott*, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, pp. 280 etc.

ft882 According to the best reading, and literally, 'This did, beginning of signs, Jesus in Cana.' Upon a careful review the Rabbinic expression *Simana* (taken from the Greek word here used) would seem to me more fully to render the idea than the Hebrew *Oth*. But the significant use of the word sign should be well marked. See Canon *Westcott* on the passage.

- ^{ft883} In this, the first of his miracles, it was all the more necessary that He should manifest His glory.
- ^{ft884} Thus *Schenkel* regards Christ's answer to Mary as a proof that He was not on good terms with His family; *Paulus* suggests, that Jesus had brought the wine, and that it was afterwards mixed with the water in the stone-vessels; *Gfroerer*, that Mary had brought it as a present, and at the feast given Jesus the appropriate hint when to have it set on. The gloss of *Renan* seems to me even more untenable and repulsive.
- ^{ft885} Against this view of *Strauss*, see *Lucke*, u. s. p. 477.
- ^{ft886} So *Lange*, in his 'Life of Christ,' imagining that converse with Jesus had put all in that higher ecstasy in which He gave them to drink from the fulness of Himself. Similar spiritualization, though by each in his own manner, has been attempted by *Baur*, *Keim*, *Ewald*, *Hilgenfeld*, and others. But it seems more rational, with *Schweizer* and *Weisse*, to deny the historical accuracy of the whole, than to resort to such expedients.
- ^{ft887} *Hilgenfeld*, however, sees in this miracle an evidence that the Christ of the fourth Gospel proclaimed another and a higher than the God of the Old Testament — in short, evidence of the Gnostic taint of the fourth Gospel.
- ^{ft888} *Meyer* well reminds us that 'physical incomprehensibility is not identical with absolute impossibility.'
- ^{ft889} *Godet* has scarcely rightly marked the difference.
- ^{ft890} If I rightly understand the meaning of Dr. *Abbott*'s remarks on the miracles in the fourth Gospel (*Encycl. Britan.* vol. 10 p. 825 *b*), they imply that the change of the water into wine was an emblematic reference to the Eucharistic wine, this view being supported by a reference to ~~1~~ John 5:8. But could this be considered sufficient ground for the inference, that no historic reality attaches to the whole history? In that case it would have to be seriously maintained, that an Ephesian writer at the end of the second century had invented the fiction of the miraculous change of water into wine, for the purpose of certain Eucharistic teaching!
- ^{ft891} In support of the natural interpretation of these terms (which I frankly own to be my view) not only St. ~~1~~ Matthew 1:25 and St. ~~1~~ Luke 2:7 may be urged, but these two questions may be put, suggested by Archdeacon *Norris* (who himself holds them to have been the children

of Joseph by a former marriage): How could our Lord have been, through Joseph, the heir of David's throne (according to the genealogies), if Joseph had elder sons? And again, What became of the six young motherless children when Joseph and the Virgin went first to Bethlehem, and then into Egypt, and why are the elder sons not mentioned on the occasion of the visit to the Temple? (Commentary on the New Testament, vol. 1 p. 117.

^{ft892} *Robinson, Sepp*, and, if I understand him aright, *Lieut. Conder*, regard *Khan Minyeh* (Tent-Work in Palest. vol. 2 pp. 182 etc.) as the site of Capernaum; but most modern writers are agreed in fixing it at *Tell Hum*.

^{ft893} The stories are too foolish, and the insinuations too vile, to be here repeated. The second of the two notices evidently refers to the first. The 'heretic' Jacob spoken of, is the *bete noire* of the Rabbis. The implied charges against the Christians remind one of the description, ~~(ft894)~~ Revelation 2:20-24.

^{ft894} The comparison is Canon *Tristram's* (Land of Israel, p. 427.).

^{ft895} This is another Rabbinic interpretation of the term Gennesaret.

^{ft896} Comp. especially *Warren's* Recovery of Jerusalem, pp. 337-351.

^{ft897} *Wieseler* and most modern writers place the Baptism of Jesus in the summer of 27 A.D., and, accordingly, the first Passover in spring, 28 A.D. But it seems to me highly improbable, that so long an interval as nine or ten months should have elapsed between John's first preaching and the Baptism of Jesus. Besides, in that case, how are we to account for the eight or nine months between the Baptism and the Passover? So far as I know, the only reason for this strange hypothesis is St. ~~(ft898)~~ John 2:20, which will be explained in its proper place.

^{ft898} Simon Maccabee had copper money coined; the so-called copper shekel, a little more than a penny, and also half and quarter shekels (about a half-penny, and a farthing). His successors coined even smaller copper money. During the whole period from the death of Simon to the last Jewish war no Jewish silver coins issued from the Palestinian mint, but only copper coins. *Herzfeld* (Handelsgesch. pp. 178, 179) suggests that there was sufficient foreign silver coinage circulating in the country, while naturally only a very small amount of foreign copper coin would be brought to Palestine.

- ft899 It is extremely difficult to fix the exact equivalent. *Cassel* computes it at one-fifth, *Herzfeld* at one-sixth, *Zunz* at one-third, and *Winer* at one-fourth of a denar.
- ft900 Comp. *Winer's Real-Worterb*. I have taken a low estimate, so as to be well within bounds. All the regulations about the *Tribute* and *Qolbon* are enumerated in *Sheqal*. 1. I have not given references for each of the statements advanced, not because they are not to hand in regard to almost every detail, but to avoid needless quotations.
- ft901 Comp. 'The Temple and its Services, etc.,' pp. 118, 119.
- ft902 *Derenbourg* (*Histoire de Palest.*, p. 467) holds that these shops were kept by priests, or at any rate that the profits went to them. But I cannot agree with him that these were the *Chanuyoth*, or shops, of the family of *Annas*, to which the Sanhedrin migrated forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem. See farther on.
- ft903 It is certain that this Temple-market could not have been 'on both sides of the Eastern Gate — the gate *Shushan* — as far as *Solomon's Porch*' (*Dr. Farrar*). If it had been on both sides of this gate, it must have been in *Solomon's Porch*. But this supposition is out of the question. There would have been no room there for a market, and it formed the principal access into the Sanctuary. The Temple-market was undoubtedly somewhere in the 'Court of the Gentiles.'
- ft904 It is, however, quite certain that *Baba ben Buta* had not 'been the first to introduce' (*Dr. Farrar*) this traffic. A perusal of *Jer. Chag. 78 a* shows this sufficiently.
- ft905 It must, however, be admitted, that even *Luther* had grave doubts whether the narrative of the Synoptists and that of the fourth Gospel did not refer to one and the same event. Comp. *Meyer, Komment.* (on *St. John*), p. 142, notes.
- ft906 And so He ever does, beginning His Ministry by purifying, whether as regards the individual or the Church.
- ft907 Canon *Westcott* calls attention to the use of two different terms for money-changers in vv. 14, 15. In the latter only it is, of which the Aramaic form is *qolbon*. It is this *qolbon*-taking against which the Hand of Christ is specially directed.
- ft908 Yet *Renan* ventures to characterize this as a sudden, ill-advised outburst of ill-humor.

^{ft909} I cannot see in the words of Jesus any direct reference to the abrogation of the material Temple and its services, and the substitution of the Church for it. Of course, such was the case, and implied in His Crucifixion and Resurrection, though not alluded to here.

^{ft910} From the expression (St. ~~Rev~~ John 2:20) ‘Forty and six years was this Temple in building,’ it has been inferred by most writers that this Passover was of the year 791 A.U.C., or 28 A.D., and not, as we have argued, of the year 780 A.U.C., or 27 A.D. But their calculation rests on an oversight. Admittedly the rebuilding of the Temple began in the autumn of the eighteenth year of Herod’s reign (*Jos. Ant.* 15:11. 1-6). As Herod’s reign dates from 717 A.U.C., the Temple-building must have commenced in the autumn of the year 734-35. But it has already been explained that, in Jewish reckoning, the beginning of a new year was reckoned as a year. Thus if, according to universal opinion (comp. *Wieseler*, *Chronolog. Synopse*, pp. 165, 166), the Temple-building began in Kislev 734, forty-nine years after it would bring us to the autumn 779, and the Passover of 780, or 27 A.D., would be regarded and spoken of as ‘forty and six years.’ If a Jew had calculated the time at the Passover 781, he would *not* have said ‘forty-six’ but ‘forty-seven years’ ‘was this Temple in building.’ The mistake of writers lies in forgetting that a fresh year had begun after the autumn — or at any rate at the Passover. It may here be added, that the Temple was not finally completed till 63 A.D.

^{ft911} Although our A.V. translates in ver. 18 ‘sign’ and in ver. 23 ‘miracles,’ the Greek word is the same in both cases, and means a ‘sign.’

^{ft912} We reserve a detailed account of the Paschal celebration for our account of the last Passover of Jesus.

^{ft913} A Nicodemus is spoken of in the Talmud as one of the richest and most distinguished citizens of Jerusalem (*Taan.* 20 a: *Kethub.* 66 b: *Gitt.* 56 a; *Ab. de R. Nath.* 6 comp. *Ber. R.* 42. *Midr.* on ~~2072~~ *Ecclesiastes* 7:12, and on *Lament.* 1:5). But this name was only given him on account of a miracle which happened at his request, his real name being *Bunai*, the son of Gorion. A *Bunai* is mentioned in the Talmud among the disciples of Jesus, and a story is related how his daughter, after immense wealth, came to most abject poverty. But there can scarcely be a doubt that this somewhat legendary *Naqdimon* was *not* the Nicodemus of the Gospel.

ft914 ‘We know that Thou art a Teacher come from God.’

ft915 This, of course, is not the view of the Tübingen School, which regards the whole of this narrative as representing a later development. Dr. Abbott (Encycl. Brit., Art. ‘Gospels,’ p. 821) regards the expression, ‘born of water and of the Spirit,’ as a reference to Christian Baptism, and this again as evidence for the late authorship of the fourth Gospel. His reasoning is, that the *earliest* reference to regeneration is contained in St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 18:3. Then he supposes a reference in *Justin’s* Apologia (i. 61) to be a *further* development of this doctrine, and he denies what is generally regarded as Justin’s quotation from St. ~~John~~ John 3:5 to be such, because it omits the word ‘water.’ A *third* stage he supposes to be implied in ~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 1:3, 23; with which he connects ~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 3:21. The *fourth* stage of development he regards as embodied in the words of St. ~~John~~ John 3:5. All these hypotheses — for they are no more than such — are built on Justin’s omission of the word ‘water,’ which, as Dr. Abbott argues, proves that Justin must have been unacquainted with the fourth Gospel, since otherwise it were impossible that, when expressly treating of Baptism, he should have omitted it. To us, on the other hand, the opposite seems the legitimate inference. Treating confessedly of Baptism, it was only necessary for his argument, which identified regeneration with Baptism, to introduce the reference to the Spirit. Otherwise the quotation is so exactly that from the fourth Gospel, including even the objection of Nicodemus, that it is almost impossible to imagine that so literal a transcription could have originated otherwise than from the fourth Gospel itself, and that it is the result of a supposed series of developments in which Justin would represent the second, and the fourth Gospel the fourth stage. But besides, the attentive reader of the chapter in *Justin’s* Apology cannot fail to remark that Justin represents a *later*, and not an *earlier*, stage than the fourth Gospel. For, with Justin, Baptism and regeneration are manifestly identified, not with renovation of our nature, but with the forgiveness of sins.

ft916 For detailed examination and proof I must here refer the reader to Canon *Westcott’s* Commentary.

ft917 I cannot agree with Archdeacon *Watkins*, who would render it, ‘The Spirit breathes’, an opinion, so far as I know, unsupported, and which seems to me ill-accordant with the whole context.

^{ft918} The expression, 'Kingdom of God,' occurs only in 3:3 and 3:5 of the fourth Gospel. Otherwise the expression 'My Kingdom' is used in 18:36. This exceptional use of the Synoptic term, 'Kingdom of God,' is noteworthy in this connection, and not without its important bearing on the question of the authorship of the fourth Gospel.

^{ft919} Notwithstanding the high authority of Professor *Westcott*, I must still hold that this, and now 'anew,' is the right rendering. The word has always the meaning 'above' in the fourth Gospel (ch. ~~ARAB~~ 3:3, 7, 31; ~~GRU~~ 19:11, 23); and otherwise also St. John always speaks of 'a birth' from God (St. ~~BOIB~~ John 1:13; ~~GRU~~ 1 John 2:29; ~~ARAB~~ 3:9; 4:7; ~~GRU~~ 5:1, 4, 18).

^{ft920} This is at least implied by *Wunsche*, and taken for granted by others. But ancient Jewish tradition and the Talmud do not speak of it. Comp. Yebam. 22 *a*, 62 *a*; 97 *a* and *b*; Bekhor 47 *a*. Proselytes are always spoken of as 'new creatures,' Ber. R. 39, ed. Warsh. p. 72 *a*; Bemidb. R. 11. In Vayyikra R. 30, ~~BA28~~ Psalm 102:18, 'the people that shall be created' is explained: 'For the Holy One, blessed be His Name, will create them a new creature.' In Yalkut on ~~GRU~~ Judges 6:1 (vol. 2 p. 10 c, about the middle) this new creation is connected with the forgiveness of sins, it being maintained that whoever has a miracle done, and praises God for it, his sins are forgiven, and he is made a new creature. This is illustrated by the history of Israel at the Red Sea, by that of Deborah and Barak, and by that of David. In Shem. R. 3 (ed. Warsh. 2 p. 11 *a*) the words ~~GRU2~~ Exodus 4:12, 'teach thee what thou shalt say,' are explained as equivalent to 'I will create thee a new creation.'

^{ft921} The clause 'Who is in heaven' is regarded, on critical grounds, as a gloss. But, even so, it seems almost a necessary gloss, in view of the Jewish notions about the ascent of Moses into heaven. Strange to say, the passage referred to forced Socinus to the curious dogma that before the commencement of His ministry Jesus had been rapt in spirit to heaven. (Comp. 'The History and Development of Socinianism,' in the North. Brit. Revelation May 1859.)

^{ft922} This in many places. Comp., for ex., Jer. Targ. on ~~GRU2~~ Deuteronomy 30:12, and the shocking notice in Bemid. R. 19. Another view, however, Sukk. 5 *a*.

^{ft923} So already in Wisdom of Solomon 16:7; still more clearly in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on ~~GRU8~~ Numbers 21:8, 9: 'He who lifted up

his heart to the name of the Memra of Jehovah, lived;’ and in the Jerusalem Targum on the passage: ‘And Moses made a serpent of brass, and set it on a place aloft [of uplifting] (*tale*) — the same term, curiously, which is applied by the Jews to Christ as the ‘Uplifted’ or ‘Crucified’ One.) And it was that every one that was bitten with the serpent, and lifted his face in prayer (the word implies humbled prayer) unto His Father Who is in heaven, and looked unto the brazen serpent, he was healed.’ Similarly RoSh hash 3:8. *Buxtorf’s* learned tractate on the Brazen Serpent (*Exercitationes*) adds little to our knowledge.

^{ft924} This seems the correct reading. Comp. Canon *Westcott’s* note on the passage, and in general his most full and thorough criticism of the various readings in this chapter.

^{ft925} The Baptism of preparation for the Kingdom could not have been administered by Him Who *opened* the Kingdom of Heaven.

^{ft926} The Evangelist reports the message which was brought to the Pharisees in the very words in which it was delivered.

^{ft927} This, and not ‘the Jews,’ is the better reading.

^{ft928} Probably the discussion originated with John’s disciples — the objector being a Jew or a professing disciple of Christ, who deprecated their views. In the one case they would in his opinion be too low; in the other too high. In either case the subject in dispute would not be *baptisms*, but the general subject of *purifications* — a subject of such wide range in Jewish theology, that one of the six sections into which the Mishnah or traditional Law is divided, is specially devoted to it.

^{ft929} The next event was John’s imprisonment by Herod.

^{ft930} This strange suggestion is made by *Godet*.

^{ft931} No fewer than four localities have been identified with AEnon and Salim. *Ewald*, *Hengstenberg*, *Wieseler*, and *Godet*, seek it on the southern border of Judaea (*En-rimmon*, ^{<6129>} Nehemiah 11:29, comp. ^{<6130>} Joshua 15:1, 32). This seems so improbable as scarcely to require discussion. Dr. *Barclay* (*City of the Great King*, pp. 558-571 finds it a few miles from Jerusalem in the *Wady Far’ah*, but admits (p. 565) that there are doubts about the Arab pronunciation of this *Salim*. Lieut. *Conder* (*Tent-Work in Palest.*, vol. 1 pp. 91-93) finds it in the *Wady Far’ah*, which leads from Samaria to the Jordan. Here he describes most pictorially ‘the springs’ ‘in the open valley surrounded by desolate and shapeless hills,’ with the village of *Salim* three miles south of the

valley, and the village of 'Ainan four miles north of the stream. Against this there are, however, two objections. First, both AEnon and Salim would have been in Samaria. Secondly, so far from being close to each other, Aenon would have been seven miles from Salim.

ft932 Ant. 18:5. 2: 'But to some of the Jews it appeared, that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and, indeed, as a righteous punishment on account of what had been done to John, who was surnamed the Baptist. For Herod ordered him to be killed, a good man, and who commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. For that the baptizing would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not for the putting away (remission) of some sins, but for the purification of the body, after that the soul had been previously cleansed by righteousness. And when others had come in crowds, for they were exceedingly moved by hearing these words, Herod, fearing lest such influence of his over the people might lead to some rebellion, for they seemed ready to do anything by his counsel, deemed it best, before anything new should happen through him, to put him to death, rather than that, when a change should arise in affairs, he might have to repent.', Comp. also *Krebs*. Observationes in Nov. Test. e Fl. Jos. pp. 35, 36.

ft933 I am so strongly impressed with this, that I do not feel sure about *Godet's* theory, that the calling of the four Apostles recorded by the Synoptists (St. ~~1048~~ Matthew 4:18-22; St. ~~4016~~ Mark 1:16-20; St. ~~4018~~ Luke 5:1-11), had really taken place during our Lord's first stay in Capernaum (St. ~~802~~ John 2:12). On the whole, however, the circumstances recorded by the Synoptists seem to indicate a period in the Lord's Ministry beyond that early stay in Capernaum.

ft934 I cannot agree with Archdeacon *Watkins*, that the 'needs go' was in order 'to teach in Samaria, as in Judea, the principles of true religion and worship.'

ft935 So *Bengel* and *Luthardt*.

ft936 Much as has been written about Samaria, the subject has not been quite satisfactorily treated. Some of the passages referred to by *Deutsch* (*Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, vol. 3, Art. Samaritan Pentat. p. 1118) cannot be verified — probably owing to printer's mistakes.

- ^{ft937} Comp. *Smith's Bible Dict.*, Art. Sargon; and *Schrader*, Keil-Inschr. u. d. Alte Test. p. 158 etc.
- ^{ft938} Of course, not *all* the ten tribes. Comp. previous remarks on their migrations.
- ^{ft939} The expression cannot, however, be pressed as implying that the Samaritans were of entirely Gentile blood.
- ^{ft940} Comp. *Herzfeld*, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr. 2, p. 120.
- ^{ft941} *Jost* thinks it existed even before the time of Alexander. Comp. *Nutt*, Samar. Hist. p. 16, note 2.
- ^{ft942} The difficult question, whether this is the Sanballat of the Book of Nehemiah, is fully discussed by *Petermann* (*Herzog's Real-Enc.* vol. 13 p. 366).
- ^{ft943} For a very full criticism of that Pentateuch, see Mr. *Deutsch's* Art. in *Smith's Bible-Dict.*
- ^{ft944} Comp. the sketch of it in *Nutt's* Samar. Hist., and *Petermann's* Art.
- ^{ft945} As instances we may mention the names of the Angels and devils. One of the latter is called *Yatsara* [rxy, which *Petermann* derives from ^{<16312>}Deuteronomy 31:21, and *Nutt* from ^{<12338>}Exodus 23:28. I have little doubt, it is only a corruption of *Yetser haRa*. Indeed, the latter and Satan are expressly identified in Baba B. 16 a. Many of the Samaritan views seem only corruptions and adaptations of those current in Palestine, which, indeed, in the circumstances, might have been expected.
- ^{ft946} The Jews termed it *swnfl p* (Ber. R. 31). *Frankel* ridicules the derivation of *Reland* (de Monte Garis 3, apud *Ugolini*, Thes. vol. 7 pp. 717, 718), who explains the name as *πελεθοῦ ναός*, *stercoreum delubrum*, corresponding to the Samaritan designation of the Temple at Jerusalem as *atl ql q tyb*, *oedes stercorea*. *Frankel* himself (Palast. Exodus p. 248) derives the expression from *πγάτανος* with reference to ^{<16304>}Genesis 35:4. But this seems quite untenable. May not the term be a compound of *fl p*, *to spit out*, and *ναός*?
- ^{ft947} Comp. *Herzfeld*, u. s. 2 p. 120.
- ^{ft948} It is very probable that the date 25 Marcheshvan (Nov.) in the Megill. Taan. refers to the capture of Samaria. Both the Talmud (Jer. Sot. 9:14; Sot. 33 a) and Josephus (Ant. 13:10. 7) refers to a *Bath Qol*

announcing this victory to Hyrcanus while he ministered in the Sanctuary at Jerusalem.

^{ft949} Not a few of the events of Herod's life were connected with Samaria. There he married the beautiful and ill-fated Mariamme (Ant. 14:12. 1); and there, thirty years later, her two sons were strangled by order of the jealous tyrant (Ant. 16:11. 2-7).

^{ft950} Comp. *Nutt*, Samar. Hist. p. 26, note, and the authorities there quoted.

^{ft951} The more exact translation would, of course, be *Kuthim*, but I have written *Cuthim* on account of the reference to 2 Kings 27:24. Indeed, for various reasons, it is impossible always to adopt a uniform or exact system of transliteration.

^{ft952} Thus in Ber. 57 *b* Cuthaeen is evidently used for 'idolator.' An instance of the Jewish use of the term Cuthaeen for Christian occurs in Ber. R. 64, where the Imperial permission to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem is said to have been frustrated by Cuthaeen intrigue, the text here evidently referring by that expression not to Samaritans, but to Christians, however silly the charge against them. See *Joel*, Blicke in d. Relig. Gesch. p. 17. Comp. also *Frankel* u. s. p. 244; *Jost*. Gesch. d. Judenth. i. p. 49, note 2.

^{ft953} *Frankel* quotes as a notable instance of it, Ber. 8:8, and refers in proof to Jerus. Talmud on this Misnah. But, for reasons soon to be explained, I am not prepared in this instance to adopt his view.

^{ft954} As in the case of heathens, neither temple tribute, nor any other than free-will and votive offerings were received from them.

^{ft955} The expression literally applies to idolaters.

^{ft956} In Jer. Kil. 9:4, 9. 32 *c* (middle) the question of the Resurrection is discussed, when it is said that the Samaritan inhabitants of Palestine, far from enjoying the blessings of that period, would be made into sections (or, made like cloth [?]), and then burnt up.

^{ft957} In Jer. Orlah 2:7 the question is discussed, how long after the Passover it is not lawful to use bread baked by Samaritans, showing that ordinarily it was lawful.

^{ft958} The doctrinal views, the festive observances, and the literature of the Samaritans of a later period, cannot be discussed in this place. For further information we refer to the following: — The Articles in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, in *Winer's Bibl. Real-Worterb.*, and

especially in *Herzog's Real-Encykl.* (by *Petermann*); to *Juynboll*, *Comment.* in *Hist. Gentis Samarit.*; *Jost*, *Gesch. des Judenth.*; *Herzfeld*, *Gesh. des judisch. Volkes*, *passim*; *Frankel*, *Einfluss der Palast. Exeg.* pp. 237-254; *Nutt*, *Sketch of Samaritan History*, etc.

^{ft959} *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* 9, 14; *Leontius*, *De Sectis* 8; *Gregory the Great*, *Moral.* 1:15 *Grimm* (*Die Samariter etc.*, pp. 91 etc.), not only strongly defends the position of the Fathers, but holds that the Samaritans did not even believe in the immortality of the soul, and maintained that the world was eternal. The 'Samaritan Chronicle' dates from the thirteenth century, but *Grimm* maintains that it embodies the earlier views of that people (u. s. p. 107).

^{ft960} This seems inconsistent with their disbelief of the Resurrection, and also casts doubt on the patristic testimony about them, since *Leontius* falsely accuses them of rejecting the doctrine of Angels. *Epiphanius*, on the other hand, attributes to them belief in Angels. *Reland* maintains, that they regarded the Angels as merely 'powers' — a sort of impersonal abstractions; *Grimm* thinks there were two sects of Samaritans — one believing, the other disbelieving, in Angels.

^{ft961} For their horrible distortion of later Jewish Biblical history, see *Grimm* (u. s.), p. 107.

^{ft962} They expected that this Messiah would finally convert all nations to Samaritanism (*Grimm*, p. 99). But there is no historic ground for the view of Mr. *Nutt* (*Sketch of Samar. Hist.* pp. 40, 69) that the idea of a Messiah the Son of Joseph, which holds so large a place in later Rabbinic theology, was of Samaritan origin.

^{ft963} The reference here is to ~~14422~~ Genesis 48:22. *Wunsche*, indeed, objects that this application of the passage is inaccurate, and contrary to universal Rabbinic tradition. But in this, as in other instances, it is not the Gospel, but rather Dr. *Wunsche*, who is inaccurate. If the reader will refer to *Geiger's Urschr.* p. 80, he will find *proof* that the Evangelist's rendering of Genesis 48 was in accordance with ancient Rabbinic tradition, which was only afterwards altered for anti-Samaritan purposes. On the other hand, this may be regarded as another undesigned proof of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

^{ft964} The present depth of the well is about seventy-five feet. Most travellers have given more or less pictorial accounts of Jacob's Well. We refer

here especially to Mr. *King's* Report (Quarterly Stat. of the Pal. Explor. Fund, Ap. 1879), although it contains the strange mistake that Jesus had that day come from Jerusalem, and reached Jacob's Well by midday.

^{ft965} For 'the location of Sychar,' and the vindication of the view that the event took place at the beginning of the wheat harvest, or about the middle of May, see Appendix XV. The question is of considerable importance.

^{ft966} From the silence of the Synoptists, and the general designation of the disciples without naming them, *Caspari* concludes that only John, and perhaps Nathanael, but none of the other apostles, had accompanied Jesus on this journey (Chronol. Geogr. Einl. p. 104).

^{ft967} *Caspari* (u. s. p. 103) thinks that John only related that of which he himself was an eyewitness, except, perhaps, in ch. 18:33, etc.

^{ft968} It is very characteristic when *Schenkel*, in ignorance of the fact that Sychar is mentioned by the Rabbis, argues that the use of the name Sychar for Shechem affords evidence that the Fourth Gospel is of Gentile-Christian origin.

^{ft969} See Appendix XV.

^{ft970} We have already expressed our belief, that in the Fourth Gospel time is reckoned not according to the Jewish mode, but according to the Roman civil day, from midnight to midnight. For a full discussion and proof of this, with notice of objections, see *McLellan's* New Test. vol. 1 pp. 737-743. It must surely be a lapsus when at p. 288 (note *o*), the same author seems to assume the contrary. *Meyer* objects, that, if it had been 6 P.M., there would not have been time for the after-events recorded. But they could easily find a place in the delicious cool of a summer's evening, and both the coming up of the Samaritans (most unlikely at noon-time), and their invitation to Jesus 'to tarry' with them (v. 40), are in favor of our view. Indeed, St. ~~John~~ John 19:14 renders it impossible to adopt the Jewish mode of reckoning.

^{ft971} See a previous note on p. 404.

^{ft972} *Godet* rightly asks what, in view of this, becomes of the supposed Docetism which, according to the Tübingen school, is one of the characteristics of the Fourth Gospel?

- ^{ft973} By which we are to understand a woman from the *country*, not the town or Samaria, a Samaritaness. The suggestion, that she resorted to Jacob's Well on account of its sanctity, scarcely requires refutation.
- ^{ft974} According to the testimony of travellers the Samaritans, with the exception of the High-Priestly family, have *not* the common, well-known type of Jewish face and feature.
- ^{ft975} The 'fringes' on the *Tallith* of the Samaritans are blue, while those worn by the Jews, whether on the *Arba Kanphoth* or the *Tallith*, are white. The Samaritans do not seem to have worn *phylacteries* (Menach. 42 *b*). But neither did many of the Jews of old — nor, I feel persuaded, our Lord (comp. *Jost*, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* vol. 1 p. 60).
- ^{ft976} There were, undoubtedly, marked differences of pronunciation between the Jews and the Samaritans. Without entering into details, it may be said, that they chiefly concern the vowel-sounds; and among consonants the gutturals (which are generally not pronounced), the aspirates, and the letter *Ç* which is not, as in Hebrew, either *Ç* (pronounced *s*), or *✓* (pronounced *sh*), but is always pronounced as '*sh*.' In connection with this we may notice one of those instances, how a strange mistake comes 'by tradition' to be commonly received. It has been asserted that, if Jesus had said to the woman: *Teni li lishtoth* ('Give me to drink'), a Samaritan would have pronounced it *listoth*, since the Samaritans pronounced the *sh* as *s*. But the reverse of this is the fact. The Samaritans pronounced the *s* ('*sin*') as *sh* ('*shin*'), and not the *sh* as *s*. The mistake arose from confounding the old Ephraimite (^{<07125>}Judges 12:5, 6) with the Samaritan mode of pronouncing. The suggestion seems first to have been made, through very *doubtfully* — by *Stier* (*Reden Jesu*, 4 p. 134). *Stier*, however, at least rendered the words of Jesus: *Teni li lishtoth*. *Godet* (ad loc.) accepts *Stier*'s suggestions, but renders the words: *Teni li lishchoth*. Later writers have repeated this, only altering *lishchoth* into *lishkoth*.
- ^{ft977} The article is wanting in the original.
- ^{ft978} Those who wish to see the well-worn Rabbinic references will find them in *Lightfoot* and *Schottgen* ad loc.
- ^{ft979} There is much spurious religious sentiment which, in contravention to our Lord's saving, delights in such expressions as that of *St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (followed by so many modern hymnologists):

*‘Qui Te gustant esuriunt,
Qui bibunt adhuc sitiunt.’
(Ap. Daniel, Thes. 1 p. 223.)*

The theology of this is not only sickly, but untrue and misleading.

ft980 See ‘The Temple and its Ministry,’ pp. 241-243.

ft981 I cannot bring myself to see, as some commentators, any extraordinary mark of rising reverence in the use by her of the word ‘Sir’ in vv. 11 and 15. It seems only natural in the circumstances.

ft982 Comp. *Lucke*, Evang. Joh. vol. 1 p. 588.

ft983 The references here are to *Strauss*, vol. 1 pp. 510-519, and to *Keim* 1:1, p. 116.

ft984 Meyer, *Komment.* vol. 2 p. 208, rightly remarks on the theory of *Baur*, *Hilgenfeld*, etc. According to them, the whole of this history is only a type of heathenism as receptive to faith, in contrast to Nicodemus, the type of Judaism shutting itself up against faith. But in that case why make the principal person a Samaritan, and not a heathen, and why attribute to her belief in a Messiah, which was entirely foreign to heathenism?

ft985 Curiously enough, several instances are related in Rabbinic writings in which Samaritans enter into dispute with Rabbis who pass by Mount Gerizim on their way to Jerusalem, to convince them that Gerizim was the proper place of worship. One instance may here be mentioned, when a Samaritan maintained that Gerizim was the mount of blessing, because it was not covered by the Flood, quoting in proof ~~Gen 22:4~~ Ezekiel 22:24. The Rabbi replied, that if such had been the case, God would have told Noah to flee there, instead of making an ark. The Samaritan retorted, that this was done to try him. The Rabbi was silenced, but his muleteer appealed to ~~Gen 7:19~~ Genesis 7:19, according to which all the high hills under the heavens were covered, and so silenced the Samaritan. (Deb. R. 3; comp. Ber. R. 32.) On the other hand, it ought to be added, that in Ber. R. 33 the Mount of Olives is said not to have been covered by the Flood, and that ~~Ezekiel 22:24~~ Ezekiel 22:24 is applied to this.

ft986 He had formerly taught her the ‘where,’ and now teaches her the ‘what,’ of true worship.

ft987 It is remarkable, that most of the alterations in the Samaritan Pentateuch are with the view of removing anthropomorphisms.

- ^{ft988} The words ‘which is called Christ’ should be within brackets, and are the explanation of the writer.
- ^{ft989} In the original, ver. 31 has it: ‘Rabbi (not Master), eat.’ Surely such an address to Christ is sufficiently anti-Ephesian. Readers know how thoroughly opposed to Jewish notions was any needless converse with a woman (comp. Ab. 1:5; Ber. 43 *b*; Kidd. 70 *a*; also Erub. 53 *b*). To instruct a woman in the Law was forbidden; comp. the story in Bemid. R. 9.
- ^{ft990} Following the suggestion of Professor *Westcott*, I would thus give the real meaning of the original. It may save needless notes if I add, that where the rendering differs from the A.V. the change has been intentional, to bring out the meaning of the Greek; and that where words in the A.V. are omitted, it is because they are either spurious, or doubtful.
- ^{ft991} This is a Hebraism.
- ^{ft992} See them in Appendix XV.
- ^{ft993} Comp. Appendix XV.
- ^{ft994} We follow Canon *Westcott*, who, for reasons explained by him, joins the word ‘already’ to ver. 36, omitting the particle ‘and.’
- ^{ft995} It will be noticed that, in ver. 36 ἵνα has been translated ‘so that,’ the καί omitted, and ὁμοῦ rendered ‘equally as.’ Linguistically, no apology is required for these renderings. I, however, hesitate between this and the rendering: ‘in order that the sower may rejoice along with the reaper.’ But the translation in the text seems to agree better with what follows. The whole passage is perhaps one of the most difficult, from the curtness and rapid transition of the sentences. The only apology which I can offer for proposing a new rendering and a new interpretation is, that those with which I am acquainted have not conveyed any distinct or connected meaning to my own mind.
- ^{ft996} λαλία speech, talking.
- ^{ft997} We have omitted the words ‘the Christ’, in ver. 42, as apparently spurious. In general, the text has been rendered as faithfully as possible, so as to bring out the real meaning.
- ^{ft998} The history of the Baptist’s imprisonment will be given in the sequel.
- ^{ft999} The origin, authorship, and occasion of the Synoptic Gospels and of that by St. John, as well as their interrelation, is discussed in *Euseb.*

Hist. ~~<2002>~~ Ecclesiastes 3:24, the discussion being the more important that Eusebius throughout appeals for his statements to ‘the testimony of the ancients.’

ft1000 I cannot believe that the expression ‘His own country,’ refers to Judaea. Such an explanation is not only unnatural, but contrary to the usage of the expression ἴδιος (‘his own’). Comp. St. ~~<4190>~~ Matthew 9:1; also St. ~~<374>~~ John 7:40-42. *Strauss*’s arguments (*Leben Jesu*, 1 p. 659) seem here conclusive.

ft1001 Βασιλικός, used by Josephus in the general sense of officers in the service of Herod Antipas. Comp. *Krebs*, Obs. in N. Test. e Fl. Josepho, pp. 144, 145, who notes that the expression occurs 600 times in the writings of Josephus.

ft1002 The emphasis must lie on the word ‘see,’ yet not exclusively. Lucke’s objections to this (*Ev. Joh.* 1 p. 622) are not well founded.

ft1003 These will readily occur on comparison of the two narratives. Archdeacon *Watkins* (*ad loc.*) has grouped these under eight distinct particulars. Comp. *Lucke* (*Ev. Joh.*) 1 p. 626.

ft1004 So partially and hesitatingly *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, and more decidedly *Theophilus*, *Euthymius*, *Irenaeus*, and *Eusebius*. All modern negative critics hold this view; but *Gfrorer* regards the narrative of St. John, *Strauss* and *Weiss* that of St. Matthew, as the original account. And yet *Keim* ventures to assert: ‘Ohne allen Zweifel (!) ist das die selbe Geschichte.’

ft1005 Alike *Strauss* and *Keim* discuss this at some length from the point of view of seeming contradiction between the reception of the heathen Centurion and the first refusal of the Syro-Phoenician woman. *Keim*’s treatment of the whole subject seems to me inconsistent with itself.

ft1006 *Keim*, *Jesu 5 Nazara*, II. 1 pp. 179-185. I regret to say, that the language of *Keim* at p. 181 is among the most painful in his book.

ft1007 So *Strauss*, *Leben Jesu*, vol. 2 pp. 121, 122 (1st ed.).

ft1008 At least I so understand *Keim*, unless he means that the faith of the child alone brought about the cure, in which case there was no need for the father’s journey. *Keim* naively asks, what objections there can be to this view, unless for the ‘wording of St. John’? But the whole narrative is derived from that ‘wording.’

ft1009 So literally; the A.V. has: ‘began to amend.’

- ft1010 The Jewish servants may have expressed the time according to Jewish notation, though in such a house in Galilee such might not have been the usual practice. However this be, we contend that St. John's notation of time was according to the Roman civil day, or rather according to that of Asia Minor.
- ft1011 The remark in the 'Speaker's Commentary' (St. ~~4046~~ Luke 4:16), that Jesus had been in the habit of expounding the Scriptures in Nazareth, is not only groundless, but inconsistent with the narrative. See ver. 22. Still more strange is the supposition, that 'Jesus offered to read and to expound, and signified this intention by standing up. This might be done by any member of the congregation.' Most assuredly such would not be the case.
- ft1012 This seems at first sight inconsistent with ~~4048~~ Psalm 124:8. But the term rendered 'Synagogues' in the A. V. has never been used in that sense. The solution of the difficulty here comes to us through the LXX. Their rendering, *καταπαύσωμεν* (let us make to cease), shows that in their Hebrew MSS. they read *ztbc*. If so, then the probably belonged to the next word, and the text would read: *l aAyrēwñAl kw]tKy* 'Let us suppress altogether, the Sabbath and all the festive seasons in the land.' Comp. *Ehrt*, Abfass. Zeit. u. Abschl. d. Psalt. pp. 17-19.
- ft1013 The introduction of morning, midday, and afternoon prayers is respectively ascribed to Abraham, Issac, and Jacob. The Targum of Onkelos and the Targum Ps., Jon. on ~~4052~~ Genesis 25:27 imply their existence in the time of Jacob. In B. Kama 82 *a*, and Jer. Megill. 75 *a*, its services are traced to the time of Moses. According to Sanh. 94 *b*, Synagogues existed in the time of Hezekiah. It is needless to follow the subject further. We take the present opportunity of adding, that, as the Rabbinic quotations in this chapter would be so numerous, only those will be given which refer to points hitherto unnoticed, or of special importance.
- ft1014 The expressions 'Targum' and 'targuming' have been previously explained. The first indication of such paraphrasing in the vernacular is found in ~~4067~~ Nehemiah 8:7, 8.
- ft1015 See Book I. pp. 19, 77.
- ft1016 These numbers, however, seem to have been symbolical. The number 480 is, by *Gimatreya*, deduced from the word 'She that was full of'

(meleathi) in ~~<2102>~~ Isaiah 1:21. Comp. Yalkut, vol. 2 p. 40 *d*, towards the end, or else $480 = 4 \times 10 \times 12$.

ft1017 Comp. Megill. 26.

ft1018 See the notes in *Maimonides*, Hilc. Tephill. 11:2; p. 75 *b*.

ft1019 Comp. Lieut. *Kitchener's* article on the Synagogues of Galilee (P.E.F. Report, July 1878, pp. 126 etc.). The inference, that they date from the beginning of the third century, when the Jews were in high favor with the Emperor Alexander Severus, is all the more ungrounded, that at that time, if ever, the Jewish authorities would strictly adhere to Talmudic directions as to the structure of Synagogues.

ft1020 From '*battel*,' which here seems to have the same meaning as the Latin *vacare rei*, to have leisure for a thing.

ft1021 This is expressly stated in Jer. Megill. 1:6, p. 70 *b*, towards the end.

ft1022 Comp. Megill. 4:3; Sanh. 1:6. That ten constituted a congregation was derived from ~~<0447>~~ Numbers 14:27. Similarly, it was thought to be implied in the fact, that if ten righteous men had been in Sodom, the city would not have been destroyed. But in case of necessity the number ten might be made up by a male child under age (Ber. R. 91, pp. 160 *a* and *b*).

ft1023 On the next page we give a plan of the Synagogue excavated at Tell Hum (Capernaum). It is adapted from Capt. *Wilson's* plan in the P.E.F. Quarterly Statement, No. 2.

ft1024 Comp. Palestine Exploration Fund Report, Quarterly Statement, 2 p. 42 etc.

ft1025 Comp. *Warren's* 'Recovery of Jerusalem,' p. 343 etc.

ft1026 There is a curious passage in Ber. 8 *a*, which states that although there were thirteen Synagogues in Tiberias, it was the practice of the Rabbis only to pray 'between the columns where they studied.' This seems to imply that the Academy consisted also of colonnades. For it would be difficult to believe that all the supposed Synagogues excavated in Galilee were Academies.

ft1027 It was also called Argas and Qomtar (Megill. 26 *b*), but more generally Chest.

ft1028 Hence the expression 'yored liphney hattebhah,' and 'obhed liphney hattebhah.'

- ft1029 Seems also to have been called 'Kathedrah,' just as by our Lord (St. ~~Matth~~ Matthew 23:2). Comp. *Buxtorf's* Lexicon, p. 2164.
- ft1030 This, not for symbolical reasons, but probably on account of the strength of the wine. It is needless here to give the rules how the cup is to be held, or even the liturgical formula of the Qiddush. Comp. Jer. Ber. p. 3 *c, d*; 7:6, p. 11 *c, d*.
- ft1031 As to all this, and the great liberty in prayer, comp. Zunz, Gottesd. Vortr. d. Jud. pp. 368, 369, and notes *a, b*, and *d*; and Ritus des Synag. Gottesd. pp. 2 and 3.
- ft1032 In St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 5:22, several *Archisynagogoi* seem to be spoken of. But the expression may only mean, as *Weiss* suggests, one of the order of the *Archisynagogoi*. The passage in ~~Acts~~ Acts 13:15 is more difficult. Possibly it may depend upon local circumstances — the term *Archisynagogoi* in the strictest sense, such as the *Gerousiarchs* of the Roman inscriptions.
- ft1033 Part of the *Shema*, and the whole of the Eulogies.
- ft1034 There is even doubt, whether the exact words of at least some of the Benedictions were fixed at an early period. See *Zunz*, u. s.
- ft1035 Originally the eulogies were eighteen in number. The addition of that against the heretics would have made them nineteen. Accordingly, Eulogy 15, which prayed for the coming of the Branch of David, was joined to the previous one in order to preserve the number eighteen. Comp. Jer. Ber. 4:3. It is sadly characteristic that, together with a curse upon Christian converts, the Messianic hope of Israel should thus have been pushed into the background.
- ft1036 For the sake of brevity, I can only here refer the reader to the passages.
- ft1037 Minor differences need not here be detailed, especially as they are by no means certain.
- ft1038 It seems also to have been the rule, that they must wash their hands before pronouncing the benediction (Sot. 39 *a*).
- ft1039 The question is discussed: first, who blessed the priests? and, secondly, what part God had in that benediction? The answer will readily be guessed (Chull. 49 *a*). In Siphre on Numbers, par. 43, the words are quoted (~~Num~~ Numbers 6:27) to show that the blessing came from God, and not from, although, through, the priests. In Bemidb. R.

11 ed. *Warsh.* 4 p. 40 *a* there is a beautiful prayer, in which Israel declares that it only needs the blessing of God, according to ~~4535~~ Deuteronomy 26:15, on which the answer comes, that although the priests bring the benediction, it is God Who stands and blesses His people. Accordingly, the benediction of the priests is only the symbol of God's blessing.

ft1040 For these different numbers very curious symbolical reasons are assigned (*Megill.* 23 *a.*).

ft1041 This division seems to have originated in Babylon. Comp. *Zunz*, *Gottesd. Vortr.* pp. 3, 4.

ft1042 Comp. *Duschak*, *Gesch. des jud. Cultus*, pp. 251-258.

ft1043 Some of the leading Rabbis resisted this practice, and declared that a Rabbi who yielded to it deserved death (*Megill.* 28 *a.*; comp. *Megill.* 22 *a.* See generally *Duschak*, u. s. p. 255.).

ft1044 Every descendant of Aaron in the Synagogue is bound to join in the act of benediction, on pain of forfeiture of the blessing on himself, according to ~~4123~~ Genesis 12:3. Otherwise he transgresses three commands, contained in ~~4462~~ Numbers 6:27 (*Sot.* 38 *b.*). The present mode of dividing the fingers when pronouncing the blessing is justified by an appeal to *Cant.* 2:9 (*Bemidb. R.* 11), although no doubt the origin of the practice is mystical.

ft1045 The reasons commonly assigned for it are unhistorical. Comp. 'Sketches of Jewish Life,' p. 278. The term *Haphtarah*, or rather *Aphtarah* and *Aphtarta* is derived from *patar*, to dismiss, either — like the Latin *Missa*, because it ended the general service, or else because the valedictory discourse, called *Aphtarah*, was connected with it.

ft1046 In a few places in Babylon (*Shabb.* 116 *b.*), lessons from the *Hagiographa* were read at afternoon services. Besides, on Purim the whole Book of Esther was read.

ft1047 At a later period, however, ordination seems to have been required for preaching. By a curious Rabbinic exegesis, the first clause of ~~4076~~ Proverbs 7:26 was applied to those who preached without ordination, and the second clause to those who were ordained and did not preach (*Sot.* 22 *a.*).

ft1048 Thus, we have a saying of the first century 'You preach beautifully, but you do not practice beautifully' (*Chag.* 14 *b.*; *Yebam.* 63 *b.*).

ft1049 In Sot. 40 *a* we have an account of how a popular preacher comforted his deserted brother theologian by the following parable: 'Two men met in a city, the one to sell jewels and precious things, the other toys, tinsel, and trifles. Then all the people ran to the latter shop, because they did not understand the wares of the former. A curious instance of popular wit is the following: It was expected that a person lately ordained should deliver a discourse before the people. The time came, but the *Methurgeman* in vain bent his ear closer and closer. It was evident that the new preacher had nothing to say. On which the *Methurgeman* quoted Habak. 2:19: 'Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise, it shall teach !' (Sanh. 7 b). It was probably on account of such scenes, that the Nasi was not allowed afterwards to ordain without the consent of the Sanhedrin.

ft1050 In connection with this the proverb quoted in the New Testament is thus used by Rabbi Tarphon: 'I wonder whether anyone at present would accept reproof. If you said, Remove the mote from thine eye, he would immediately reply, First remove the beam out of thine own eye' (Arach. 16 b). May this not indicate how very widely the sayings of Christ had spread among the people?

ft1051 Even the celebrated R. Eliezer had the misfortune that, at a festival, his hearers one by one stole out during the sermon (Bez. 15 b). On the other hand, it is said of R. Akiba, although his success as a preacher was very varied, that his application to Israel of the sufferings of Job and of his final deliverance moved his hearers to tears (Ber. R. 33).

ft1052 See *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. p. 352, Note *b*.

ft1053 Thus, in Tanch. on ¹⁰²²⁴Exodus 22:24 (ed. *Warsh.* p. 105 *a* and *b*, sect. 15, towards the end), the expression in ¹⁰¹⁹⁷Deuteronomy 15:7, 'Meachikha,' from thy brother, is rendered 'μῆ achikha,' not thy brother. Similarly, in the Pesiqta, the statement in ¹⁰²¹⁷Genesis 22:7, 8, 'God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering,' is paraphrased. 'And if not a *Seh* (lamb) for a burnt-offering, my son, δε (thee) for a burnt offering. It is added, 'se leolah is Greek, meaning, thou art the burnt-offering.' But the Greek in the former passage is also explained by rendering the 'achikha' as an Aramaic form of ¹⁰²¹⁷ῥοικα, in which case it would targumically mean 'Withhold not thy hand from the poor, who is like to thee.' Comp. the interesting tractate of *Brull* (Fremdspr. Redens. p. 21). A play upon Greek words is also supposed to occur in the Midrash on Cant. 2:9, where the word 'dodi,' by omitting the

second *d*, and transposing the *yod* and the *vav*, is made into the Greek δῖος, divine. But I confess I do not feel quite sure about this, although it has the countenance of *Levy*. In the Midrash on Cant. 2:15, a whole Greek sentence is inserted, only Aramaically written. See also *Sachs*, Beitr. pp. 19 etc.

ft1054 Thus, when on one occasion the hearers of Akiba were going to sleep during his sermon, he called out: ‘Why was Esther Queen in Persia over 127 provinces? Answer: She was a descendant of Sarah, who lived 127 years’ (Ber. R. 58). On a similar occasion R. Jehudah startled the sleepers by the question: ‘One woman in Egypt bore 600,000 men in one birth.’ One of his hearers immediately replied to the question, who she was: ‘It was Jochebed, who bore Moses, who is reckoned equal to all the 600,000 of Israel’ (Midr. Shir haSh. R., ed. *Warsh.*, p. 11 *b*, towards the end, on Cant. 1:15).

ft1055 In both these passages, ‘the fools’ are explained to refer to the Methurgeman.

ft1056 And yet most commentators — following, I suppose, the lead of *Meyer* — hold that Christ had ‘stood up’ in the sense of offering or claiming to read.

ft1057 Although we cannot feel quite sure of this.

ft1058 I infer this from the fact, that the Book of the Prophet Isaiah was given to Him by the Minister of the Synagogue. Since the time of *Bengel* it has been a kind of traditional idea that, if this was the *Haphtarah* for the day, the sermon of Christ in Nazareth must have taken place on the Day of Atonement, for which in the modern Jewish lectionary 2880b Isaiah 58:6 forms part of the *Haphtarah*. There are, however, two objections to this view: 1. Our modern lectionary of *Haphtarahs* is certainly not the same as that in the time of Christ. 2. Even in our modern lectionary, 2860b Isaiah 61:1, 2 forms no part of the *Haphtarah*, either for the Day of Atonement, nor for any other Sabbath or festive day. In the modern lectionary 28714 Isaiah 57:14 to 28814 Isaiah 58:14 is the *Haphtarah* for the Day of Atonement.

ft1059 This symbolically: 7 x 3, since each of the seven readers in the Law had to read at least three verses.

ft1060 ‘To set at liberty those that are bruised.’ The words are taken, with but a slight necessary alteration in the verb, from the LXX. rendering

of ^{<2806>}Isaiah 58:6. The clause from ^{<2610>}Isaiah 61:2 is: 'To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.'

^{ft1061} *Preaching* instead of *proclaiming*, in ^{<2610>}Isaiah 61:2, and in the form of the verb in the clause from ^{<2806>}Isaiah 58:6. Besides, the insertion of the clause: 'to heal the broken-hearted,' is spurious.

^{ft1062} All the best MSS. omit the words, 'To heal the broken-hearted.'

^{ft1063} See above, Note 2.

^{ft1064} See the remarks on this point in the previous chapter. If I rightly understand the somewhat obscure language of *Surenhusius* (Biblos Katallages, pp. 339-345), such is also the view of that learned writer. This peculiarly Jewish method of Scriptural quotation by 'stringing together' is employed by St. Paul in ^{<4810>}Romans 3:10-18.

^{ft1065} See the Appendix on the Messianic passages.

^{ft1066} See the previous chapter. It was the universal rule to listen to the sermon in perfect silence (Pes. 110 *a*; Moed K. *a*). The questions and objections commenced afterwards.

^{ft1067} The proverb really is: 'Physician, heal thine own lameness' (Ber. R. 23, ed. *Warsh.* p. 45 *b*).

^{ft1068} The statement that the famine in the time of Elijah lasted three and a half years is in accordance with universal Jewish tradition. Comp. Yalkut on 1 Kings 16, vol. 2 p. 32 *b*.

^{ft1069} See *Stanley*, Sinai and Palestine, p. 363. But surely it could not have been the south-western corner (Conder, Tent-Work, 1 p. 140, and all later writers).

^{ft1070} The provision, which awarded instant death without formal trial in case of open blasphemy or profanation (Sanh. 81 *b*), would not apply in this instance. Probably the purpose was, that the crowd around should, as it were accidentally, push Him over the cliff.

^{ft1071} The spot is just above the Maronite Church.

^{ft1072} See the plan of Nazareth in *Badeker's* (*Socin's*) Palaestina, p. 255. The road to the left goes westward, that through the northern part of the town, towards Capernaum. Our localization gains in probability, if the ancient Synagogue stood where tradition places it. At present it is in the hands of the Maronites.

ft1073 The circumstance that the Nazarenes did not avow the purpose of casting Him over the cliff, but intended accidentally to crowd Him over, explains how, when He turned sharply round to the right, and passed through the crowd, they did not follow Him.

ft1074 Many, even orthodox commentators, hold that this history is the same as that related in St. ~~1054~~ Matthew 13:54-58, and St. ~~1061~~ Mark 6:1-6. But, for the reasons about to be stated, I have come, although somewhat hesitatingly, to the conclusion, that the narrative of St. Luke and those of St. Matthew and St. Mark refer to different events. 1. The narrative in St. Luke (which we shall call A) refers to the commencement of Christ's Ministry, while those of St. Matthew and St. Mark (which we shall call B) are placed at a later period. Nor does it seem likely, that our Lord would have entirely abandoned Nazareth after one rejection. 2. In narrative A, Christ is without disciples; in narrative B He is accompanied by them. 3. In narrative A no miracles are recorded, in fact, His words about Elijah and Elisha preclude any idea of them; while in narrative B there are a few, though not many. 4. In narrative A He is thrust out of the city immediately after His sermon, while narrative B implies, that He continued for some time in Nazareth, only wondering at their unbelief.

If it be objected, that Jesus could scarcely have returned to Nazareth after the attempt on His life, we must bear in mind that this purpose had not been avowed, and that His growing fame during the intervening period may have rendered such a return not only possible, but even advisable.

The coincidences as regards our Lord's statement about the Prophet, and their objection as to His being the carpenter's son, are only natural in the circumstances.

ft1075 Probably resting in the immediate neighborhood of Nazareth, and pursuing His journey next day, when the Sabbath was past.

ft1076 See *Mikraoth Gedoloth* on the passage.

ft1077 The words, 'That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias,' do not bear the meaning, that this was their primary and literal purpose. They represent a frequent mode of citation among Jewish writers, indicating a *real* fulfillment of the spirit, though not always of the letter, of a prophecy. On this subject see also *Surenhusius*, u. s., p. 218,

and his admirable exposition of the Jewish formula *ῥμανῖ ἡμ μῡγῡῑ* ('that it might be fulfilled which was spoken'), u. s., pp. 2-4.

ft1078 Both *Godet* and Prof. *Westcott* (the latter more fully) have pointed out the distinction between *μετὰ ταῦτα* (literally: 'after those things — as in St. ~~<411>~~ John 5:1'), and *μετὰ τοῦτο*. The former does not indicate immediate succession of time.

ft1079 For a full discussion of the question see vol. 2 App. XV. pp. 765, 766; for the 'Feast of Wood-offering,' 'The Temple and its Services, etc.,' pp. 295, 296.

ft1080 The reader will have no difficulty in finding not a few points in St. John 5 utterly irreconcilable with the theory of a second century Ephesian Gospel. It would take too much space to particularize them.

ft1081 So *Gess*, *Godet*, and others.

ft1082 Even *Strauss* admits, that the discourse contains nothing which *might* not have been spoken by Christ. His objection to its authenticity, on the ground of the analogies to it in certain portions of the Fourth Gospel and of the Epistles of St. John, is a curious instance of critical argumentation (*Leben Jesu*, 1 p. 646).

ft1083 Comp. specially *Riehm's* Handwörterb. *ad voc.*

ft1084 Said when people sneezed, like '*Prosit!*'

ft1085 Indeed, belief in 'holy wells' seems to have been very common in ancient times. From the cuneiform inscriptions it appears to have been even entertained by the ancient Babylonians.

ft1086 I must here refer to the critical discussion in Canon *Westcott's* Commentary on St. John. I only wish I could without unfairness transport to these pages the results of his masterly criticism of this chapter.

ft1087 See the Appendix on 'Angels.'

ft1088 Another term for 'sick' in the N. T. is *ἄρρωστος* (St. ~~<4044>~~ Matthew 14:14; St. ~~<4106>~~ Mark 6:5, 13; 16:18; (comp. *Ecclus.* 7:35). This corresponds to the Hebrew ~~<4008>~~ Malachi 1:8. In ~~<4113>~~ 1 Corinthians 11:30 the two words are used together, *ἄρρωστος* and *ἀσθενής*.

ft1089 Such a logical inversion seems necessary in passing from the objective to the subjective.

ft1090 This characteristic is specially marked by Canon *Westcott*.

- ft1091 The meaning of the expression is 'retired' or 'withdrawn' Himself.
- ft1092 In connection with this see ver. 24, where the expression is 'believeth Him,' not 'on Him' as in the A.V., which occasionally obliterates the difference between the two, which is so important, the one implying credit, the other its outcoming trust (comp. St. ~~<16>~~ John 6:29, 30; 8:30, 31; ~~<150>~~ 1 John 5:10).
- ft1093 The whole subject of the Sabbath-Law will be specially discussed in a later chapter. See also Appendix XVII. on 'The Law of the Sabbath' according to the Mishnah and Talmud.
- ft1094 See *Westcott* ad loc.
- ft1095 The accounts in the three Synoptic Gospels must be carefully pieced together. It will be seen that only thus can they be understood. The narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark are almost literally the same, only adding in St. ~~<100>~~ Mark 1:20 a notice about 'the hired servants,' which is evidential of the Petrine origin of the information. St. Luke seems to have made special inquiry, and, while adopting the narrative of the others, supplements it with what without them would be almost unintelligible.
- ft1096 St. ~~<1018>~~ Matthew 4:18 etc.; St. ~~<1016>~~ Mark 1:16 etc. as compared with St. ~~<1012>~~ Luke 5:2.
- ft1097 In order not to impede navigation, it was forbidden to fix nets. For these two ordinances, see Baba K. 80 *b*, last line etc. The reference to the fishing in the lake is in 81 *b*. But see Tos. Baba K. 8:17, 18.
- ft1098 Three lines before that we read this saying of a fisherman: 'Roast fish with his brother (salt), lay it beside his father (water), eat it with his son (fish-juice), and drink upon it his father' (water).
- ft1099 Specially from Egypt and Spain, Machsh. 6:3.
- ft1100 The name *Peter* occurs also among the Jews, but not that of *Paul*. Thus, in Pesiqta (ed. *Buber*, p. 158 *a*, line 8 from bottom, see also the Note there) we read of a R. Jose the son of Peytros, and similarly in the fragments from Tanchuma in *Jellinek's* Beth ha-Midr. vol. 6 p. 95, where, however, he is called *Ben Petio*. In Menor. Hamm. the name is changed into *Phinehas*. Comp. *Jellinek*, Beth ha-Midr. vol. 6 Pref. 11.
- ft1101 We would call special attention to the arrangement of this narrative. The explanation given in the text will, it is hoped, be sufficient answer to the difficulties raised by some commentators. *Strauss'* attempt to

indicate the mythic origin of this narrative forms one of the weakest parts of his book. *Keim* holds the genuineness of the account of the two first Evangelists, but rejects that of the third, on grounds which neither admit nor require detailed examination. The latest and most curious idea of the Tübingen school has been, to see in the account of St. Luke a reflection on Peter as Judaistically cramped, and to understand the beckoning to his partners as implying the calling in of Pauline teachers.

ft1102 The accounts of this given by St. Mark and St. Luke chronologically precede what is related in St. ^{<0184>}Matthew 8:14-17. The reader is requested in each case to peruse the Biblical narratives before, or along with their commentation in the chapters of the present work.

ft1103 The following are the passages in which the same term is used: St. ^{<0728>}Matthew 7:28; ^{<0154>}13:54; ^{<0125>}19:25; ^{<0223>}22:33; St. ^{<0022>}Mark 1:22; ^{<0062>}6:2; ^{<0075>}7:37; ^{<0105>}10:26; ^{<0118>}11:18; St. ^{<0128>}Luke 2:48; ^{<0142>}4:32; ^{<0143>}9:43; ^{<0132>}Acts 13:12.

ft1104 The word 'spirit' or 'spirits' occurs *twice* in St. Matthew, *thrice* in St. Mark and *twice* in St. Luke; with the addition 'evil,' *twice* in St. Luke; with that of 'unclean,' *once* in St. Matthew, *eleven* times in St. Mark, and *four* times in St. Luke. The word in δαίμων singular or plural occurs once in each of the Synoptists; while δαιμονοῖν in singular or plural, occurs nine times in St. Matthew, three times in St. Mark, fourteen times in St. Luke, and six times in St. John. The expression 'the spirit of an unclean demon' occurs once in the St. Luke, while the verb 'to be demonished' occurs, in one form or another, seven times in St. Matthew, four times in St. Mark, once in St. Luke, and once in St. John. Comp. also the careful *brochure* of Pastor *Nanz*, Die Besessenen im N.T., although we differ from his conclusions.

ft1105 Comp. also *Weiss*, *Leben Jesu* 1 p. 457.

ft1106 This is also the conclusion arrived at by *Weiss*, u. s.

ft1107 The nearest approach to it, so far as I am aware, occurs in Pirque de R. El. c. 13 (ed. Lemberg, p. 16 *b*, 17 *a*), where the influence of Satan over the serpent (in the history of the Fall) is likened to that of an evil spirit over a man, all whose deeds and words are done under the influence of the demon, so that he only acts at his bidding.

- ft1108 Surely *Strauss* (Leben Jesu, 2:10) could not have remembered the expressions in ~~<964>~~ 1 Samuel 16:14, 15, etc., when he sees a parallel to demoniacal possessions in the case of Saul.
- ft1109 Tob. 8:2, 3, is *not* a case in point.
- ft1110 *Gfrorer* (Jahrh. d. Heils, 1 p. 410, 412) quotes Erub. 4:1 and Gitt. 7:1; but neither of these passages implies anything like demoniac possession.
- ft1111 See, for example, Ant 6:8. 2; 11. 3; 8:2. 5; War 7:6. 3.
- ft1112 The reader will find full references in the Encyclopaedias, in *Wetstein* (Nov. Test. 1 pp. 279-284), and in *Nanz's* brochure.
- ft1113 See Appendix XVI.: 'Jewish Views about Demons and the demonised.'
- ft1114 I have omitted, on critical grounds, the clause, 'Let us alone.' The expression, 'What between us and Thee, Jesu Nazarene,' contains a well-known Hebraism.
- ft1115 This seems the more correct rendering.
- ft1116 This is the real meaning of the expression rendered, 'Hold thy peace.' It stills the raging of the powers of evil just as, characteristically, it is again employed in the stilling of the storm, St. ~~<406>~~ Mark 4:39.
- ft1117 The Greek term implies this. Besides its use in this narrative (St. ~~<407>~~ Mark 1:27; St. ~~<408>~~ Luke 4:36, in the latter in the substantive form), it occurs in St. ~~<409>~~ Mark 10:24, 32; ~~<410>~~ Acts 9:6; and as a substantive in ~~<411>~~ Acts 3:10.
- ft1118 This seems the better rendering.
- ft1119 Such is the meaning of the Greek word. I cannot understand, why the corresponding term in St. Luke should have been interpreted in 'The Speaker's Commentary as 'typhoid fever.'
- ft1120 The word is the same in both cases.
- ft1121 The term is the same. See the remarks of *Volkmar* (Marcus, pp. 99, 100).
- ft1122 I can scarcely find words strong enough to express my dissent from those who would limit ~~<2804>~~ Isaiah 53:4, either on the one hand to spiritual, or on the other to physical 'sicknesses.' The promise is one of future deliverance from both, of a Restorer from all the woe which sin had brought. In the same way the expression 'taking upon Himself,'

and ‘bearing’ refers to the Christ as our Deliverer, because our Substitute. Because He took upon Himself our infirmities, therefore He bore our sicknesses. That the view here given is that of the N.T., appears from a comparison of the application of the passage in St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 8:17 with that in St. ~~John~~ John 1:29 and ~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 2:24.

The words, as given by St. Matthew, are most truly a N.T. ‘Targum’ of the original. The LXX. renders, ‘This man carries our sins and is pained for us;’ *Symmachus*, ‘Surely He took up our sins, and endured our labors;’ the Targum Jon., ‘Thus for our sins He will pray, and our iniquities will for His sake be forgiven.’ (Comp. *Driver* and *Neubauer*, The Jewish Interpreters on Isaiah 53, vol. 2) Lastly, it is with reference to this passage that the Messiah bears in the Talmud the designation, ‘The Leprous One,’ and ‘the Sick One’ (Sanh. 98 b).

ft1123 So both in St. Mark (~~Mark~~ 1:35-39) and in St. Luke (~~Luke~~ 4:42-44), and in substantial accord even in St. Matthew (~~Matthew~~ 4:23).

ft1124 So also St. Paul, ~~1 Corinthians~~ 1 Corinthians 12:31; 13:1.

ft1125 πρωί

ft1126 The circumstances will be referred to in the sequel.

ft1127 The expression in St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 4:43 shows, that the ‘coming forth’ (St. ~~Mark~~ Mark 1:38) cannot be limited to His leaving Capernaum.

ft1128 The following are, briefly, some of the considerations which determine the chronological order here adopted: (1.) This event could not have taken place *after* the Sermon on the Mount, since then the twelve Apostles were already called, nor yet after the call of St. Matthew. (2) From the similes employed (about the lilies of the field, etc.), the Sermon on the Mount seems to have taken place in spring; this event in early autumn. On the other hand, the order in St. Mark exactly fits in, and also in the main agrees, with that in St. Luke, while, lastly, it exhibits the growing persecutions from Jerusalem, of which we have here the first traces.

ft1129 This is ingeniously indicated in Professor *Delitzsch*’s *Entsteh. d. Kanon. Evang.*, although, in my view, the theory cannot be carried out in the full details attempted by the Professor. But such a general conception of the Gospel by St. Matthew is not only reasonable in itself, but explains his peculiar arrangement of events.

ft1130 On the date of this feast comp. Appendix 15.

- ft1131 From this women were excepted, Sot. 3:8.
- ft1132 They were not allowed to hold intercourse with persons under other defilement than leprosy, Pes. 67 *a*.
- ft1133 These were considered as walled since the time of Joshua, Kel. 1:7, and their sanctity equal to that of the camp of Israel, and greater than that of unwalled towns.
- ft1134 Neg. 3:1; 7:1; 11:1; 12:1.
- ft1135 The following parts are declared in the Mishnah as untainted by leprosy: within the eye, ear, nose, and mouth; the folds of the skin, especially those of the neck; under the female breast; the armpit; the sole of the foot, the nails, the head, and the beard (Neg. 6:8).
- ft1136 Michaelis views the whole question chiefly from the standpoint of sanitary police.
- ft1137 It is, though I think hesitatingly, propounded by *Strauss* (vol. 2 pp. 56, 57). He has been satisfactorily answered by *Volkmar* (Marcus, p. 110).
- ft1138 u. s. pp. 53, 54.
- ft1139 Jesu von Naz. 2:p. 174. This is among the weakest portions of the book. *Keim* must have strongly felt 'the telling marks of the authenticity of this narrative,' when he was driven to an explanation which makes Jesus 'present Himself as a Scribe.'
- ft1140 See the passage in full in the Appendix on Messianic Prophecies.
- ft1141 These are detailed in Neg. 1:1-4; 2:1; 3:3-6; 7:1; 9:2, 3.
- ft1142 Undoubtedly the deepest and most philosophical treatment of this subject is that in the now somewhat rare, and unfortunately uncompleted, work of *Molitor*, Philosophie d. Gesch. (see vol. 3 pp. 126 etc., and 253 etc). The author is, however, perhaps too much imbued with the views of the Kabbalah.
- ft1143 According to Tos. Neg. 6, no case of leprosy of houses had ever occurred, but was only mentioned in Scripture, in order to give occasion to legal studies, so as to procure a Divine reward.
- ft1144 I have here followed, or rather summarized, *Maimonides*. It was, of course, impossible to give even the briefest details.
- ft1145 The story, of which this saying is the moral, is that of the crushing of a serpent by the great miracle-monger Chanina ben Dosa, without his being hurt. But I cannot help feeling that a *double entendre* is here

intended — on the one hand, that even a serpent could not hurt one like Chanina, and, on the other, the wider bearing on the real cause of death: not our original state, but our actual sin.

ft1146 The Midrash enumerates four as in that category: the poor, the blind, the childless, and the leprous.

ft1147 From ^{<38412>}Zechariah 14:12 it was inferred, that this leprosy would smite the Gentiles even in the Messianic age (Tanchuma, Tazria, end).

ft1148 And yet Jewish symbolism saw in the sufferings of Israel and the destruction of the Temple the real fulfilment of the punishment of leprosy with its attendant ordinances, while it also traced in the healing of that disease and the provisions for declaring the leper clean, a close analogy to what would happen in Israel's restoration (Vayyikra R. 15, 17; Yalkut 1 par. 551, 563).

ft1149 On this term see the first note in this chapter.

ft1150 This, however, as *Godet* has shown (Comm. on St. Luke, German transl., p. 137), does not imply that the event took place either in a house or in a town, as most commentators suppose. It is strange that the 'Speaker's Commentary,' following *Weiss*, should have located the incident in a Synagogue. It could not possibly have occurred there, unless all Jewish ordinances and customs had been reversed.

ft1151 The Rabbinic ordinances as to the ritual in such cases are in Neg. 14 See 'The Temple and its Services' pp. 315-317. Special attention was to be given, that the water with which the purified leper was sprinkled was from a pure, flowing spring (six different collections of water, suited to different kinds of impurity, being described in Miqv. 1:1-8). From Parah 8:10 we gather, that among other rivers even the Jordan was not deemed sufficiently pure, because in its course other streams, which were not lawful for such purification, had mingled with it.

ft1152 The same order is followed by St. Luke. From the connection between St. Mark and St. Peter, we should naturally look for the fullest account of that early Capernaum-Ministry in the Second Gospel.

ft1153 The A. V. mars the meaning by rendering it: 'power.'

ft1154 So according to the best readings.

ft1155 It is, of course, not pretended by negative critics that the Fourth Gospel borrowed from St. Mark. On the contrary, the supposed differences in form and spirit between the Synoptists and the Fourth

Gospel form one of the main arguments against the authenticity of the latter. In regard to the 5th chap. of St. John, Dr. *Abbott* writes (Art. ‘Gospels,’ Encycl. Brit. p. 833 b): ‘That part of the discourse in which Christ describes Himself in the presence of the multitude as having received all power to judge and to quicken the dead, does not resemble anything in the Synoptic narrative’ — except St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 11:27; St. ~~Luke~~ Luke 10:22, and ‘that was uttered privately to the disciples.’ To complete the irony of criticism, Dr. *Abbott* contrasts the ‘faith of the Synoptists,’ such as ‘that half-physical thrill of trust in the presence of Jesus. Which enables the limbs of a paralyzed man to make the due physical response to the emotional shock consequent on the word “Arise,” so that in the strength of that shock the paralytic is enabled to shake off the disease of many years,’ with faith such as the Fourth Gospel presents it.

ft1156 μymyl See *Wetstein* in loc.

^{ft1157} ‘Sketches of Jewish life,’ pp. 93-96.

^{ft158} Such a crowd could scarcely have assembled there — and where were those about and beyond the door?

fi1159 This is the suggestion of Dr. *Thomson* ('The Land and the Book,' pp. 358, 359). But even he sees difficulties in it. Besides, was Christ inside the small room of such a house, and if so, how did the multitude see and hear Him? Nor can I see any reason for representing Peter as so poor. Professor *Delitzsch*'s conception of the scene (in his 'Elin Tag in Capern,') seems to me, so far as I follow it, though exceedingly beautiful, too imaginative.

^{ft1160}In our A. V. it is erroneously ~~(1520)~~Deuteronomy 29:1.

^{ft1161} So according to the greater number of MSS., which have the verb in the *perfect* tense.

^{ft1162} The expression, ‘reasoning in their hearts,’ corresponds *exactly* to the Rabbinic **wbl b whrh** **m** Ber. 22 *a*. The word **rHrh** is frequently used in contradistinction to speaking.

^{ft1163} In Sanh. 93 *b* this reading of the thoughts is regarded as the fulfilment of ~~<210B>~~ Isaiah 11:3, and as one of the marks of the Messiah, which Bar Kokhabh not possessing was killed.

^{ft1164} That the expression ‘Son of Man’ **מֶרַחֵב** was well understood as referring to the Messiah, appears from the following remarkable anti-

Christian passage (Jer. Taan 65 *b*, at the bottom): 'If a man shall say to thee, I am God, he lies; if he says, I am the Son of Man, his end will be to repent it; if he says, I go up into heaven (to this applies ^{<4239>}Numbers 23:19), hath he said and shall he not do it? [or, hath he spoken, and shall he make it good?] Indeed, the whole passage, as will be seen, is an attempt to adapt. ^{<4239>}Numbers 23:19 to the Christian controversy.

^{ft1165} The words 'to repentance' are certainly spurious in St. Matthew and St. Mark. I regard theirs as the original and authentic report of the words of Christ. In St. ^{<4152>}Luke 5:32, the words 'unto repentance' do certainly occur. But, with *Godet*, I regard them as referring to 'the righteous,' and as used, in a sense ironically.

^{ft1166} So in all the three Gospels.

^{ft1167} Comp. *Sepher Iqqarim* 4:28.

^{ft1168} It would be quite one-sided to represent this as the *only* meaning, as, it seems to me, *Weber* has done in his 'System d. altsynagog, palaest. Theol.' This, and a certain defectiveness in the treatment, are among the blemishes in this otherwise interesting and very able posthumous work.

^{ft1169} So in too many passages for enumeration.

^{ft1170} Some of these points have already been stated. But it was necessary to repeat them so as to give a connected view.

^{ft1171} So, according to Rabbinism, both in the *Sepher Iqqar.* and in *Menor. Hammaor*.

^{ft1172} In *Menorath Hammaor* (Ner ver. 1:1, 2) seven kinds of repentance in regard to seven different conditions are mentioned. They are repentance immediately after the commission of sin; after a course of sin, but while there is still the power of sinning; where there is no longer the occasion for sinning; where it is caused by admonition, or fear of danger; where it is caused by actual affliction; where a man is old, and unable to sin; and, lastly, repentance in prospect of death.

^{ft1173} This is illustrated, among other things, by the history of a Rabbi who, at the close of a dissolute life, became a convert by repentance. The story of the occasion of his repentance is not at all nice in its realistic details, and the tears with which a self-righteous colleague saw the beatification of the penitent are painfully illustrative of the elder brother in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (*Ab. Z.* 17 *a*).

ft1174 So it would need to be rendered in this context.

ft1175 Another beautiful allegory is that, in the fear of Adam, as the night closed in upon his guilt, God gave him two stones to rub against each other, which produced the spark of light — the rubbing of these two stones being emblematic of repentance (Pes. 54 *a*; Ber. R. 11, 12).

ft1176 Baba Mez. 84 *b* (quoted by *Weber*) is scarcely an instance. The whole of that part of the Talmud is specially repugnant, from its unsavory character and grossly absurd stories. In one of the stories in Baba Mez. 85, a Rabbi tries by sitting over the fire in an oven, whether he has become impervious to the fire of Gehinnom. For thirty days he was successful, but after that it was noticed his thighs were singed, whence he was called ‘the little one with the singed thighs.’

ft1177 But such restitution was sometimes not insisted on, for the sake of encouraging penitents.

ft1178 Rabbinism has an apt illustration of this in the saying, that all the baths of lustration would not cleanse a man, so long as he continued holding in his hand that which had polluted him (Taan. 16 *a*).

ft1179 These statements are all so thoroughly Rabbinic that it is needless to make special references.

ft1180 A ridiculous story is told that Matthew endeavored to avert sentence of death by a play on his name, quoting ^{<9012>}Psalm 42:2: ‘*Mathai* (in our version, ‘When’) I shall come and appear before God;’ to which the judges replied by similarly adapting ^{<9406>}Psalm 41:5: ‘*Mathai* (in our version, ‘When’) he shall die, and his name perish.’ The other three disciples are named: *Neqai*, *Netser*, and *Boni*, or *Buni*. In Taan. 20 *a* a miracle is related which gave to Boni the name of Nicodemus (Naqdimon). But I regard this as some confusion, of which there is much in connection with the name of Nicodemus in the Talmud. According to the Talmud, like Matthew, the other three tried to save their lives by punning appeals to Scripture, similar to that of St. Matthew. Thus, *Neqai* quotes ^{<1237>}Exodus 23:7, ‘*Naqi* (‘the innocent’ in our version) and the righteous shalt thou not slay,’ to which the judges replied by ^{<9008>}Psalm 10:8, ‘in the secret places he shall slay *Naqi* (‘the innocent’ in our version)’. Again, *Netser* pleads ^{<2310>}Isaiah 11:1: ‘*Netser* (a branch) shall grow out of his roots,’ to which the judges reply, ^{<2349>}Isaiah 14:19: ‘Thou art cast out of thy grave like an abominable *Netser*’ (branch), while *Boni* tries to save his life by a pun on

~~1012~~ Exodus 4:22: 'My first-born *Beni* (in our version, 'my son') is Israel,' to which the judges reply by quoting the next verse, 'I will slay *Binkha* (in our version, 'thy son'), thy first-born!' If the Hebrew *Beni* was sometimes pronounced *Boni*, this may account for the Grecianized form *Boanerges* ('sons of thunder') for *Beney-Regosh*, or *Regasha*. In Hebrew the root scarcely means even 'noise' (see *Gesenius* sub), but it has that meaning in the Aramaean. *Kautzsch* (Gram. d. Bibl.-Aram.) suggests the word *regaz* 'anger,' 'angry impetuosity.' But the suggestion does not commend itself.

ft1181 ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνειν.

ft1182 With them herdsmen were conjoined, on account of their frequent temptations to dishonesty, and their wild lives far from ordinances.

ft1183 *Wunsche* is mistaken in making the *Gabbai* the superior, and the *Mokhes* the subordinate, tax-collector. See *Levy*, Neuhebr. Worterb, 3 p. 116 a.

ft1184 Comp. *Wieseler*'s Beitr. pp. 75-78. Hence the 'publicans' were not subordinates, but direct officials of the Government.

ft1185 This is perhaps the better reading of St. ~~4126~~ Mark 2:16.

ft1186 **rml w ax** a very common formula, where further thought and instruction are required. So common, indeed, is it, that it is applied in the sense of 'let,' such or such thing 'come and teach' **harw awb**. Sometimes the formula is varied, as **harw azb**, 'come and see' (*Baba Bath. 10 a*), or **zarw zax**, 'go and see' (u. s., *b*).

ft1187 Even in that beautiful page in the Talmud (*Succ. 49 b*) righteousness and sacrifices are compared, the former being declared the greater; and then righteousness is compared with works of kindness with alms, etc.

ft1188 Mark the absence of the Article.

ft1189 See footnote 1165 (ft1165)

ft1190 Thus he would be the same as 'James the Less,' or rather 'the Little,' a son of Mary, the sister-in-law of the Virgin-Mother.

ft1191 As is done in the Rabbinic story where Thaddaeus appeals to ~~1401~~ Psalm 100:1 (superscription) to save his life, while the Rabbis reply by appealing to Psalm 1. 23: 'Whoso offereth praise (*thodah*) glorifieth Me' (*Sanh. 43 a, Chesr. haSh.*).

- ft1192 As to the identity of the names Alphaeus and Clopas, comp. *Wetzel* in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. for 1883, Heft 3. See also further remarks on the sons of Clopas, in the comment on St. ~~4025~~ John 19:25 in Book 5 ch. 15.
- ft1193 As to the designation Boanerges (sons of thunder), see note 2, p. 514.
- ft1194 As it was impossible to quote separately the different verses in the Sermon on the Mount, the reader is requested to have the Bible before him, so as to compare the verses referred to with their commentation in this chapter.
- ft1195 It is so that we group together St. ~~4062~~ Luke 6:12, 13, 17-19, compared with St. ~~4083~~ Mark 3:13-15 and St. ~~4081~~ Matthew 5:1, 2.
- ft1196 According to traditional view this mountain was the so-called 'Karn Hattin' (Horns of Hattin) on the road from Tiberias to Nazareth, about 1 1/2 hours to the north-west of Tiberias. But the tradition dates only from late Crusading times, and the locality is, for many reasons, unsuitable.
- ft1197 The reader will find these parallelisms in Dean *Plumptre's* Notes on St. ~~4081~~ Matthew 5:1 (in Bishop *Ellicott's* Commentary for English Readers, vol. 1 of the N.T. p. 20).
- ft1198 Comp. *Euseb.* H. ~~2088~~ Ecclesiastes 3:39.
- ft1199 Thus St. Matthew passes over those earlier events in the Gospel-history of which Judaea was the scene, and even over the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem previous to the last Passover, while he devotes not less than fourteen chapters and a half to the half-year's activity in Galilee. If St. John's is the Judaeian, St. Matthew's is the Galilean Gospel.
- ft1200 On this point there seems to me some confusion of language on the part of controversialists. Those who maintain that the Sermon on the Mount contains no doctrinal elements at all must mean systematic teaching — what are commonly called dogmas — since, besides St. ~~4072~~ Matthew 7:22, 23, as Professor *Wace* has so well urged, love to God and to our neighbor mark both the starting-point and the final outcome of all theology.
- ft1201 To adopt the language of St. Thomas Aquinas — it is neither *meritum ex congruo*, nor yet is it *ex condigno*. The Reformers fully showed not only the error of Romanism in this respect, but the untenableness of the theological distinction.

- ft1202 So in the quotations of many writers on the subject, notably those of *Wunsche*.
- ft1203 In Jer. B. Kamma 6 c, we have this saying in the name of R. Gamaliel, and therefore near Christian times: ‘Whosoever thou hast mercy, God will have mercy upon thee; if thou hast not mercy, neither will God have mercy upon thee;’ to which, however, this saying of Rab must be put as a pendent, that if a man has in vain sought forgiveness from his neighbor, he is to get a whole row of men to try to assuage his wrath, to which ~~<853>~~ Job 33:28 applies; the exception, however, being, according to R. Jose, that if one had brought an evil name upon his neighbor, he would never obtain forgiveness. See also Shabb. 151 b.
- ft1204 As already stated, it occurs in this negative and unspiritual form in Tob. 4:15, and is also so quoted in the lately published *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* (ed. *Bryennios*) ch. 1. It occurs in the same form in Clem. Strom. 2 c. 23.
- ft1205 For some interesting Rabbinic parallels to the Lord’s Prayer, see Dr. *Taylor’s* learned edition of the ‘Sayings of the Jewish Fathers,’ *Excursus V.* (pp. 138-145). The reader will also find much to interest him in *Excursus IV.*
- ft1206 Comp. the more full account of this Jacob’s proposal to heal Eleazar ben Dama when bitten of a serpent in Jer. Shabb. 14 end. Kefr Sekanya seems to have been the same as Kefr Simai, between Sepphoris and Acco (comp. *Neubauer*, Geogr. p. 234.)
- ft1207 *Delitzsch* accepts a different reading, which furnishes this meaning, ‘but I am come to add.’ The passage occurs in a very curious connection, and for the purpose of showing the utter dishonesty of Christians — a Christian philosopher first arguing from interested motives, that since the dispersion of the Jews the Law of Moses was abrogated, and a new Law given; and the next day, having received a larger bribe, reversing his decision, and appealing to this rendering of St. ~~<157>~~ Matthew 5:17.
- ft1208 The following are mentioned as instances: the change of **r** into **r** in ~~<864>~~ Deuteronomy 6:4; of **r** into **r** in ~~<2344>~~ Exodus 34:14; of **j** into **h** ~~<873>~~ Leviticus 22:32 of **h** into **j** first verse of Psalm 150; of **b** into **k** in ~~<462>~~ Jeremiah 5:12; into **b** ~~<912>~~ 1 Samuel 2:2. It ought to be marked, that

Wunsche's quotations of these passages (Bibl. Rabb. on Shir haSh. R. 5:11) are not always correct.

^{ft1209} See 'The Temple. its Ministry and Services,' etc., pp. 26, 27.

^{ft1210} I had collected a large number of supposed or real Rabbinic parallels to the 'Sermon on the Mount.' But as they would have occupied by far too large a space, I have been obliged to omit all but such as would illustrate the fundamental position taken in this chapter, and, indeed, in this book: the contrariety of spirit, by the side of similarity of form and expressions, between the teaching of Jesus and that of Rabbinism.

^{ft1211} For a discussion of the precise date of the building of Tiberias, see *Schurer*, Neutest. Zeitgesch. p. 234, note 2. For details, comp. *Jos.* Ant. 18:2. 3; 6. 2; 19:8. 1; War 2:9. 1; 21. 3, 6, 9; Life 9, 12, 17, 66, and many other places.

^{ft1212} I take this as the general meaning, although the interpretation which paraphrases the ('they said,' ver. 21) as referring to the report which reached the seems to me strained. Those who are curious will find all kinds of proposed interpretations collected in *Meyer*, ad loc.

^{ft1213} The idea that they were in Nazareth seems wholly unfounded.

^{ft1214} Urged even by *Meyer*.

^{ft1215} The difficulties which *Keim* raises seem to me little deserving of serious treatment. Sometimes they rest on assumptions which, to say the least, are not grounded on evidence.

^{ft1216} *Godet* has some excellent remarks on this point.

^{ft1217} So notably *Keim*.

^{ft1218} The differences have been well marked by *Keim*.

^{ft1219} Comp. *Warren*, Recovery of Jerusalem, p. 385 etc.

^{ft1220} Without the article; perhaps only some of them went on this errand of mercy.

^{ft1221} St. ⁴⁰⁸⁶ Matthew 8:6, 'my servant has been thrown down (by disease) in the house, paralytic.' The βέβληται corresponds to the I fww. The same word is used in ver. 14, when Peter's mother-in-law is described as 'thrown down and fever-burning.'

^{ft1222} One might say that all the species of animals are put in requisition of this great feast: Leviathan (B. Bath. 75 a); Behemoth (Pirke d. R. Eliez.; the gigantic bird Bar Jochani (B. Bath. 73 b; Bekhor. 57 b, and

other passages). Similar, fabulous fatted geese are mentioned — probably for that feast (B. Bath. 73 *b*). The wine there dispensed had been kept in the grapes from the creation of the world (Sanh. 99 *a*; Targum, on ~~218P~~ Song of Solomon 8:2); while there is difficulty as to who is worthy to return thanks, when at last the duty is undertaken by David, according to ~~486B~~ Psalm 116:13 (Pes. 119 *b*).

ft1223 All commentators regard this as a contrast to the light in the palace, but so far as I know the Messianic feast is not described as taking place in a palace.

ft1224 The use of the article makes it emphatic — as *Bengel* has it: *In hac vita dolor nondum est dolor*.

ft1225 In Succ. 52 *a* it is said that in the age to come (Athid labho) God would bring out the *Yetser* haRa (evil impulse), and slaughter it before the just before the wicked. To the one he would appear like a great mountain, to the other like a small thread. Both would weep — the righteous for joy, that they had been able to subdue so great so great a mountain; the wicked for sorrow, that they had not been able even to break so small a thread.

ft1226 This is also the meaning of the expression in ~~482D~~ Psalm 112:10. The verb is used with this idea in ~~417S~~ Acts 7:54, and in the LXX, Job. 16:9; ~~4856~~ Psalm 35:16; 37:12; and in Rabbinical writings, for example, Jer. Keth. 35 *b*; Shem. R. 5, etc.

ft1227 This depends on whether we adopt the reading ἐν τῇ or τῷ ἐξῆς.

ft1228 I cannot understand what Dean *Stanley* means, when he says (Sinai and Palestine p. 352): ‘One entrance alone it could have had.’ I have counted not fewer than six roads leading to Nain.

ft1229 So Dean *Stanley*, and even Captain *Conder*. Canon *Farrar* regards this as one of ‘the certain sites.’ But, even according to his own description of the route taken from Capernaum, it is difficult to understand how Jesus could have issued upon the rock-hewn tombs.

ft1230 ‘Land of Israel,’ pp. 129, 130.

ft1231 Captain *Conder* (Tent-Work in Palestine *i.* pp. 121, 122) has failed to discover traces of a wall. But see the description of Canon *Tristram* (Land of Isr. p. 129) which I have followed in my account.

ft1232 I cannot accept the rendering of *Nain* by ‘*pascuum*.’

ft1233 Ber. R. 98, ed. *Warsh.* p. 175 *b*: μy[g wz hm][g yk xrah taz

ft1234 For the sake of brevity I must here refer to ‘Sketches of Jewish Social Life,’ ch. 10, and to the article in ‘The Bible Educator,’ vol. 4 pp. 330-333.

ft1235 *Haneberg* (Relig. Alterth. pp. 502, 503) gives the apt reasons for this.

ft1236 The Tractate Ebhel Rabbathi (‘Great Mourning’) euphemistically called *Masse kheth Semachoth*, ‘Tractate of Joys,’ It is already quoted in the Talmud: comp *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vortr. p. 90, note *d*. It is inserted in vol. 9 of the Bab. Talmud, pp. 28 *a* to 31 *b*.

ft1237 The mourning up to the time of burial or during the first day was termed *Aninah* (widowed-mourning, moaning) Jer. Horay. 48 *a*. The following three, seven, or thirty days (as the case might be) were those of *Ebhel*, ‘mourning.’ Other forms of the same word need not be mentioned.

ft1238 Of these a number of instances are given in the Talmud — though probably only of the prologue, or epilogue, or of the most striking thoughts.

ft1239 It is evident the young man could not have been ‘coffined,’ or it would have been impossible for him to sit up at Christ’s bidding. I must differ from the learned *Delitzsch*, who uses the word *ῥα* in translating *σορός*. Very remarkable also it seems to me, that those who advocate wicker-basket interments are without knowing it, resorting to the old Jewish practice.

ft1240 Sometimes the lament was chanted simply in chorus, at others one woman began and then the rest joined in chorus. The latter was distinctively termed the *Qinah*, see Moed K. 3:9.

ft1241 Apparently sometimes torches were used at funerals (Ber. 53 *a*).

ft1242 The term *κύριος* for ‘the Lord’ is peculiar to St. Luke and St. John — a significant conjunction. It occurs only once in St. Mark (16:19).

ft1243 So literally. We here recall the unfeeling threats by R. Huna of further bereavements to a mother who wept very much, and their fulfilment (Moed. K. 27 *b*).

ft1244 So literally, and very significantly.

ft1245 Minor difficulties may be readily dismissed. Such is the question, why this miracle has not been recorded by St. Matthew. Possibly St. Matthew may have remained a day behind in Capernaum. In any case, the omission cannot be of real importance as regards the question of

the credibility of such a miracle, since similar miracles are related in all the four Gospels.

ft1246 So *Keim*, who finally arrives at the conclusion that the event is fictitious His account seems to me painfully unfair, as well as unsatisfactory in the extreme.

ft1247 This is the admission of *Keim*.

ft1248 The term συγκυρία rendered in the A.V. 'chance' (St. ~~<DUB>~~ Luke 10:31), means literally, the coming together, the meeting, or concurrence of events.

ft1249 Lit. 'fear took all

ft1250 ὅτι.

ft1251 Significantly, the same expression as in St. ~~<DUB>~~ Luke 1:68.

ft1252 The embassy of the Baptist will be described in connection with the account of his martyrdom.

ft1253 This is specially characteristic of the Gospel by St. Luke.

ft1254 See note in previous chapter.

ft1255 Made 'the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven' $\mu\upsilon\mu\nu\ \tau\omega\kappa\lambda\ \iota\ \mu\ \iota\ \omega\lceil$ equal to 'the yoke of the Law' $h\acute{r}\omega\tau\ \iota\ \omega\lceil$ or to that 'of the commandments' $\tau\omega\chi\mu\ \iota\ \omega\lceil$.

ft1256 The untenableness of this strange hypothesis has been shown in almost all commentaries. There is not a tittle of evidence for it.

ft1257 The objections of *Keim*, though bulking largely when heaped together by him, seem not only unfair, but, when examined one by one, are seen to be groundless.

ft1258 Ber. 6:6 makes the following curious distinction: if they sit at the table, each says 'the grace' for himself; if they 'lie down' to table, one says it in the name of all. If wine is handed them during dinner, each says 'the grace' over it for himself; if after dinner, one says it for all.

ft1259 The *Teraqlin* was sometimes entered by an *antechamber* (*Prosedor*), Ab. 4:16, and opened into one (Jer. Rosh haSh. 59 *b*), or more (Yom. 15 *b*), side-or bed-rooms. The common measurement for such a hall was fifteen feet (ten cubits) breadth, length, and height (Baba B. 6:4).

ft1260 The strangeness of the circumstance suggests this, which is, alas! by no means inconsistent with what we know of the morality of some of

these Rabbis, although this page must not be stained by detailed references.

ft1261 The other and harsher reading, ‘a woman which was in the city a sinner,’ need scarcely be discussed.

ft1262 I have so translated the word *μύρον*, which the A.V. renders ‘ointment.’ The word is evidently the Hebrew and Rabbinic *רִמָּוֶה* which, however, is not always the equivalent for myrrh, but seems also to mean *musk* and *mastic*. In short, I regard it as designating any fluid unguent — or, generally speaking, ‘perfume.’ So common was the use of perfumes, that Ber. 6:6 mentions a *mugmar*, or a kind of incense, which was commonly burnt after a feast. As regards the word ‘*alabastron*,’ the name was given to perfume-phials in general, even if not made of alabaster, because the latter was so frequently used for such flasks.

ft1263 The derivation of the Rabbinic term in *Buxtorf’s* Lexicon (p. 1724) is certainly incorrect. I have no doubt it was the *foliatum* of *Pliny* (Hist. Nat. 13:1, 2). In Jew. War 4:9, 10, Josephus seems to imply that women occasionally poured over themselves unguents. According to Kethub. 6:4, a woman might apparently spend a tenth of her dowry on such things as unguents and perfumes. For, in Kethub. 66 *b* we have an exaggerated account of a woman spending upwards of 300*l.* on perfumes! This will at any rate prove their common and abundant use.

ft1264 This is the real meaning of the verb.

ft1265 This is implied in the tense.

ft1266 It is certainly not implied, that she had her hair disheveled as in mourning, or as by women before drinking the waters of jealousy.

ft1267 The tense implies this.

ft1268 In the A. V.

ft1269 The Talmud, with its usual exaggeration, has this story when commenting on the reverence due by children to their parents, that R. Ishmael’s mother had complained her son would not allow her, when he came from the Academy, to *wash his feet* and then drink the water — on which the sages made the Rabbi yield! (Jer. Peah 15 c). Again, some one came to *kiss R. Jonathan’s feet*, because he had induced filial reverence in his son (u. s., col. *d*).

ft1270 The one sum=upwards of 15*l.*; the other=upwards of 1*l.* 10*s.*

- ft1271 Money-lender, though perhaps not in the evil sense which we attach to the term. At the same time, the frequent allusion to such and to their harsh ways offers painful illustration of the social state at the time.
- ft1272 So rather 'frankly' in the A. V.
- ft1273 The points of resemblance and of difference with St. ~~<0183>~~Matthew 18:23 will readily appear on comparison.
- ft1274 Comp. for ex. St. ~~<0134>~~John 13:4.
- ft1275 Washing: ~~<0180>~~Genesis 18:4; 19:2; ~~<0242>~~24:32; ~~<0752>~~Judges 19:21; ~~<0254>~~1 Samuel 25:41; kissing: ~~<0287>~~Exodus 18:7; ~~<0155>~~2 Samuel 15:5; ~~<0159>~~19:39; anointing: ~~<0108>~~Ecclesiastes 9:8; ~~<0106>~~Amos 6:6, as well as ~~<0235>~~Psalm 23:5.
- ft1276 Thou gavest me no water, she washed not with water but tears; no kiss, she kissed my feet; no oil, she unguent; not to the head, but to the feet. And yet: *emphatically* — into *thy* house I came, etc.
- ft1277 So literally.
- ft1278 Mark the tense.
- ft1279 So, properly rendered. Romanism, in this also arrogating to man more than Christ Himself ever spoke, has it: *Absolvo te*, not 'thy sins have been forgiven,' but I absolve thee!
- ft1280 So literally.
- ft1281 This distinction between the two modes of expression is marked in Moed. K. 29 *a*: 'into peace,' as said to the living; 'in peace,' as referring to the dead.
- ft1282 'Out of whom went seven devils.' Those who are curious to see one attempt at finding a 'rational' basis for some of the Talmudical legends about Mary Magdalene and others connected with the history of Christ, may consult the essay of *Rosch* in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1873, pp. 77-115 (*Die Jesus-Mythen d. Judenth.*).
- ft1283 The suggestion that the word meant 'curler of hair,' which is made by *Lightfoot*, and repeated by his modern followers, depends on entire misapprehension.
- ft1284 In *Baba Mets.* 25 *a*, middle, R. Isaac the Magdalene is introduced in a highly characteristic discussion about coins that are found. His remark about three coins laid on each other like a tower might, if it had not been connected with such a grave discussion, have almost seemed a pun on *Magdala*.

^{ft1285} Thus in regard to another village (not mentioned either by *Relandus* or *Neubauer*) in the Midr. on Lament. 2:2, ed. Warsh. p. 67 *b*, line 13 from bottom.

^{ft1286} This Synagogue is introduced in the almost blasphemous account of the miracles of Simon ben Jochai, when he declared Tiberias free from the defilement of dead bodies, buried there.

^{ft1287} This has been well shown by *Neubauer*, Geogr. de la Palestine, pp. 217, 218.

^{ft1288} It is at any rate remarkable that the Talmud (Megill. 6 *a*) finds in the ancient territory of Zebulun the *Chilzon* װזל j so largely used in dyeing purple and scarlet, and so very precious. Spurious dyes of the same color were also produced (comp. *Lewysohn*, Zool. d. Talm. pp. 281-283).

^{ft1289} Curiously enough, the Greek term ἐπίτροπος (steward) has passed into the Rabbinic *Aphiterophos*.

^{ft1290} *Delitzsch* (Zeitsch. für Luther Theol. for 1876, p. 598), seems to regard *Kuzith* tyzwK as the Jewish equivalent of Chuza. The word is mentioned in the *Aruch* (ed. *Landau*, p. 801 *b*, where the references, however, are misquoted) as occurring in Ber. R. 23 and 51. No existing copy of the Midrash has these references, which seem to have been purposely omitted. It is curious that both occur in connection with Messianic passages. In any case, however, *Kuzith* was not a proper name, but some mystic designation. *Lightfoot* (Horae Hebr. on ~~Q88B~~ Luke 8:3) reads in the genealogy of Haman (in Sopher. 13:6) Bar Kuza. But it is really *Bar Biza* 'son of contempt' — all the names being intended as defamatory of Haman. Similarly, *Lightfoot* asserts that the designation does not occur in the genealogy of Haman in the Targum Esther. But in the Second Targum Esther (Miqraoth Gedol. Part 6 p. 5 *a*) the name does occur in the genealogy as '*Bar Buzah*.'

^{ft1291} Dr. *Neubauer* (Studia Bibl. p. 225) regards *Chuza* as an Idumaean name, connected with the Edomite god *Kos*.

^{ft1292} I regard St. ~~40R23~~ Mark 3:23-30 as combining the event in St. Matthew 9 (see St. ~~40R23~~ Mark 3:23) with what is recorded in St. Matthew 12 and St. Luke 11, and I account for this combination by the circumstance that the latter is not related by St. Mark.

- ft1293 At the same time I have, with not a few authorities, strong doubts whether St. Matthew 9 is not to be regarded as an interpolation (see *Westcott and Hort*, New Testament). *Substantially*, the charge was there; but it seems doubtful whether, *in so many words*, it was made till a later period.
- ft1294 An instance of this has been given in the previous chapter, p. 567, note. Other examples of filial reverence are mentioned, some painfully ludicrous, others touching, and accompanied by sayings which sometimes rise to the sublime.
- ft1295 *Bengel* remarks on St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 12:46: ‘Non plane hic congruebat sensus Mariae cum sensu Filii.’
- ft1296 ‘Non spernit Matrem, sed anteponit Patrem.’
- ft1297 It adds interest to these Solomon-like lilies that the Mishnah designates one class of them, growing in fields and vineyards, by the name ‘royal lily’ (Kil. 5:8, Bab. Talmud, p. 29 *a*). At the same time, the term used by our Lord need not be confined to ‘lilies’ in the strictest sense. It may represent the whole wild flora of spring, chiefly the anemones (comp. *Tristram*, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, pp. 462-465). A word with the same letters as κρίνος (though of different meaning) is the Rabbinic *Narkes*, the narcissus — of course that arbrd (of fields), not atyGwggr (of gardens).
- ft1298 This seems to be the view of *Goebel* in his ‘Parabeln Jesu,’ a book to which I would here, in general, acknowledge my obligations. The latest work on the subject (*F. L. Steinmeyer*, d. Par. d. Herrn, Berlin 1884) is very disappointing.
- ft1299 Admonitory, hortatory — a term used in theology, of which it is not easy to give the exact equivalent.
- ft1300 Even *Goebel*, though rightly following the purely historical method, has, in the interest of so-called higher criticism, attempted such artificial grouping.
- ft1301 From παραβάλλω, *projicio*, *admoveo rem rei comparationis causa* (*Grimm*). Little can be learned from the classical definitions of the παραβολή. See Archbishop *Trench* on the Parables.
- ft1302 *F. L. Steinmeyer* has most strangely attempted to deny this. Yet every ancient Rabbinic work is literally *full* of parables. In Sanh. 38 *b* we read

that R. Meir's discourses consisted in third of legal determinations, in third of Haggadah, and in third of parables.

ft1303 I am here referring only to the form, not the substance, of these Jewish parables.

ft1304 It is, indeed, possible that the framework of some of Christ's Parables may have been adopted and adapted by later Rabbis. No one who knows the early intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians would deny this *a priori*.

ft1305 I must here refer to the various Biblical Dictionaries, to Professor *Westcott's* Introduction to the Study of the Gospels (pp. 28, 286), and to the works of Archbishop *Trench* and Dr. *Goebel*.

ft1306 Every reader of the Gospels will be able to distinguish these various classes.

ft1307 *Cremer* (Lex. of N.T. Greek, p. 124) lays stress on the idea of a *comparison*, which is manifestly incorrect; *Goebel*, with not much better reason, on that of a narrative form.

ft1308 So by *Goebel*.

ft1309 In the Old Testament there are parabolic descriptions and utterances — especially in Ezekiel (15, 16, 17, 19) and a fable (~~<000>~~ Judges 9:7-15), but only two Parables: the one *typical* (~~<002>~~ 2 Samuel 12:1-6), the other *symbolical* (~~<200>~~ Isaiah 5:1-6).

ft1310 So even *Goebel* (i. pp. 33-42, and especially p. 38.).

ft1311 The correct reading in St. ~~<003>~~ Matthew 13:18 is τοῦ σπείραντος, not as in the T. R.

ft1312 With the definite article — not 'a Sower,' as in our A.V., but the Sower.

ft1313 παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, not. I cannot understand how this road could be within the ploughed and sowed field. Our view is further confirmed by St. ~~<005>~~ Luke 8:5, where the seed is described as 'trodden down' — evidently on the highway.

ft1314 Comp. the slight variations in the three Gospels.

ft1315 Comp. the chapter on the Temptation.

ft1316 I would here remark in general, that I have always adopted what seemed to me the best attested readings, and endeavored to translate

literally, preserving, where it seemed desirable, even the succession of the words.

ft1317 This is a Hebraism — explaining the Hebrew use of the verb **j l v** in analogous circumstances.

ft1318 The tense should here be marked.

ft1319 The Greek **ζιζάνοις** is represented by the Hebrew **yWz** or **agWz**.

ft1320 The expression is of great importance. The right reading is **ἐπίσπειρεν** (*insuper sero* — to sow above), not **ἐσπείρε** (sowed).

ft1321 AEon, or ‘age,’ *without* the article in ver. 40, and so it should also be in ver. 39.

ft1322 With the two articles: the well-known oven of the well-known fire — Gehenna.

ft1323 Without here anticipating what may have to be said as to Christ’s teaching of the final fate of the wicked, it cannot be questioned that at that period the doctrine of endless punishment was the common belief of the Jews. I am aware, that dogmas should not be based upon parabolic teaching, but in the present instance the Parable would have been differently worded, if such dogmatic teaching had not been in the mind of Speaker and hearers.

ft1324 Certainly the *Sinapis nigra*, and not the *Salvadora persica*.

ft1325 Comp. *Tristram*, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 472. the quotations in *Buxtorf’s* Lex. Rabb. pp. 822, 823, on which the supposed Rabbinic illustrations of the growth of the plant are based (*Lightfoot*, *Schottgen*, *Wetstein*, even *Vorstius* and *Winer*), are wholly inapt, being taken from legendary descriptions of the future glory of Palestine, the exaggerations being of the grossest character.

ft1326 Canon *Tristram’s* rendering of the verb (u. s. p. 473) as merely perching or resting does not give the real meaning of it. He has very aptly noticed how fond birds are of the mustard-seed.

ft1327 Comp. *Herzfeld*, Handelsgesch. d. Juden, pp. 183-185.

ft1328 On ^{<2810>}Isaiah 61:10, we read the following beautiful illustration, alike of the words of our Lord in St. ^{<0136>}Matthew 13:16, and of the exclamation of the woman in St. ^{<2127>}Luke 11:27: ‘Seven garments there are with which the Holy One, blessed be His Name, clothed Himself, from the time the world was created to the hour when He will execute

punishment on Edom the wicked (Rome). When He created the world, He clothed himself with glory and splendor (^{<940>}Psalm 104:1); when He manifested Himself by the Red Sea, He clothed Himself with majesty (^{<981>}Psalm 93:1); when He gave the Law, He clothed Himself with strength (*ib.*); when He forgives the iniquity of Israel, He clothes Himself in white (^{<200>}Daniel 7:9); when He executeth punishment on the nations of the world, He clothes himself with vengeance (^{<2917>}Isaiah 59:17). The sixth garment He will put on in the hour when the Messiah shall be revealed. Then shall He clothe Himself with righteousness (*ib.*). The seventh garment is when He taketh vengeance on Edom, then shall He be clothed in red (^{<2612>}Isaiah 63:2). And the garment with which in the future He will clothe Messiah shall shine forth from one end of the world to the other, according to ^{<2610>}Isaiah 61:10. And Israel shall enjoy His light, and say, Blessed the hour in which Messiah was born; blessed the womb which bare Him; blessed the generation which seeth, blessed the eye which is deemed worthy to behold Him, because that the opening of His lips is blessing and peace, His speech rest to the soul, and security and rest are in His Word. And on His tongue pardon and forgiveness; His prayer the incense of accepted sacrifice; His entreaty holiness and purity. Blessed are ye Israel, what is reserved for you! Even as it is written (^{<9812>}Psalm 31:20; 19 in our A. V.). (Pesiqta, ed. *Bub.* p. *a* and *b.*)

^{ft1329} The ἔμπορος — in opposition to the κάπηλος or huckster, small trader — is the *en gros* merchant who travels from place to place and across waters (from πόρος) to purchase.

^{ft1330} But the instance quoted by *Wetstein* (N. Test. 1 p. 407) from Babha Mez. 28 *b* is inapt, and depends on entire misunderstanding of the passage. The Rabbi who found the treasure, so far from claiming, urged its owner to take it back.

^{ft1331} The so-called Rabbinic illustrations are inapt, except as *per contra*. Thus, on St. ^{<1037>}Matthew 13:17 it is to be remarked, that in Rabbinic opinion revelation of God's mysteries would only be granted to those who were righteous or learned. The Midr. on ^{<2000>}Ecclesiastes 1:7 contains the following Parable in illustration (comp. ^{<2021>}Daniel 2:21): A matron is asked, to which of two that would borrow she would lend money — to a rich or a poor man. And when she answers: To a rich man, since even if he lost it, he would be able to repay, she is told that similarly God gives not wisdom to fools, who would employ it for

theaters and baths, etc., but to the sages, who make use of it in the Academies. A similar and even more strange explanation of ^{<1253>}Exodus 15:26 occurs Ber. 40 *a*, where it is shown that God supports the full, and not, as man, an empty vessel. Hence, if we begin to learn, or repeat what we have learned, we shall learn more, and conversely also.

Further, on ver. 12 we note, that 'to have taken away what one hath' is a Jewish proverbial expression: 'that which is in their hand shall be taken from them' (Ber. R. 20, ed. *Warsh.* p. 38 *b*, last two lines).

Expressions similar to ver. 16 are used by the Rabbis, for ex. Chag. 14 *b*. In regard to ver. 17, R. Eliezer inferred from ^{<1252>}Exodus 15:2 that servantmaids saw at the Red Sea what neither Ezekiel nor the prophets had seen, which he corroborates from ^{<2000>}Ezekiel 1:1 and ^{<2020>}Hosea 12:10 (Mechilta, ed. *Weiss* p. 44 *a*). Another and much more beautiful parallelism has been given before. On ver. 19 it ought to be remarked that the Wicked One was not so much represented by the Rabbis as the Enemy of the Kingdom of God, but as that of individuals, indeed, was often described as identical with the evil impulse (*Yetser* haRa, comp. Chag. 16 *a*; B. Bathr. 16 *a*; Succ. 52 *a*). On ver. 22 we remark, that not riches, but poverty, was regarded by the Rabbis as that which choked the good seed. On ver. 39, we may remark a somewhat similar expression in B. Mez. 83 *b*: 'Let the Lord of the Vineyard come and remove the thorns.' On ver. 42, the expression 'oven of fire,' for Gehenna, is the popular Jewish one (^{<1251>}*rWNT*). Similarly, the expression, 'gnashing of teeth,' chiefly characteristic of the anger and jealousy of those in Gehinnom, occurs in the Midrash on ^{<2005>}Ecclesiastes 1:15. On ver. 44 we refer to the remarks and note on that Parable (p. 595). In connection with ver. 46, we remember that, in Shabb. 119 *a*, a story is told concerning a pearl for which a man had given his whole fortune, hoping thereby to prevent the latter being alienated from him (comp. Ber. R. 11). Lastly, in connection with ver. 47 we notice, that the comparison of men with fishes is a common Jewish one (Abod. Zar. 3 *b*; 4 *a*).

^{ft1332} The definite article (St. ^{<1066>}Mark 4:36) marks it as 'the' ship — a well-known boat which always bore Him.

^{ft1333} From the size of these boats it seems unlikely, that any but His closest followers would have found room in the ship. Besides, the language of those who called for help and the answer of Christ imply the same thing.

ft1334 So literally.

ft1335 The supposed Rabbinic parallels in *Wetstein* (Babha Mez. 59 *b*) and *Wunsche's* (Chull. 7 *a*) works are quite inapplicable.

ft1336 The strangest commentation, perhaps, is that of *Volkmär* (Marcus, pp. 307-312). For I cannot here perceive any kind of parallelism with the history of Jonah, nor yet see any references to the history of St. Paul's shipwreck.

ft1337 A fact may be the basis of a symbol; but a symbol can never be the basis of a fact. The former is the principle of Divine history, the latter of human legend. But, even so, legend could never have arisen but for a belief in Divine history: it is the counterfeit coin of Revelation.

ft1338 In the history related in St. ~~<042>~~ Matthew 14:22, etc. the embarkation was much later (see next note), and it is expressly stated that 'the wind was contrary.' But even there, when it ceased they were 'immediately' on shore (St. ~~<021>~~ John 6:21), although the distance formerly traversed had been rather less than three-fourths of the way (twenty-five or thirty furlongs, St. ~~<019>~~ John 6:19). At that place the whole distance across would be five or six miles. But the passage from Capernaum to Gerasa would not be so long as that.

ft1339 The distinction between the two evenings seems marked in St. ~~<045>~~ Matthew 14:15, as compared with verse 23. In both verses precisely the same expression is used. But between the first and the second evening a considerable interval of time must be placed.

ft1340 Comp. *Tristram's* 'Land of Israel,' p. 465; *Badeker's* (*Socin*) Palestina, p. 267. The objection in *Riehm's* Handwörterb. p. 454, that Gerasa did not form part of the Decapolis manifestly derives no real support from St. ~~<020>~~ Mark 5:20. The two facts are in no way inconsistent. All other localizations are impossible, since the text requires close proximity to the lake. Professor *Socin* describes this cliff as steep 'as nowhere else by the lake.'

ft1341 In this, as in all other instances, I can only indicate the critical results at which I have arrived. For the grounds, on which these conclusions are based, I must refer to the works which bear on the respective subjects.

ft1342 See Appendix XIII., 'Angelology and Demonology:' and Appendix XVI., 'Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised.' Archdeacon *Farrar* has misunderstood the reference of *Otho* (Lex. Rabb. 146). The

affections mentioned in Jer. Terum. 40 *b* are not treated as ‘all demoniacs;’ on the contrary, most of them, indeed all, with one exception, are expressly stated to be indications of *mental disease* (comp. also Chag. 3 *b*). The quotations of *Gfrorer* are, as too often, for a purpose, and untrustworthy, except after examination of the context.

ft1342 St. ~~4187B~~ Mark 5:3, 4.

ft1344 ‘Ware no clothes’ (St. ~~4187C~~ Luke 8:27) may, however, refer only to the upper, not the under-garments.

ft1345 St. ~~4188~~ Matthew 8:28.

ft1346 St. ~~4186~~ Mark 5:5.

ft1347 In his endeavor to represent the demonised state as a species of mania, which was affected by the Presence of Christ, Archdeacon *Farrar* makes the following statement: ‘The presence, the look, the voice of Christ, even before He addressed these sufferers, seems always to have calmed and overawed them.’ But surely the very opposite of this is the fact, and the first effect of contact with Christ was not calm, but a paroxysm.

ft1348 Both St. Mark and St. Luke have it: ‘Jesus, Son of the Most High God.’

ft1349 So substantially in St. Luke, as in St. Mark.

ft1350 This is one of the difficulties mentioned by Dean *Plumptre*. Archdeacon *Farrar* seems to think that the man imagined ‘6000 devils were in possession of his soul.’ His statement, that it ‘was a thoroughly Jewish belief’ that unclean spirits should pass into the swine, I must take leave to deny. One or another disease, such as *rabies*, were, indeed, attributed by some Rabbis to the agency of evil spirits — but there is no ground for either the general or the specific statement of Dr. *Farrar* as regards this ‘Jewish belief.’

ft1351 The common Rabbinic word for Legion is, indeed, *Ligyon* or *Ligyona*, but the expression (Ber. 51 *a*) *tyñyGI ṭṣai* (Istalginit) *hl bj ykal m l v* cannot mean anything else than a legion of hurtful spirits.

ft1352 The verb is *ἐπιτρέπω* used both in the active sense of permitting, and in that of not hindering. As to the latter use of the word, comp. specially St. ~~4198~~ Matthew 19:8; St. ~~4100B~~ Mark 10:4.

ft1353 This is the view of Archdeacon *Farrar*. The Gadara of which the poets *Meleager* and *Philodemus* were natives was, of course, not the scene of this miracle.

ft1354 As this healing of the demonised may be regarded as the ‘test-case’ on the general question, I have entered more fully on the discussion. The arguments in favor of the general view taken of the demonised are so clearly and forcibly stated by Archbishop *Trench* (on ‘The Miracles’) and in ‘The Speaker’s Commentary’ (N. Test. vol. 1 p. 44), that it seems needless to reiterate them. To me at least it seems difficult to understand, how any reader of the narrative, who comes to it without preconceived opinions, can arrive at any other conclusion than that either the whole must be rejected as mythical, or else be received as implying that there was a demonised state, different from madness; that Jesus treated the present as such; bade the unclean spirits go out, and by His word banished them. The objection as to the morality of the destruction of the herd seems scarcely more weighty than the sneer of *Strauss*, that the devils must have been stupid in immediately destroying their new habitations. The question of morality cannot even be raised, since Jesus did not command — only not hinder — the devils entering into the swine, and as for the destruction of their new dwellings, so far from being stupid, it certainly did secure their undisturbed continuance in the country and the withdrawal of Jesus. All attempts to adapt this miracle to our modern experience, and the ideas based upon it, by leaving out or rationalizing one or another trait in the narrative, are emphatically failures. We repeat: the history must be received as it stands — or wholly rejected.

ft1355 Comp. St. ~~<Q85>~~ Luke 8:45; St. ~~<Q83>~~ Mark 5:31.

ft1356 The name, a well-known O.T. one (~~<Q83>~~ Numbers 32:41; Judg., 10:3), does not occur in Rabbinic literature till after the Middle Ages.

ft1357 *Keim* starts the theory that, according to St. Matthew, Jairus was an ἄρχων in the sense of a civil magistrate. This, in order to make St. Matthew contradict St. Mark and St. Luke, as if ἄρχων were not one of the most common designations of Synagogue-rulers.

ft1358 The particulars of her history must be gathered from a comparison of the three Gospels.

ft1359 A woman came of age at twelve years and one day, and boys at thirteen years and one day.

- ft1360 *Godet* points out a like summarization in St. Matthew's account of the Centurion's servant.
- ft1361 The following are the instances in which silence was enjoined:, St. ~~<1004>~~ Matthew 8:4 (St. ~~<1044>~~ Mark 1:44; St. ~~<1054>~~ Luke 5:14); St. ~~<1080>~~ Matthew 9:30; ~~<1026>~~ 12:16; St. ~~<1082>~~ Mark 3:12; ~~<1058>~~ 5:43 (St. ~~<1086>~~ Luke 8:56); St. ~~<1076>~~ Mark 7:36; ~~<1086>~~ 8:26.
- ft1362 In general, we would once more thus formulate our views: *In the Days of Christ men learned first to believe in His Person, and then in His Word; in the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit we learn first to believe in His Word, and then in His Person.*
- ft1363 Such as the ashes of an Ostrich-Egg, carried in summer in a linen, in winter in a cotton rag; or a barley-corn found in the dung of a white she-ass, etc.
- ft1364 In Ber. 43 *b*, it is explained to refer to such shoes as had 'clouts on the top of clouts.'
- ft1365 Accordingly, when a person applied for relief in food, inquiry was be made as to his means, but not if he applied for raiment (Babha B 9 *a*).
- ft1366 But I admit that the passage (Vayyik. R. 2) is not quite clear. The *Maaphoraeth* there mentioned may not have been an official dress, but one which the man otherwise used, and which was only specially endeared to him by the recollection that he had worn it at his ordination.
- ft1367 In general, I would here acknowledge my indeptedness on the very difficult subject of dress to *Sachs*, Beitrage z. Sprach- u. Alterth.-Forsch.; to the Articles in *Levy's* Dictionaries; and especially to *Brull*, Trachten d. Juden. The Article in *Hamburger's* Real-Encykl. is little more than a repetition of *Brull's*. From other writers I have not been able to derive any help.
- ft1368 So Landau renders one of the words in Shabb. 120 *a*. I need scarcely say that the rendering is very doubtful.
- ft1369 *Brull* regards this as controversial to the practices of the early Christians. But he confounds sects with the church.
- ft1370 On the other hand, to walk about with shoes loosed was regarded as a mark of pride.
- ft1371 The like expression occurs in the Targum on ~~<1089>~~ Judges 5:9.

ft1372 Also, *Kittanitha*, and *Kittunita*.

ft1373 As to the mode of weaving such garments, see the pictorial illustration in *Braunius*, *Vest. Sacred. Hebraeor.*, which is reproduced, with full details for various other works, in *Hartmanns Hebr. am Putzt.* vol. 1, explanatory notes being added at the beginning of vol. 3. *Sammter's* note in his edition of B. Mezia, p. 151 *a*, is only a reproduction of *Hartmann's* remarks.

ft1374 It was worn outside (Jer. Ber. 14 *c*, top). This is the girdle which was not to be worn in the Temple, probably as being that of a person engaged in business.

ft1375 This is the explanation of the *Aruch* (ed. *Landau*, 1 p. 157 *b*).

ft1376 This passage is both curious and difficult. It seems to imply that the *Aphqarsin* was a garment worn in summer, close to the body, and having sleeves.

ft1377 The number of knots and threads at present counted are, of course, later additions. The little tractate *Tsitsith Kirchheim*, *Septem Libri Talm. P.* pp. 22-24 is merely a summary. The various authorities on the subject — and not a few have been consulted — are more or less wanting in clearness and defective. *Comp.* p. 277, note 2, of this volume.

ft1378 The difference between it and the *Aphqarsin* seems to be, that the latter was worn and fastened *inside* the dress. The *Maaphoreth* would in some measure combine the uses of the *Sudar* and the *Aphqarsin*.

ft1379 Canon *Westcott* (*Speaker's Comment.* on St. ~~John~~ John 19:23) seems to imply that the girdle was worn outside the loose outer garment. This was not the case.

ft1380 On this subject I must take leave to refer to the *Bibl. Cyclopaedias* and to 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' pp. 220-224.

ft1381 As the question is of considerable practical importance, the following, as bearing upon it, may be noticed. From Jer. Ber. 4 *c*, we gather: 1. That at one time it was the practice to wear the phylacteries all day long, in order to pass as pious. This is denounced as a mark of hypocrisy. 2. That it was settled, that phylacteries should be worn during a considerable part of the day, but not the whole day. [In Ber. 23 *a* to 24 *a* we have rules and discussions about depositing them under certain circumstances, and where to place them at night. 3. That

it was deemed objectionable to wear them only during prayer. 4. That celebrated Rabbis did not deem it necessary always to wear the phylacteries both on the head and on the arm. This seems to prove that their obligation could not have been regarded as absolutely binding. Thus, R. Jochanan wore those for the head only in winter, but not in summer, because then he did not wear a headgear. As another illustration, that the wearing of phylacteries was not deemed absolutely requisite, the following passage may be quoted (Sanh. 11:3): ‘It is more culpable to transgress the words of the Scribes than those of the Torah. He that says, There are no phylacteries, transgresses the word of the Torah, and is not to be regarded as a rebel (literally, is free); but he who says, There are five compartments (instead of four), to add to the words of the Scribes, he is guilty.’ }

^{ft1382} I find that the lowest price mentioned for an upper garment was 7 1/2 *dinars*, or about 4*s. 7d.* (Jer. Kilay. 9:1). The more common price, however, seems to have been 12 *dinars*, or about 7*s. 6d.* The cost of making seems to have been 8 *dinars*, or about 5*s.* (Jer. Babha Mets. 6:1), leaving 4 *dinars*, or 2*s. 6d.*, for the material. Of course, the latter might be much more expensive, and the cost of the garment increased accordingly.

^{ft1383} This, however, does not necessarily follow, although in New Testament language κράσπεδον seems to bear that meaning. Comp. the excellent work of *Braunius* (Vest. Sac. Hebrews pp. 72, 73 — *not* p. 55, as *Schleusner* notes).

^{ft1384} So literally in St. Mark’s Gospel.

^{ft1385} This gives the full meaning, but it is difficult to give a literal translation which would give the entire meaning of the original.

^{ft1386} The Revised Version renders it: ‘And straightway Jesus, perceiving in Himself that the power *proceeding* from Him had gone forth, turned Him about.’ Mark the position of the first comma. In the Speaker’s Commentary it is rendered: ‘And immediately Jesus, having perceived in Himself that the virtue had gone forth from Him.’ Dean *Plumptre* translates: ‘Knowing fully in Himself the virtue that had gone out from Him.’

^{ft1387} The arrangement of the words in the A.V. is entirely misleading. The word ‘immediately’ refers to His turning round, *not* to His perceiving in Himself.

ft1388 So literally.

ft1389 I adopt the reading παρακούσας, which seems to me better rendered by ‘overhearing’ than by ‘not heeding,’ as in the Revised Version.

ft1390 The word unquestionably means, literally, Teacher — but in the sense of Rabbi, or Master.

ft1391 Those who believe in an ‘anti-Petrine’ tendency in the Gospel by St. Luke must find it difficult to account for the prominence given to him in the Third Gospel.

ft1392 I confess myself unable to see any real discrepancy between the accounts of St. Mark and St. Luke, such as *Strauss*, *Keim*, and others have tried to establish. In St. Mark it is: ‘He suffered no man to accompany Him’ (whither?); in St. Luke: ‘He suffered not any man to enter in with Him.’

ft1393 They are specially called ‘flutes for the dead’ (B. Mez. 6:1): tml
μλ λ j .

ft1394 The reading which accordingly seems best is that adopted by *Westcott* and *Hort*, Ταλειθά κούμ. The Aramaic or Rabbinic for maiden is either *Talyetha* or *Talyutha* (a tWyl f). In the second Targum on ~~Esther~~ Esther 2:7, 8, the reading is a tWl m (Talutha), where *Levy* conjectures the reading atyl f (*Talitha*) or else *Talyetha*. The latter seems also the proper equivalent of ταλειθά. While the reading ‘*Talitha*’ is very uncertain. As regards the second word, *qum* [pronounced *kum*], most writers have, without difficulty, shown that it would be *qumi*, not *qum*. Nevertheless the same command is spelt μωq in the Talmud (as it is pronounced in the Syriac) when a woman is addressed. In Shabb. 110 b, the command *qum*, as addressed to a woman suffering from a bloody flux, occurs not less than seven times in that one page rybzzm μzq.

ft1395 We cannot call the trivial objections urged other than ‘cavils.’

ft1396 According to *Eusebius* (Hist. Eccl. 7:18) there was a statue in Paneas in commemoration of this event, which was said to have been erected by this woman to Christ.

ft1397 The passage which *Strauss* quotes from *Bertholdt* (Christol. Jud. p. 179), is from a later Midrash, that on Proverbs. No one would think of deriving purely Jewish doctrine either from the Sohar or from IV.

Esdras, which is of post-Christian date, and strongly tinged with Christian elements. Other passages, however, might be quoted in favor of this view (comp. *Weber*, *Altsynagog. Theol.* pp. 351, 352), and on the other side, *Hamburger*, *Real-Encykl.* (II. Abth. 'Belebung der Todten'). The matter will be discussed in the sequel.

ft1398 Although in Ber. R. 23 the origin of that name is rightly traced to the Emperor Tiberius, it is characteristic that the Talmud tries otherwise to derive the name of what afterwards was the sacred capital of Palestinian Rabbinism, some explaining that it lay in the navel (*tibura*) of the land, others paraphrasing the name 'because the view was good' (Meg. 6 a). Rabbinic ingenuity declared it one of the cities fortified since the time of Joshua, so as to give it the privileges attaching to such.

ft1399 Compare Chapters X. and XI.

ft1400 They seem to have settled in Capernaum, having followed Jesus to that place on His first removal to it. We can readily understand, that their continuance in Nazareth would have been difficult. The death of Joseph is implied in his not being mentioned in the later history of Jesus.

ft1401 So in St. ~~Matth~~ Matthew 9:36.

ft1402 So also in St. Matthew and in St. Mark. But this 'authority' sprang from the power which he gave them.

ft1403 Dean *Plumptre* remarks: 'The words ("raise the dead") are omitted by the best MSS.'

ft1404 *Weiss* (Matth. Evang. p. 262) has the curious idea that the prohibitions about money, etc., refer to their not making gain on their journey.

ft1405 Sandals, but not shoes. As regards the marked difference about 'the staff,' *Ebrard* (Evang. Gesch. p. 459) points out the agreement of *thought* in all the Gospels. Nothing was to be taken — they were to go as they stood, without preparation or provision. Sometimes there was a secret receptacle at the top of the staff to hold valuables, or, in the case of the poor, water (Kel. 17:16).

ft1406 According to Jewish Law, 'the laborers' (the, μϰλ [WP at least), would be secured their food. Not so always, however, slaves (Gitt. 12 a). In general, the Rabbinic Law of slavery is exceeding harsh — far

more so than that of the Pentateuch (comp. an abstract of the Laws of Slavery in *Fassel*, Mos.-Rabb. Civil-Recht, vol. 2 pp. 393-406).

ft1407 The direction is recorded by St. Matthew only. But St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 28:19 would, if it were necessary, sufficiently prove that this is not a Judaistic limitation.

ft1408 At the same time the statement in Bekhor. 29 *a*, that 'if needful money was to be paid for the acquisition of learning,' according to ~~Proverbs~~ Proverbs 23:23 ('by the truth'), implies that the rule cannot always have been strictly observed.

ft1409 The *Manal* (ל [נח]) or shoe, in contradistinction to the *Sandal* (ל דנש), as in Jer. Shabb. 8 *a*.

ft1410 The *Pundah* (הדנשP), or *Aphundah* (הדנשpa). Comp. for ex. Jer. Shabb. 12 *c*.

ft1411 The explanations of this expression generally offered need not here be repeated.

ft1412 So common, indeed, was this view as to have become proverbial. Thus, it was said concerning learned descendants of a learned man, that 'the Torah returned into its *Akhsanya* (ξενία),' or hospice (Baba Mez. 85 *a*, *bis*, in the curious story about the successful attempts made to convert to study the dissolute son of a great Rabbi).

ft1413 The question of the constitution and jurisdiction of the various Sanhedrin will be discussed in another place.

ft1414 So Ber. 58 *b*; Siphra on ~~Leviticus~~ Leviticus 25:23; Ber. R. 49; Shem. R. 42; Midr. on ~~Psalms~~ Psalm 27:4.

ft1415 This is undoubtedly the correct reading, and not Beelzebub. Any reference to the Beelzebub, or 'fly-god' of ~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 1:2, seems, rationally, out of the question.

ft1416 Zebhul (ל Wbz) is also the name of the fourth of the seven heavens in which Jewish mysticism located the heavenly Jerusalem with its Temple, at whose altar Michael ministered (Chag. 12 *b*).

ft1417 The primary meaning is: manuring (land) with dung.

ft1418 It could not possibly mean, as has been supposed, 'lord of dung,' because dung is ל bz, and not ל WBz.

- ft1419 This alone explains the meaning of Beelzebul. Neither Beelzebub nor Baalzebul were names *given* by the Jews to any demon, but Beelzebul, the ‘lord of sacrificing to idols,’ would certainly be the *designation* of what they regarded as the chief of the demons.
- ft1420 Mark the same meaning of the expression in St. ~~4187~~ Luke 8:17; 12:2.
- ft1421 I confess myself unable to understand the bearing of the special pleading of *Wunsche* against this inference from Sanh. 74 *a*. His reasoning is certainly incorrect.
- ft1422 The *Isar* (*rsyai*), or assarion, is expressly and repeatedly stated in Rabbinic writings to be the twenty-forth part of a dinar, and hence not a halfpenny farthing, but about the third of a penny. Comp. *Herzfeld*, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 180-182.
- ft1423 This is the literal rendering.
- ft1424 This appears more clearly when we translate literally (ver. 32): ‘Who shall confess in Me’ — and again: ‘in him will I also confess.’
- ft1425 The original is very peculiar: ‘Think not that I came to cast peace on the earth,’ as a sower casts the seed into the ground.
- ft1426 The meaning of the expression, losing and finding one’s life, appears more markedly by attending to the tenses in the text: ‘He that found his life shall lose it, and he that lost his life for My sake shall find it.’
- ft1427 Especially if he taught him the highest of all lore, the Talmud, or explained the reason for the meaning of what it contained.
- ft1428 This is the only occasion on which they are designated as Apostles in the Gospel by St. Mark.
- ft1429 Their mission seems to have been short, probably not more than two weeks or so. But it seems impossible, in consistency with the facts, to confine it to two days, as Bishop Ellicott proposes (*Hist. Lect.* p. 193).
- ft1430 Comp. chapter 7 of this Book. For the sake of clearness and connection, some points formerly referred to have had to be here repeated.
- ft1431 Comp. ‘Sketches of Jewish Social Life,’ pp. 152, 153.
- ft1432 These verses contain the reflections of the Evangelist, not the words of the Baptist, just as previously vv. 16 to 21 are no longer the words of Christ but those of St. John.
- ft1433 Comp. *Caspari*, *Chronolog.* Geogr. Einl. pp. 83-91.

- ft1434 AEnon may even have been in Peraea itself — in that case, on the eastern bank of the Jordan.
- ft1435 Comp. *Schurer*, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* p. 233. As to the name Tiberias, comp. p. 635, note 1.
- ft1436 Comp. the references in *Bottger*, *Lex. zu Jos.* p. 58.
- ft1437 See the description of the site in *Tristram*, *Land of Moab*, p. 348.
- ft1438 A little before that it seems belonged to Aretas. We know not, how it again passed into the hands of Antipas, if, indeed, it ever was fully ceded by him to the Arabs. Comp. *Schurer*, u.s. p. 239, and *Wieseler*, *Chron. Syn.* p. 244, *Beitr.* pp. 5, etc., whose positions are, however, not always quite reliable.
- ft1439 Here Bassus made his attack in the last Jewish war (*Jos. War* 7:6. 1-4).
- ft1440 Canon *Tristram* *Land of Moab*, pp. 255-265; comp. *Baedeker (Socin)* *Palastina*, p. 195 and, for the various passages in Josephus referring to Machaerus, *Bottger*, u.s. pp. 165-167.
- ft1441 Thus viewed there is no contradiction, not even real variation, between St. ~~ⲁⲛⲉⲙ~~ Matthew 9:14, St. ~~ⲁⲓⲉⲣⲱⲥ~~ Mark 2:18, and St. ~~ⲁⲓⲉⲣⲱⲥ~~ Luke 5:33.
- ft1442 Altogether, Baba Mez, 84 a to 85 a contains a mixture of the strangest, grossest, and profanest absurdities.
- ft1443 Thus a three day's fast would be on the second, fifth, and again on the second day of the week.
- ft1444 Comp. 'The Temple, its Ministry and Services,' pp. 296-298.
- ft1445 This is the real import of the original.
- ft1446 'All bride-chambers were only within the portions of Benjamin' (the Tabernacle and the Temple). Hence Benjamin was called 'the host of the Lord.'
- ft1447 Strangely, the two designations are treated as identical in most Commentaries.
- ft1448 *Godet* has shown objections against all previous interpretations. But his own view seems to me equally untenable.
- ft1449 St. ~~ⲁⲓⲉⲣⲱⲥ~~ Luke 5:39 seems either a gloss of the writer, or may be (though very doubtfully) an interpolation. There is a curious parallel to the verse in Ab. 4:20.

- ft1450 This is both the correct reading and rendering.
- ft1451 The distinction between the two expressions will be further explained in the sequel.
- ft1452 Negative criticism charges St. Luke with having inserted this trait, forgetting that it is referred to by St. Matthew.
- ft1453 The two terms are different. The query was: would they go out 'to gaze at' a reed, and 'to see' one in soft clothing.
- ft1454 The reader will mark the difference between the quotation as made by all the three Evangelists, and our present Hebrew text and the LXX., and possibly draw his own inferences.
- ft1455 This is a sort of parenthetical note by St. Luke.
- ft1456 The common interpretations of this verse have seemed to me singularly unsatisfactory.
- ft1457 Comp. the Appendix on the Jewish Interpretation of Prophecy.
- ft1458 The pipe was used both in feasts and at mourning. So the Messianic hope had both its joyous and its sorrowful aspect.
- ft1459 Literally, justified. The expression is a Hebraism.
- ft1460 I cannot accept the reading 'works' in St. Mark.
- ft1461 As, according to *Josephus*, John was executed at Machaerus, the scene must have been there, and not either at Tiberias or at Julias.
- ft1462 The expression **γενέσις** leaves it doubtful, whether it was the birthday of Herod or the anniversary of his accession. *Wieseler* maintains that the Rabbinic equivalent (*Ginuseya*, or *Giniseya*) means the day of accession, *Meyer* the birthday. In truth it is used for both. But in Abod. Z. 10 *a* (about the middle) the *Yom Ginuseya* is expressly and elaborately shown to be the day of accession. Otherwise also the balance of evidence is in favor of this view. The event described in the text certainly took place *before* the Passover, and this was the time of Herod's death and of the accession of Antipas. It is not likely, that the Herodians would have celebrated their birthdays.
- ft1463 From the circumstance that *Josephus* calls him Herod and not Philip, a certain class of critics have imputed error to the Evangelists (*Schurer*, u. s., p. 237). But it requires to be kept in view, that in that case the Evangelists would be guilty not of one but of two gross historical errors. They would (1) have confounded this Herod with his half-

brother Philip. the Tetrarch, and (2) made him the husband of Herodias, instead of being her son-in-law, Philip the Tetrarch having married Salome. Two such errors are altogether inconceivable in so well-known a history, with which the Evangelists otherwise show such familiarity. On the other hand, there are internal reasons for believing that this Herod had a second name. Among the eight sons of Herod the Great there are three who bear his name (Herod). Of only one, Herod Antipas, we know the second name (Antipas). But, as for example in the case of the Bonaparte family, it is most unlikely that the other two should have borne the name of Herod without any distinctive second name. Hence we conclude, that the name Philip, which occurs in the Gospels (in St. ~~Q199~~ Luke 3:19 it is spurious), was the second name of him whom *Josephus* simply names as Herod. If it be objected, that in such case Herod would have had two sons named Philip, we answer (1) that he had two sons of the name Antipas, or Antipater, (2) that they were the sons of different mothers, and (3) that the full name of the one was Herod Philip (first husband of Herodias), and of the other simply Philip the Tetrarch (husband of Salome, and son-in-law of Herodias and of Herod Philip her first husband). Thus for distinction's sake the one might have been generally called simply Herod, the other Philip.

^{ft1464} A σπεκουλάτωμ, *speculator*, one of a body-guard which had come into use, who attended the Caesars, executed their behests and often their sudden sentences of death (from *speculator*). The same word occurs in Rabbinic Hebrew as *Sephaqlator* (ר״ח קִבְּסַ), or *Isphaqlator* (ר״ח קִבְּסָה), and is applied to one who carries out the sentence of execution (Shabb. 108 *a.*).

^{ft1465} The common reading, 'House of *fishes*,' is certainly inaccurate. Its Aramaic equivalent would be probably adyxetyKeTseida means literally hunting as well as fishing, having special reference to catching in a *snare* or net. Possibly, but not so likely, it may have been adyxt (*Tsayyada*), house of a snarer-huntsman, here fisher. It will be noticed, that we retain the *textus receptus* of St. ~~Q199~~ Luke 9:10.

^{ft1466} I do not quite understand the reasoning of Captain *Conder* on this point (*Handb. of the Bible*, pp. 321, etc.), but I cannot agree with his conclusions.

^{ft1467} On the whole question comp. the *Encyclopaedias*, *Caspari* u. s. pp. 81, 83; *Baedeker* (*Socin*), p. 267; *Tristram*, *Land of Israel*, p. 443 etc.

ft1468 Professor *Westcott* notes, that the account of St. John could neither have been derived from those of the Synoptists, nor from any common original, from which their narratives are by some supposed to have been derived.

ft1469 There is no valid reason for doubting the genuineness of these words, or giving them another meaning than in the text. Comp. *Westcott*, ad. loc.

ft1470 Even those who hold such views assert them in this instance hesitatingly. It seems almost impossible to conceive, that a narrative recorded in all the four Gospels should not have an historical basis, and the appeal to the precedent of Elisha is the more inapt, that in common Jewish thinking he was *not* regarded as specially the type of the Messiah.

ft1471 This seems the fair meaning of St. mark 6:31-33, comp. with St. ~~4043~~ Matthew 14:13.

ft1472 St. ~~4052~~ Mark 6:32 has it 'by (or rather in) the ship,' with the definite article. Probably it was the same boat that was always at His disposal, perhaps belonging to the sons of Jonas or to the sons of Zebedee.

ft1473 Canon *Westcott* supposes that 'a day of teaching and healing must be intercalated before the miracle of feeding,' but I cannot see any reason for this. All the events fit well into one day.

ft1474 The expression in St. ~~4055~~ Mark 6:35 is literally, 'a late hour,'

ft1475 Comp. *Herzfeld*, *Handelsgesch.* pp. 305, 306. In my view he has established the meaning of this name as against *Lewysohn*, *Zool.* d. Talm. pp. 255, 256, and *Levy*, *Neuhebr. Worterb.* 2:192 a.

ft1476 The literal rendering of **πρασιά**, is 'garden-bed.' In ~~4060~~ Mark 6:40, 'garden-beds, garden-beds.' In the A. V. 'in ranks.'

ft1477 The expression is different from that used by the Synoptists; but in St. ~~4056~~ Matthew 15:36 and in St. ~~4086~~ Mark 8:6, the term is also that of *thanksgiving*, not *blessing*. **εὐχαριστέω**, not **εὐλογέω**.

ft1478 Not an Egyptian basket, as even *Jost* translates in his edition of the Mishnah. The word is derived from **ῥαμη** (Metser), wicker or willow.)

ft1479 See the meaning of that expression in the previous chapter.

ft1480 Note here the want of the article: *ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτον βασιλέα*. We owe this notice to the Fourth Gospel, and it is in marked inconsistency with the theory of its late Ephesian authority.

ft1481 Probably from 3 to about 6 A. M.

ft1482 Even the beautiful allegory into which *Keim* would resolve it — that the Church in her need knows not, whether her Savior may not come in the last watch of the night — entirely surrenders the whole narrative. And why should three Evangelists have invented such a story, in order to teach or rather disguise a doctrine, which is otherwise so clearly expressed throughout the whole New Testament, as to form one of its primary principles? *Volkmar* (Marcus, p. 372) regards this whole history as an allegory of St. Paul's activity among the Gentiles! Strange in that case, that it was omitted in the Gospel by St. Luke. But the whole of that section of *Volkmar's* book (beginning at p. 327) contains an extra-ordinary congeries, of baseless hypotheses, of which it were difficult to say, whether the language is more painfully irreverent or the outcome more extravagant.

ft1483 On the other hand, the miraculous feeding of the multitude seems to exhibit rather the humanly-Divine aspect of His Person.

ft1484 Literally, a phantasma. This word is only used in this narrative (St. ~~Matthew~~ 14:26 and St. ~~Mark~~ 6:49.).

ft1485 The authenticity of the Second Epistle of St. Peter is here taken for granted, but the drift of the argument would be the same, to whatever authorship it be ascribed.

ft1486 *Weiss* (Matthaus-Evang. p. 372) sees a gross contradiction between what seems implied as to His original purpose and His walking on the sea, and hence rejects the narrative. Such are the assumptions of negative criticism. But it seems forgotten that, according to St. ~~Matthew~~ 14:24, the journey seems at first to have been fairly prosperous.

ft1487 *Weiss* (u. s.) certainly argues on the impossibility of His having seen the boat so far out on the Lake.

ft1488 According to St. ~~Matthew~~ 14:24, they seem only to have encountered the full force of the wind when they were about the middle of the Lake. We imagine that soon after they embarked there may have been a fresh breeze from the other side of the Lake, which by and by rose into a violent contrary wind.

ft1489 St. John, in distinction to the Synoptists, here uses the expression **θεωρεῖν** (St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 6:19), which in the Gospels has the *distinctive meaning of fixed, earnest, and intent gaze*, mostly outward, but sometimes also inward, in the sense of earnest and attentive consideration. The use of this word as distinguished from merely *seeing*, is so important for the better understanding of the New Testament, that every reader should mark it. We accordingly append a list of the passages in the Gospels where this word is used: St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Matthew 27:55; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 28:1; St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Mark 3:11; 5:15, 38; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 12:41; 15:40, 47; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 16:4; St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Luke 10:18; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 14:29; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 21:6; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 23:35, 48; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 24:37, 39; St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 2:23; 4:19; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 6:2 (*Lachm. and Treg.*), 19, 40, 62; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 7:3; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 8:51; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 9:8; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 10:12; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 12:19, 45; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 14:17, 19; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 16:10, 16, 17, 19; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 17:24; ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ 20:6, 12, 14. It will thus be seen, that the expression is more frequently used by St. John than in the other Gospels, and it is there also that its distinctive meaning is of greatest importance.

ft1490 This seems to me implied in the expression, St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 6:21: ‘Then they were willing to take Him into the ship.’ Some negative critics have gone so far as to see in this graphic hint a contradiction to the statements of the Synoptists. (See *Lucke*, Comment. u. d. Evang. Joh. 2 pp. 120-122.).

ft1491 As to the physical possibility of it, we have to refer to our former remarks.

ft1492 The word ‘boisterous’ must be struck out as an interpolated gloss.

ft1493 I cannot see (with *Meyer*) any variation in the narrative in St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ John 6:21. The expression, ‘they were willing to take him into the ship,’ certainly does not imply that, after, the incident of Peter’s failure, He did not actually enter the boat.

ft1494 *Weiss* (p. 373) assures us that this view is ‘impossible;’ but on no better ground than that no others than ten disciples are mentioned in St. ~~ⲁⲓⲃ~~ Matthew 14:22, as if it had been necessary to mention the embarkation of the boatmen.

ft1495 I have myself counted twelve different places in England bearing names which might be freely rendered by ‘Beth-Saida,’ not to speak of the many suburbs and quarters which bear a like designation, and, of course, my list is anything but complete.

- ft1496 In Jer. Megill. (p. 70 *a*, line 15 from bottom) we read of a **httryx** , but the locality scarcely agrees with our Beth-Saida.
- ft1497 Comp. *Baedeker (Socin)* Palast. page 270.
- ft1498 May this connection of Capernaum and Beth-Saida account for the mention of the latter as one of the places which had been the scene of so many of His mighty works (St. ~~<4012>~~ Matthew 11:21; St. ~~<4003>~~ Luke 10:13)?
- ft1499 There is no article in the original.
- ft1500 *Baedeker (Socin)* has grouped together the reasons against identifying *Khan Minyeh* with Capernaum itself.
- ft1501 Mr. *Brown McClellan* (N.T. vol. 1 p. 570) holds, that both the Passover and Pentecost had intervened — I know not on what grounds. At the same time the language in St. ~~<4066>~~ Mark 6:56, might imply more than one occasion on which the same thing happened.
- ft1502 This is propounded in *Wieseler*, Chronolog. Synopse, pp. 276, 290, as a possible view.
- ft1503 The word quite corresponds to the Jewish term. Notwithstanding the objection of the learned Bishop *Haneberg* (Relig. Alterth. p. 475, note 288) I believe it corresponds to the Rabbinic **lwh** or *profanus*, in the sense of ‘common,’ ‘not hallowed.’
- ft1504 The fullest account of it within reach of ordinary readers is in the Notes to *Pocock’s* Porta Mosis (pp. 350-402) though it is confused, not quite accurate, and based chiefly on later Jewish authorities. *Spencer* (de Leg. Hebr. pp. 1175-1179) only adds references to similar Gentile rites. *Goodwin*, even under the revision of *Hottinger* (pp. 182-188), is in this instance inferior to *Pocock*. *Buxtorf* (Synag. pp. 179-184) gives chiefly illustrative Jewish legends; *Otho* (Lex. Rabb. pp. 335, 336) extracts from his predecessors, to little advantage. The Rabbinic notes of *Lightfoot*, *Wunsche*, *Schottgen*, and *Weistein* give no clear account; and the Biblical Dictionaries are either silent, or (as *Herzog’s*) very meager. Other accounts are, unfortunately, very inaccurate.
- ft1505 *Yadayim*, in four chapters, which, however, touches on other subjects also, notably on the canonicity of certain parts of the O.T.
- ft1506 We refer here generally to *Chull.* 105 *a*, *b*, 106 *b*.

- ft1507 Many illustrative stories are given of its importance, on the one hand, and of the danger of neglecting it on the other. With these legends it is not necessary to cumber our pages.
- ft1508 The danger from 'Salt of Sodom' is specially mentioned.
- ft1509 **hl yfn** sometimes though rarely, **pydy trhf** but not **txyj r** which refers to ordinary washing. Occasionally it is simply designated by the term *Netilah*.
- ft1510 This and what follows illustrates St. ~~<RB>~~ John 2:6.
- ft1511 The language of the Mishnah shows that the word **grp** which bears as vague and wide meaning as **πυγμή**, which seems a literal translation of it, can only apply to the wrist.
- ft1512 The rendering 'wash diligently,' gives no meaning; that 'with the fist' is not in accordance with Jewish Law; while that 'up to the elbow' is not only contrary to Jewish Law, but apparently based on a wrong rendering of the word This is fully shown by *Wetstein* (N. T. 1 p. 585), but his own explanation, that **πυγμή** refers to the measure or weight of the water for washing, is inadmissible.
- ft1513 In Yad. 4:6, the Pharisees in dispute with the Sadducees indicate what seems to me a far more likely reason, in the desire to protect the Scriptures from profane use.
- ft1514 By a curious inversion the law ultimately came to be, that the Scriptures everywhere defiled the hands, except those of the Priests in the Temple (Kel. 15:6). This on the ground that, taught by former enactments, they had learned to keep the Terumah far away from the sacred rolls, but really, as I believe, because the law, that the Priests' hands became defiled if they touched a copy of the sacred rules, must have involved constant difficulties.
- ft1515 We must bear in mind, that it was the work of an Egyptian Jew, and I cannot help feeling that the language bears some likeness to what afterwards was one of the distinctive practices of the Essenes.
- ft1516 In the 'Speaker's Commentary' (ad loc.) this 'extreme minuteness of details' is, it seems to me not correctly, accounted for on the ground of 'special reference to the Judaisers who at a very early period formed an influential party at Rome.'
- ft1517 This is the more striking as the same expression is used in reference to the opposition or rather the 'invalidating' by R. Eliezer ben Chanokh of

the ordinance of hand-washing, for which he was excommunicated (μydy trhf b qpqp v Eduy. 5:6). The term qpqp, which originally means to stop up by pouring or putting in something, is used for contemning or bringing into contempt, invalidating, or shaking a decree, with the same signification as l zēḏ. This is proved from the use of the latter in Ab. Z. 35 a, line 9 from bottom, and 36 a, line 12 from top.

ft1518 In this passage there is a regular discussion, whether that which is written (the Pentateuch), or that which is oral (tradition is more precious and to be loved ḡbybj ḡhm hzya. The opinion is in favor of the oral ḡtwa hpbv.

ft1519 It was, however, admitted that the Halakhah sometimes went beyond the Pentateuch (Sot. 16 a).

ft1520 See the remarks this point in vol. 1 pp. 567, 576, 577.

ft1521 According to Nedar. 10 a, the Rabbis invented this word instead of 'Qorban to the Lord' (⌘ Leviticus 1:2), in order that the Name of God might not be idly taken.

ft1522 See *Maimonides*, Yad haChas., Hilkh. Nedar. 1:1, 2.

ft1523 *Maimonides* u. s. Hilkh. Shebh. 5:1.

ft1524 This is altogether a very curious Mishnah. It adds to the remark quoted in the text this other significant admission, that the laws about the Sabbath, festive offerings, and the malversation of things devoted to God 'are like mountains hanging by one hair,' since Scripture is scant on these subjects, while the traditional Laws are many.

ft1525 On the subject of Vows see also 'The Temple and its Services,' pp. 322-326. The student should consult *Siphre*, Par. Mattoth, pp. 55 b to 58 b.

ft1526 I can only express surprise, that *Wunsche* should throw doubt upon it. It was fully admitted by *Levy*, Targ. Worterb. sub zbrq

ft1527 In this case the son, desirous that his father should share in the festivities at his marriage, proposed to give to a friend the court in which the banquet was to be held and the banquet itself, but only for the purpose that his father might eat and drink with him. The proposal was refused as involving sin, and the point afterwards discussed and confirmed — implying, that in no circumstances could a parent partake

of anything belonging to his son, if he had pronounced such a vow, the only relaxation being that in case of actual starvation ('if he have not what to eat') the son might make a present to a third person, when the father might in turn receive of it.

ft1528 Comp. *Wunsche*, ad loc.

ft1529 Other translations have been proposed, but the above is taken from Nedar. 8:7, with the change only of *Qonam* into *Qorban*.

ft1530 The quotation is a 'Targum,' which in the last clause follows almost entirely the LXX.

ft1531 Mark the definite article.

ft1532 The words in St. ~~40715~~ Mark 7:16 are of very doubtful authenticity.

ft1533 Both these sayings seem to have been proverbial at the time, although I am not able to quote any passage in Jewish writings in which they occur in exactly the same form.

ft1534 In St. ~~40721~~ Mark 7:21 these outcomings of 'evil thoughts' are arranged in three groups of four, characterized as in the text; while in St. ~~4059~~ Matthew 15:19 the order of the ten commandments seems followed. The account of St. Mark is the fuller. In both accounts the expression 'blasphemy' (βλασφημία) — rendered in the Revised Version by 'railing' — seems to refer to calumnious and evil speaking about our fellow-men.

ft1535 I have accepted this rendering of the words, first propounded by St. Chrysostom, and now adopted in the Revised Version, although not without much misgiving. For there is strong objection to it from the Jewish *usus* and views. The statement in Ber. 61 *a*, last line, 'The oesophagus which causeth to enter and which casteth out all manner of meat. Lkam ynym l k ayxwmw synkm fvw seems to imply *that the words of Christ were a proverbial expression*. The Talmudic idea is based on the curious physiological notion (Midr. on ~~2079~~ Ecclesiastes 7:19), that the food passed from the oesophagus first into the larger intestine (*Hemses*, *ssmh* perhaps = *omasum*), where the food was supposed to be crushed as in a mill (Vayyik R. 4, 18; Midr. on Ecclesiastes. 12:3), and thence only, through various organs, into the stomach proper. (As regards the process in animals, see *Lewysohn*, *Zool. d. Talm.* pp. 37-40). (The passage from Ber. 61 *a* has been so rendered by *Wunsche*, in his note on St. ~~4057~~ Matthew 15:17, as to be in

parts well nigh unintelligible.) It may interest students that the strange word ἄφεδρών rendered both in the A.V. and the R.V. by ‘draught,’ seems to correspond to the Rabbinic *Aphidra* ardypa which *Levy* renders by ‘the floor of a stable formed by the excrements of the animals which are soaked and stamped into a hard mass.’

^{ft1536} It is, of course, well known that the reasoning of the Tübingen school and of kindred negative theology is based on a supposed contrariety between the Petrine and Pauline direction, and that this again is chiefly based on the occurrence in Antioch recorded in <801>Galatians 2:11 etc.

^{ft1537} IT IS SPECIALLY REQUESTED, THAT THIS CHAPTER BE READ ALONG WITH THE TEXT OF SCRIPTURE.

^{ft1538} We are here involuntarily reminded of the fate of Elijah on the morning after the miracle on Mount Carmel. But how different the bearing of Christ from that of the great prophet!

^{ft1539} *Westcott*, ad. loc.

^{ft1540} Canon *Westcott* notes the intended realism in the choice of words: ‘Literally, “were satisfied with food as animals with fodder.”’

^{ft1541} Comp. ‘Sketches of Jewish Social Life,’ pp. 256, 257.

^{ft1542} Not as in the A.V. of ver. 33: ‘He Which cometh down from heaven.’ The alteration is most important in the argument as addressed to the Jews: the one they could understand and would admit, not so the other.

^{ft1543} In the Midrash on <1024>Ecclesiastes 2:24; 3:12; 8:15, we are told, that when in Ecclesiastes we read of eating and drinking, it always refers to the Law and good works.

^{ft1544} After having arrived at this conclusion, I find that Canon *Westcott* has expressed the same views, and I rejoice in being fortified by so great an authority.

^{ft1545} But not here and there one dead. In general, see vol. 1 p. 633, where the question of Jewish belief on that subject is discussed.

^{ft1546} So Canon *Westcott*; and also *Godet* ad loc.

^{ft1547} Mark the special meaning of as previously explained.

^{ft1548} This is not narrated in the Fourth Gospel. But allusions like this cover the whole early history of Jesus, and prove that omissions of the most important facts in the history of Jesus are neither due to ignorance of

them on the part of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, nor to the desire to express by silence his dissent from the accounts of the Synoptists.

ft1549 Canon *Westcott* has called attention to this.

ft1550 For other Rabbinic applications of these verses to the Messiah and His times, see the Appendix on Messianic passages.

ft1551 The words 'on Me' are spurious.

ft1552 The words in the A.V., 'which I will give,' are spurious.

ft1553 Canon *Westcott* (ad loc.) clearly shows, that the reference to the Holy Supper can only be secondary. Mark here specially, that in the latter we have 'the Body,' not 'the Flesh' of the Lord.

ft1554 Comp. here the remarks on ver. 27, about Truth as the seal with which God sealed the Christ.

ft1555 Mark here also the special meaning of θεωρήτε.

ft1556 This is the reading of all the best MSS., and not as in the A.V. 'that Christ, the Son of the Living God.' For the history of the variations by which this change was brought about, see *Westcott*, ad loc.

ft1557 The right reading of ver. 71 is: 'Judas the son of Simon Iscariot,' that is, 'a man of Kerioth.' *Kerioth* was in Judaea (~~1853~~ Joshua 15:25), and Judas, it will be remembered, the only Judæan disciple of Jesus.

ft1558 So correctly rendered.

ft1559 Or, the Passover-eve may have been Monday evening.

ft1560 Comp. Cannon *Westcott*, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Appendix C.

ft1561 This view is advocated by Dean *Plumptre* with remarkable beauty, tenderness, and reverence. It is also that of *Meyer* and of *Ewald*. The latter remarks, that our Lord showed twofold greatness: First, in his calm limitation to His special mission, and then in His equally calm overstepping of it, when a higher ground for so doing appeared.

ft1562 The term means 'little dogs,' or 'house-dogs.'

ft1563 Many passages might be quoted either similar, or based on this view of Gentiles.

ft1564 Canon *Cook* (Speaker's Comm. on St. ~~4075~~ Mark 7:26) regards this 'as one of the very few instances in which our Lord's words really differ in the two accounts.' With all deference, I venture to think it is not so,

but that St. Mark gives what St. Peter had received as the impression of Christ's words on his mind.

ft1565 For the Rabbinic views of the boundaries of Palestine see 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' ch. 2.

ft1566 The correct reading of St. ~~<4073>~~ Mark 7:31, is 'through Sidon.' By the latter I do not understand the town of that name. which would have been quite outside the savior's route, but (with *Ewald* and *Lange*) the territory of Sidon.

ft1567 The fullest notice of the 'Ten Cities' is that of *Caspari*, Chronolog. Geogr. Einl. pp. 83-91, with which compare Menke's Bibel-Atlas, Map 5.

ft1568 Comp. Schurer, pp. 382, 383.

ft1569 μογιλάλος or μογγιλάλος does not mean one absolutely dumb. It is literally: *difficulter loquens*. The Rabbinic designation of such a person would have been *Cheresh* (Ter. 1:2) although different opinions obtain as to whether the term includes impediment of speech (comp. Meg. 2:4; Gitt. 71 *a*).

ft1570 In St. ~~<4006>~~ John 9:6 it is really application of clay.

ft1571 στενάζω occurs only here in the Gospels. Otherwise it occurs in ~~<4023>~~ Romans 8:23; ~~<4072>~~ 2 Corinthians 5:2, 4; Hebrew 13:17; ~~<4089>~~ James 5:9; the substantive in ~~<4073>~~ Acts 7:34; ~~<4086>~~ Romans 8:26.

ft1572 So literally.

ft1573 Κυλλός means here *incurvatus*, and not as in 9:43 *mutilatus*.

ft1574 *Wunsche* (ad. loc.) is guilty of serious misapprehension when he says that the Talmud condemns to eternal punishment those who employ this mode of healing. This statement is incorrect. What it condemns is the whispering of magical formulas over a wound (Sanh. 90 *a*), when it was the custom of some magicians to spit before (Sanh. 101 *a*), of others after pronouncing the formula (Jer. Sanh. 28 *b*). There is no analogy whatever between this and what our Lord did, and the use of saliva for cures is universally recognized by the Rabbis.

ft1575 So literally, or rather 'hearings' — in the plural.

ft1576 Most commentators regard this as the *eastern* Bethsaida, or Bethsaida-Julias. The objection (in the Speaker's Commentary) that the text speaks of 'a village' (verses 23, 26) is obviated by the

circumstance that similarly we read immediately afterwards (ver. 27) about the ‘villages of Caesarea Philippi.’ Indeed, a knowledge of Jewish law enables us to see here a fresh proof of the genuineness of the Evangelic narrative. For, according to Meg. 3 *b* the villages about a town were reckoned as belonging to it, while, on the other hand, a town which had not among its inhabitants ten *Batlanin* (persons who devoted themselves to the worship and affairs of the Synagogue) was to be regarded as a village. The Bethsaida of ver. 22 must refer to the district, in one of the hamlets of which the blind man met Jesus. It does not appear, that Jesus ever again wrought miracles, either in Capernaum or the western Bethsaida, if, indeed, He ever returned to that district. Lastly, the scene of that miracle must have been the eastern Bethsaida (Julias), since immediately afterwards the continuance of His journey to Caesarea Philippi is related without any notice of crossing the Lake.

ft1577 The better reading of the words is given in the Revised Version.

ft1578 Thus, the healing recorded immediately after this history, in St. ~~4092~~ Matthew 9:32-35, belongs evidently to a later period. Comp. St. ~~2114~~ Luke 11:14.

ft1579 I admit that especially the latter argument is inconclusive, but I appeal to the general context and the setting of this history. It is impossible to regard St. Matthew 9 as a chronological record of events.

ft1580 He is *addressed* as ‘Son of David,’ in this passage, by the Syro-Phoenician woman (St. ~~4152~~ Matthew 15:22), and by the blind men near Jericho (St. ~~4110~~ Matthew 20:30, 31; St. ~~4107~~ Mark 10:47, 48; St. ~~2188~~ Luke 18:38, 39), and *proclaimed* as such by the people in St. ~~4123~~ Matthew 12:23; 21:9, 15.

ft1581 ἐνβριμάομαι — the word occurs in that sense only here and in St. ~~4104~~ Mark 1:43; otherwise also in St. ~~4145~~ Mark 14:5, and in St. ~~4113~~ John 11:33, 38.

ft1582 It should be borne in mind, that the country, surroundings, etc., place these men in a totally different category from the Syro-Phoenician woman.

ft1583 Roman Catholic writers mostly praise, while Protestants blame, their conduct.

ft1584 See Appendix XVII: The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath.

ft1585 Comp. 'The Temple and its Services,' pp. 222, 226, 230, 231.

ft1586 The great majority of critics are agreed as to its authenticity.

ft1587 The view which I have adopted is that of *Scaliger* and *Lightfoot*; the alternative one mentioned, that of *Delitzsch*. In regard to the many other explanations proposed, I would lay down this canon: No explanation can be satisfactory which rests not on some ascertained fact in Jewish life, but where the fact is merely 'supposed' for the sake of the explanation which it would afford. Thus, there is not the slightest support in fact for the idea, that the first Sabbath of the second month was so called (*Wetstein*, Speaker's Commentary), or the first Sabbath in the second year of a septennial cycle, or the Sabbath of the Nisan (the sacred) year, in contradistinction to the Tishri or secular year, which began in autumn. Of these and similar interpretations it is enough to say, that the underlying fact is 'supposed' for the sake of a 'supposed' explanation; in other words, they embody an hypothesis based on an hypothesis.

ft1588 There were only three Paschal feasts during the public ministry of Christ. Any other computation rests on the idea that the Unknown Feast was the Passover, or even the Feast of Esther.

ft1589 Comp. Appendix XV.

ft1590 Few would be disposed to place St. Matthew 12 before St. Matthew 4.

ft1591 Adverbs answer to the questions, How, When, Why, Where.

ft1592 *Meyer* insists that the ὁδὸν, ποιεῖν or more correctly, ὁδοποιεῖν (St. ⁴¹⁰²³Mark 2:23) should be translated literally, that the disciples began to make a way by plucking the ears of corn. Accordingly, he maintains, that there is an essential difference between the account of St. Mark and those of the two other Evangelists, who attribute the plucking of the ears to hunger. Canon *Cook* (Speaker's Commentary, New Testament 1 p. 216) has to my mind, conclusively shown the untenableness of Meyer's contention. He compares the expression of St. Mark to the Latin '*iter facere*.' I would suggest the French '*chemin faisant*.' *Godet* points out the absurdity of plucking up ears in order to make a way through the corn.

ft1593 In St. Mark also the better reading is διαπορεύεσθαι.

- ft1594 Thus (Shabb. 74 *b*, lines 12, 11 from bottom), if a person were to pull out a feather from the wing of a bird, cut off the top, and then pluck off the fluff below it would involve three labors and three sin-offerings.
- ft1595 But only where the life of an Israelite, not of a heathen or Samaritan, was in danger (Yoma 84 *b*).
- ft1596 *Maimonides*, Hilkh. Shabb. 2:1 (Yad haCh. vol. 1 part 3 p. 141 *a*): ‘The Sabbath is set aside on account of danger to life, as all other ordinances **l k ravk twxmh**.
- ft1597 According to ~~Q21B~~ 1 Samuel 22:9 Ahimelech (or Ahijah, ~~Q14B~~ 1 Samuel 14:3) was the high Priest. We infer, that Abiathar was conjoined with his father in the priesthood. Comp. the ‘Bible-History,’ vol. 4 p. 111.
- ft1598 The question discussed in the Talmud is, whether, supposing an ordinary Israelite discharged priestly functions on the Sabbath in the temple, it would involve two sins: unlawful service and Sabbath desecration; or only one sin, unlawful service.
- ft1599 We may here again state, that Cod. D has this after St. ~~Q14B~~ Luke 6:4: ‘The same day, having beholden a man working on the Sabbath, He said to Him: “Man, if thou knowest what thou dost, blessed are thou: but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the Law”’ (*Nicholson*, Gospel according to the Hebrews, p. 151). It need scarcely be said, that the words, as placed in St. Luke, are a spurious addition, although as Canon *Westcott* rightly infers, ‘the saying [probably] rests on some real incident’ (Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, p. 454, note).
- ft1600 Thus, when a Rabbi was consulted, whether a man might on the Sabbath take a certain drink which had a purgative effect, he answered: ‘If for pleasure it is lawful; if for healing forbidden’ (Jer. Shabb. 14 *c*).
- ft1601 Thus one of the Rabbis regarded foetor of the breath as possibly dangerous (u. s. 14 *d*).
- ft1602 Displacement of the frontal bone, disease of the nerves leading from the ear to the upper jaw, an eye starting from its socket, severe inflammations, and swelling wounds, are specially mentioned.
- ft1603 The tense indicates, that it was restored as he stretched it out. And this is spiritually significant. According to St. *Jerome* (Comm. in ~~Q21B~~ Matthew 12:13), in the Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites this

man was described as a mason, and that he had besought Jesus to restore him, so that he might not have to beg for his bread.

ft1604 Comp. ch. 29 of this Book.

ft1605 This appears from the whole context. Comp. Bp. *Ellicott's* Histor. Lect. pp. 220, 221, and notes.

ft1606 For a summary of the great differences between the two miracles, comp. Bp. *Ellicott*, u. s. pp. 221, 222. The statements of *Meyer* ad loc. are unsatisfactory.

ft1607 The **κόφινος** (St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 14:20) was the small handbasket (see ch. 29), while the **σπυρίς** (the term used at the feeding of the four thousand) is the large provision-basket or hamper, such as that in which St. Paul was let down over the wall at Damascus (~~Acts~~ Acts 9:25). What makes it more marked is, that the distinction of the two words is kept up in the reference to the two miracles (St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 16:9, 10).

ft1608 See ch. 29.

ft1609 Literally, 'upon the earth.'

ft1610 The word **ἐρημία** means a specially lonely place.

ft1611 Of *Bleek*.

ft1612 By Dean *Plumptre*, ad loc.

ft1613 Compare, however, vol. 1 pp. 238, 240, and Book 5 ch. 3. Where the political element was dominant, the religious distinction might not be so clearly marked.

ft1614 It need scarcely be said that the best reading is Magadan, not Magdala.

ft1615 It has been ingeniously suggested, that Magadan might represent a Megiddo, being a form intermediate between the Hebrew Megiddon and the Assyrian Magadu.

ft1616 Canon *Cook* in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' ad loc.

ft1617 *Sepp*, ap. *Bottger*, Topogr. Lex. zu Fl. Josephus, p. 240.

ft1618 Bearing in mind that Tarichaea was the chief depot for salting the fish for export, the disciples may have had some connections with the place.

ft1619 The word here used would, to judge by analogous instances, be **twa** (*Oth*), and not **mys** (*Siman*), as *Wunsche* suggests, even though the word is formed from the Greek **σήμεϊον**. But the Rabbinic *Siman* seems to me to have a different shade of meaning.

ft1620 However, this (and, for that matter, the next Haggadah also) may have been intended to be taken in an allegoric or parabolic sense, though there is no hint given to that effect.

ft1621 See ch. 27 vol. 1, p. 647.

ft1622 Although some of the best MSS. omit St. ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 16:2, beginning ‘When it is evening,’ to the end of ver. 3, most critics are agreed that it should be retained. But the words in italics in verses 2 and 3 should be left out, so as to mark exclamations.

ft1623 So according to the best reading.

ft1624 The figurative meaning of leaven, as that which morally corrupts, was familiar to the Jews. Thus the word **rwav** (*Seor*) is used in the sense of ‘moral leaven’ hindering the good in Ber. 17 *a* while the verb **xmj** (*chamets*) ‘to be come leavened,’ is used to indicate moral deterioration in Rosh haSh. 3 *b*, 4 *a*.

ft1625 If it were for no other reason than the mode in which the ex-general of the Galileans, *Josephus*, tells this story, he would deserve our execration.

ft1626 For the geographical details I must refer to the words of *Stanley* and *Tristram*, and to *Badeker’s* Palastina. I have not deemed it necessary to make special quotation of my authority in each case.

ft1627 *Tristram*, Land of Israel, p. 586.

ft1628 So Dean *Stanley*, with his usual charm of language, though topographically not quite correctly (Sinai and Palestine, p. 395).

ft1629 Nothing in the above obliges us to infer, that the words of Peter’s confession were spoken in Caesarea itself. The place might have been in view or in the memory.

ft1630 I confess, however, to strong doubts on this point. Legends of the hiding of the tabernacle, ark, and altar of incense on Mount Nebo by Jeremiah, were, indeed, combined with an expectation that these precious possessions would be restored in Messianic times (2 Macc. 2:1-7), but it is expressly added in ver. 8, that ‘the Lord’ Himself, and not the prophet, would show their place of concealment. Dean *Plumptre’s* statement, that the Pharisees taught, and the Jews believed in, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls must have arisen from the misapprehension of what *Josephus* said, to which reference has already been made in the chapter on ‘The Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.’

The first distinct mention of the reappearance of Jeremiah, along with Elijah, to restore the ark, etc., is in *Josippon ben Gorion* (lib. 1 c. 21), but here also only in the Cod. *Munster.*, not in that used by *Breithaupt*. The age of the work of *Josippon* is in dispute; probably we may date it from the tenth century of our era. The only other testimony about the reappearance of Jeremiah is in 4 Esdras. (2 Esdras.) 2:18. But the book is post-Christian, and, in that section especially, evidently borrows from the Christian Scriptures.

ft1631 On the vague fears of Herod, see vol. 1 p. 675.

ft1632 A vision of Jeremiah in a dream was supposed to betoken chastisements (Ber. 57 *e*, line 7 from top).

ft1633 This is the correct reading.

ft1634 There could have been no anti-Petrine tendency in this, since it is equally omitted in the Petrine Gospel of St. Mark.

ft1635 See the remarks on Matthew-Levi in vol. 1 ch. 17 p. 514 of this Book.

ft1636 Thus, for example, Andrew was both Ἀνδρέας and yarDḡḡ (Anderai) = ‘manly,’ ‘brave.’ A family *Anderai* is mentioned Jer. Kethub. 33 *a*.

ft1637 The same occurs in Shem. R. 15, only that there it is not only Abraham but ‘the fathers’ who are ‘the Rocks’ (the word used there is not *Petra* but *Tsur*) on whom the world is founded.

ft1638 There was a strange idea about Jewish children who had died uncircumcised and the sinners in Israel exchanging their position in regard to circumcision. Could this, only spiritually understood and applied, have been present to the mind of St. Paul when he wrote ~~ⲁⲓⲁⲛ~~ Romans 2:25, 26, last clauses?

ft1639 See Appendix XVIII.

ft1640 The reader will have no difficulty in recognizing a reference to the See of Rome, perhaps ‘the Chair of St. Peter,’ mixed up with the meaning of the name of Peter.

ft1641 The other views of the words are (*a*) that Christ pointed to Himself as the Rock, (*b*) or to Peter as a person, (*c*) or to Peter’s confession.

ft1642 The other word is *Edah*. Comp. Bible Hist. vol. 2 p. 177, note.

- ft1643 It is important to notice that the word is *Hades*, and not *Gehenna*. Dean *Plumptre* calls attention to the wonderful character of such a prophecy at a time when all around seemed to foreshadow only failure.
- ft1644 Those who apply the words ‘upon this Rock, etc.,’ to Peter or to Christ must feel, that they introduce an abrupt and inelegant transition from one figure to another.
- ft1645 The word used by St. Matthew (δισετείλατο) means ‘charged;’ that by St. Mark (ἐπετίμησεν) implies rebuke; while the expression employed by St. Luke (ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλε) conveys both rebuke and command.
- ft1646 Otherwise they could not afterwards have been in such doubt about His Death and Resurrection.
- ft1647 It is very remarkable that the expression ἰλεώς σοι literally ‘have mercy on thee,’ is the exact transcript of the Rabbinic *Chas lecha* (Al sj). See *Levy, Neuhebr. Worterb.* vol. 2, p. 85. The commoner expression is *Chas ve Shalom*, ‘mercy and peace,’ viz. be to thee, and the meaning is, God forbid, or God avert, a thing or its continuance.
- ft1648 So the Greek literally.
- ft1649 In those days the extreme suffering which a man might expect from the hostile power (the Romans) was the literal cross; in ours, it is suffering not less acute, the greatest which the present hostile power can inflict: really, through perhaps not literally, a cross.
- ft1650 This is an exact translation of the phrase *htym μ[f*, which is of such very frequent occurrence in Rabbinic writings. See our remarks on St. ~~John~~ John 8:52 in Book IV. ch. 8.

PUBLISHERS NOTES

CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at...

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to “make the words of the wise available to all — inexpensively.” We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at AGES Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We

have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation.